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The Preface.

Reader,

If thou meet me at the threshold with a [What need any more against Popery then is written?] I must answer thee, [No need, if all that is already written, were improved. Nor were there need of any writings, if men would not renounce their common senses. We cannot hope or pretend, by any writings, to bring any controversy to a plainer, better issue, then to resolve it by the judgement of the common senses of all the world: and yet this doth not end the controversies between us and the Papists; whether Bread be Bread, and Wine be Wine, when they are seen, felt, tasted,
ed, &c. But some writings are useful to awake men to the use of Reason, and to help them to improve their other helps. And, as Seneca faith, Multum egerunt qui ante nos fuerunt; sed non peregerunt: suscipiendi tamen sunt.] Though I thought I had said enough before in three or four former writings, yet the weight of the Question here debated, and the common use that is made of it by the Papists, have persuaded me, that this also will be useful to the Church.

And I must confess the moderation and ingenuity of the Gentleman that I contend with, did not only tempt me into the undertaking at the first, but also did incline my thoughts to a publication; there being here no stinking breath to annoy and drive away the Reader. I have learned by experience, that its only prudent, charitable, self-denying, humble men, that are fit to be engaged in controversies. We bring fire to Gun-powder, when we deal with proud malignant wretches, (such as I have lately had to do with,) that have souls so forsaken, and consciences so feared, as that they seem to make malicious lies, their glory and delight. Some think that the contending with such, is a needful, though an unsavoury
unsavoury work: I confess, a Lyar is not to be encouraged, nor our just reputation to be prodigally cast away, or contemptuously neglected. Duo sunt necessaria, faith Augustine, Conscientia & fama: Conscientia propter Deum; fama propter proximum. But for our selves, Gods approbation is enough; and for others, if Duty satisifie them not, contending will not.

Bacchae bacchanti sive velis adversarier, Ex insana insaniorem facies; feriet sepius, faith Plaut.

If Truth make blinded men our enemies, and the performance of our duty be our greatest crime, and no purgation be left us, but by becoming erroneous or ungodly, its not worth our labour to word it with such men. Pride and Malice hearken not to Reason: Apologies will not cure the envy of a Cain, or the pride of a Diotrephes, or the hypocrisie and persecuting fury of a Pharisee. But (as August.) Conscientiam malam laudantis praeconium non sanat; nec bonam vulnerat convitium. Praise healeth not an ill Conscience; and reproach cannot wound a good one. Conscience respects a higher tribunal. Could a Calumniator be believed, it were a small thing to be judged by man: and

A 4 Conscia
Consciamens refti fama n s h adacia videt.

But when they make themselves the objects of the common compassion or derision, they spare me the labour of a controversy: It's enough to say with the Philosopher, \( Ego sic vivam, ut nemo illi credat \) \( [I \text{ will so live, that no man shall believe him;} \) \( ] \) when they themselves will so lie that no man (or next to none) shall believe them. It's a far more necessary and profitable employment, to oppose our sins then our accusers; and to see that we are blameless, then that we are so reputed: and to escape the temptations of Satan, rather then the calumnies of his instruments. It's better this wind offend our ears, then guilt should wound our hearts: 'Penalty is heavier then injurious persecution, because of its relation to guilt: but culpability itself is worse then both,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Poenapote\text{st} \text{demi; culpa pere\text{n}niss erit.}} \\
\text{Mors faciet certe, ne sim, cum venerit, exul.}
\end{align*}
\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Ne non peccarem, mors quod, non faciet.}
\end{align*}
\]

And even when God hath fully pardoned us,
us. *Litirra tam est extat.* A soul that knows the evil of sin, and feeth by faith the dreadful Majesty, and the judgement to which he must stand or fall, is taken up with greater cares, then the defence of his reputation with men, except as Gods honour, or the good of souls may be concerned in it.

Another thing that encouraged me to this engagement was, that my Antagonist seemed exceeding desirous of a close syllogistical way of arguing, which put me in hope of a speedier and better issue, then with wordy wandering Sophisters I could expect. I never liked, either the feasts that consist of sawce and ceremony with little meat; or the bawling rooks, that will not receive a bit without a troublesome noise.

*Sed tacitus pasce si posset corvus, habere.*

*Plus dapis, & rixa multo minus, invidiae.*

Nor the prodigal covetousness that turns the Cock when none requireth it; and plucks up the flood-gates, and sets the mill a going when there is no grain; & *omnia valte dicere, & nihil audire.*

*When words are too cheap, it either proves them*
them worthless, or makes them so esteemed. The sentence of an Orator, and the very syllables of a Disputant should be short. There should be no more dishes then are necessary for the meat: nor no more straw then is necessary to sustain the grain. Frugality of speech, and sermonem habere rebus parem, do shew and make our speeches valuable. Truth would be adorned, but not covered: attended, but not crowded; proclaimed, but not buried in an heap of words. Arguments are like money, that is valuable according to the metal and the weight, and not according to the number of pieces, or curiosity of the stamp.

And a third thing that made me the willinger to this task, was; that the assaults of Juglers, that thought to catch me under the names and mask of Seekers, Behmenists, and such other sects, had possessioned me with so much indignation and distaste, that I was glad to meet with a bare-fac’t Papist, that was not ashamed of his Religion, but would profess himself to be what he is. I could never hear that the Papists won so many, and so considerable persons this threescore years, by open dealing, as I have cause to think they have won by fraud under the vizor of Seekers, and Sectaries,
Sectaries, within a few years past. I fear no Papists, but Protestant Papists, that come to Church, and take the oaths of Supremacy and Allegiance, as many did the engagement but a while ago, or that wear some other vizer of dissimulation. Hypocrisy is nowhere so odious as in Religion, where men have to do with a heart searching God, and deal in matters of everlasting consequence. He hath no Religion, that thinks it his duty to lie for his Religion. For he hath no Religion that believeth not in God. And he that believeth him to be a Lover of Lies, believeth not that he is God. Verba (inq. August.) propter ea instituta sunt, non ut per ea se invicem homines fallant, sed ut eis quisque in alterius noticiam cogitationes suas proferat. Verbis ergo uti ad fallaciam, non ad quod sunt instituta, peccatum est. —— Longe tamen tolerabilius est, in his quae ad religione fidei sejuneta sunt mentiri, quam in his, &c. ——] Truth is great, (and the greatest advantage to a Disputant:) and will at last prevail. Lying is a remedy that needeth a remedy; easing for the time by palliation, but much increasing the disease. [Magna est viis Veritatis qua contra omnium ingenia, calidatem, solertiam, contra sistas hominum insidias,
infidias, facile se per ipsam defendit, saith Seneca.

Three Questions about Popery have put the world to much dispute. Qu. 1. Whether it be the right and safe Religion? 2. Whether it may be tolerated? 3. Whether it be our duty to enter into reconciliation and communion with the Papist, (though not subject) and on what terms?

The first I have debated in this and divers other writings, (viz. three Disputations, called the safe Religion, a Key for Catholikes, &c. a winding-sheet for Popery, and the true Catholike, and Catholike Church described.) It is one of the reproaches of humane nature, that ever it could be corrupted into so senseless, unreasonable, impious, uncharitable a thing as Popery: And one of the prodigies of misery, in the world, that any save one that Inguinis & capitis quae sunt discrimina nescit, should be fully, and seriously a Papist.

But four things I find are the pillars of their Church, and propagates their corruptions: 1. One is the love of themselves and of the world in unsanctified hearts: which makes them be of the Religion of their Rulers; and resolve to be of no Religion that shall undo them in the world:

And
And therefore to escape reproach, and torment, and death, they will do any thing, and as they speak, will trust God with their souls, rather than men with their bodies: The meaning is, they will rather venture on the wrath of God, then of man; and save their bodies, then their souls; and secure this life (as long as they can) then life everlasting.

2. Another is Custom and Education, possessing men with blinding stupifying prejudice, together with a contempt of truth and happiness, that keepeth sluggish souls from that diligent search and tryal that is necessary to a conquest of that temptation, and to a saving entertainment of the truth. And the name and reverence of their forefathers, emboldeneth them against the name and reverence of God. Aed at teneris assnescere multum est. Saith Seneca, Inter causas malorum est quod vivimus ad exempla, nec ratione componimur, sed consuetudine adducimur. Quod si pauci facerent, nolumus imitari; quum plures facere caperunt, quasi honestius sit, quia frequentius sequimur, & recti apud nos locum tendere, ubi publicus factus est. Not what God saith, but what man doth, is made the rule of this humane apish kind of Religion. And so the Tyrant Custom ruleth them: Et gravissimum est imperium
imperium consuetudinis, Senec. Education & discipline mores facit: & id sapit unusquisque quod didicit: Id.

3. Another cause is superstitious fears which the false doctrines of Purgatory, and no salvation out of their Church, &c. have cast into mens minds. The Priests rule their subjects, as one of their Captains ruled the Thracians, by making ladders, and making them believe he would climb up to Juno to complain of them.

4. And it is not the least support of Popery, that it maketh light of heynous sins; as fornication, drunkenness, swearing, forswearing, lying, equivocation, &c. and provideth for them the easie remedies of confession, and such gentle penance as the sagacious tractable Priest shall impose. But holy water will not wash out their spots. God judgeth not as the Pope or Mass Priest.

Let no man deceive you with vain words: for such things (as fornication, uncleanness, filthiness, foolish talking, &c.) cometh the wrath of God on the children of disobedience, Eph. 5. 3, 5, 6. For all the flatteries of indulgences, and pardons, and the name of Venial sin, yet conscience hath not pardoned all that is pardoned by the Pope. And,
And its no great ease to have an external pardon, and neither an Eternal, nor Internal; but Nota dieque suisum gestare in pectore testem. How many must be damned by Christ, that were pardoned by the Vice-christ.

Qu. 2. And for the second Question, about the Toleration of Popery, let him that desireth it, but procure a Toleration of the Protestant Profession in Spain, Italy, Bavaria, Austria, &c. and then I undertake to give him a satisfactory answer of this question. In the mean time, I shall only say as Seneca, Nemo ex imprudentibus est qui relinqui sibi debeat: especially men that renounce all their senses and reason so far, as not to believe that bread is bread, and wine is wine, should not be left without a guardian. But in general, we must on one hand avoid inhumane cruelty (and leave them those means that are suited to their cause;) and on the other hand we must take heed that we betray not the Gospel and the souls of men, to the subtilty and pernicious fraud of trained deceivers. We must vigilantly and strenuously defend, though we must tenderly
tenderly and sparingly offend, any further then is necessary to such defence.

Qn. 3. And for the third question, about Reconciliation, I have spoken to it, and offered the terms in other writings (especially my Key for Catholikes) I only add now, that the Peace-makers no doubt are blessed, and if it be possible, as much as in us lyeth, we must live peaceably with all men. But for the terms, we cannot possibly meet every corrupted party half way in their sins and errors, that we may be friends. Let us hold to the immutable sufficient Rule, indited by the Holy Ghost, and judge of all that swerve from it, according to the degree of their deviation, and unite in the ancient simplicity of Doctrine, Worship, and Government, and lay our unity only on things necessary. For who soever deviseth any other Rule and terms of unity then these, shall never attain it, but raise up a new Sect, and encrease our wounds. I am as much for unity as ever was Cæsander, Erasmus, Grotius, or any of the Reconcilers: But I am certain that to subscribe to the Trent Decrees and Creed, and to turn Papist, or Semi-Papist, or participate of any sin for peace, is not the way. Let some plead for all the Greek corruptions, and some for the Popes supremacy.
gulated by Canons; and some for his meer Primacy as principium unitatis, and his Government of all the West as Patriark; let them digladiate about a Pope and Council, as wisely as Greece and Troy did fight ten years for a beautiful whore; I am sure that none of these are the way to the Churches Unity and Peace (as I have opened in my description of the true Catholike Church.) Nor will their design be more successful, that would so discordantly agree us all with the first three hundred years, as to deny the first hundred, or two hundred to be our pattern, and to make all the forms and ceremonies to be necessary to our concord, which the third or fourth Century used but as things indifferent, with diversity and mutation, and mutual forbearance.

But of the terms of Catholike Unity, I have spoken, as in the forecited papers, so in a Pacificatory Letter of the Worcestershire Ministers to Mr. J. Dury: and if God will, shall do it yet more fully.

And of the evils in Popery, that move me to distaste it, having given a Breuiate in an Epistle before another mans Book, which I perceive is seen of very few, I shall here annex so much of that Epistle, as is pertinent to the present business.

(a) Readers,
Readers,

Ere not the judgments of God so dreadfull, and infatuation so lamentable in matters of everlasting consequence, and sin so odious, and the calamities of the Church, the dishonour of God, and the Damnation of Souls such deplorable things, as to tolerate not a laughter in the standers by, it would seem one of the most ridiculous things in the World, that a man of seeming wisdom should be a Papist, and that so many Princes, and learned men, with the vulgar multitude, should be able so far to renounce or intoxicate their Reason while they are awake: And a Papist would be described to be one that sets up his understanding to be the laughing-stock of the sober rational World. There are abundance of Controversies among Physitians that concern mens lives; and yet I have heard of none so vain, as to step forth and challenge the Authority of being the universal Decider of them, or to charge God with folly or oversight, if he have not appointed some such universal Judge in the World, to end all Controversies in matters of such weight. But if in Physick's, Law, or any of
of the Sciences, the Controversies should be never so many or so great, if yet you could resolve them into sense it self, and bring all to the judgement of mens eyes, and ears, and taste, and feeling, who would not laugh or hiss at him that would still make them the matters of serious doubts?

The Papists finding that man is yet imperfect, and knoweth but in part, and that in the Scripture there are some things are hard to be understood, and that Earth hath not so much Light as Heaven, imagine that hereby they have a fair advantage to plead for an universal terrestrial Judge, and to reproach God, if he have appointed none such, and next to plead that their Pope or his approved Councils must needs have this Authority. And when they come to the Decision, they are not ashamed to see after so many hundred years pretentions, that the World is but baffled with the empty name of a Judge of Controversies, and that Difficulties are no less Difficulties still, and Controversies are nowhere so voluminous as with them. But this is a small matter with them. Their Judge seems much wiser when he is silent, then when he speaks. When he comes to a Decision, and formeth up thereby the Hodge-podge of Popery, they seem not to smile at, nor be ashamed
of the Picture which they have drawn; which is, of an Harlot shewing her nakedness, and committing her lewdness in the open Assemblies, in the sight of the Sun. They openly proclaim their shame against the light of all the acknowledged Principles in the World, their own or others, and in opposition to all, or almost all that is commendable among men. The charge seems high, but (in a few words) take the proof.

1. They confess the Scripture to be the Word of God: and yet when we would appeal to that as the Rule of Faith and Life, or as a divine Revelation, in our Disputes, they fly off, and tell us of its obscurity, and the necessity of a Judge. If they meet with a Hoc est corpus meum, they seem for a while to be zealous for the Scripture: But tell them that Paul in 1 Cor. 11. 26, 27, 28. doth call it Bread after the Consecration, no less than three times in the three next Verses, and then Scripture is nonsensical to them till the Pope make sense of it. It is one of their principal labours against us, to argue against the Scriptures sufficiency to this use. By no means can we prevail with them to stand to the Decision of the Scripture.

2. They excessively cry up the Church, and appeal to its Decision: and therefore we might hope,
hope, that here if anywhere, we might have some hold of them. But when it comes to the Point, they not only disown the judgement of the Church, but impudently call Christ's Spouse a Strumpet, and cut off (in their uncharitable imagination) two or three parts of the universal Church as Hereticks or Schismatics. The judgement of the Churches in Armenia, Ethiopia, Egypt, Syria, the Greeks, and many more besides the Reformed Churches in the West, is against their Popes universal Vicarship or Soveraignty, and many of their Errours that depend thereon: And yet their judgement is not regarded by this Faction. And if a third or fourth part (such as it is) of the Universal Church, may cry up themselves as the Church to be appealed to, and condemn the far greater part, Why may not a tenth or a twentieth part do the like? Why may not the Donatists, the Novatians, or the Greeks (much more) do so as well as Papists?

3. They cry up Tradition. And when we ask them, How we shall know it, and where it is to be found, they tell us, principally in the profession and practice of the present Church. And yet when two or three parts of the universal Church profess that Tradition is against the Papal Monarchy, and other Points (a 3) depend-
depending on it, they cast Tradition behind their backs.

4. They cry up the Fathers: and when we bring their judgements against the substance of Popery, they sometime vilifie or accuse them as erroneous, and sometime tell us, that Fathers as well as Scripture must be no otherwise understood, than their Church expoundeth them.

5. They plead for an appeal to Councils; and (though we easily prove that none of them were universal, yet such as they were) they call them all Reprobate, which were not approved by their Pope, let the number of Bishops there be never so great. And those that were approved, if they speak against them, they reject also, either with lying shifts denying the approbation, or saying, the acts are not deside, or not conciliariter facta, or the sense must be given by their present Church, or one such contemptible shift or other.

6. At least one would think they should stand to the judgement of the Pope, which yet they will not: for shame forbids them to own the Doctrine of those Popes that were Hereticks or Infidels (and by Councils so judged:) And others they are forced to disown, because they contradict their Predecessors. And at Rome the Cardinals are the Pope, while be that
that hath the name is oft made light of. And how infallible he is judged by the French and the Venetians; how Sixtus the fifth was valued by the Spaniards, and by Bellarmine, is commonly known.

7. But all this is nothing to their renunciation of humanity, even of the common senses and reason of the world. When the matter is brought to the Decision of their eyes, and taste, and feeling, whether Bread be Bread, and Wine be Wine; and yet all Italy, Spain, Austria, Bravaria, &c. cannot resolve it; yea, generally (unless some latent Protestant) do pass their judgement against their senses, & the senses of all sound men in the World; & that not in a matter beyond the reach of sense (as whether Christ be there spiritually) but in a matter belonging to sense, if anything belong to it, as whether Bread be Bread, &c. Kings and Nobles, Prelates and Priests, do all give their judgement, that all their senses are deceived. And is it possible for these men then to know any thing? or any controversy between us and them to be decided? If we say that the Sun is light, or that the Pope is a man, and Scripture legible, or that there are the Writings of Councils and Fathers extant in the World, they may as well concur in a denial of all this, or any thing else that sense should judge
judge of. If they tell us that Scripture requireth them to contradict all their senses in this point, I answer,

1. Not that Scripture before mentioned, that calleth it [Bread] after the Consecration, thrice in the three next Verses.

2. And how know they that there is such a Scripture, if all their senses be so fallible? If the certainty of sense be not supposed, a little learning or wit might satisfy them, that Faith can have no certainty. But is it not a most dreadful judgement of God, that Princes and Nations, Learned men, and some that in their way are conscientious, should be given over to so much inhumanity, and to make a Religion of this brutishness, (and worse) and to persecute those with Fire and Sword, that are not so far forsaken by God, and by their reason? And that they should so solicitously labour the perversion of States and Kingdoms for the promoting of Stupidity or stark madness?

8. And (if we go from their Principles to their Ends, or Wayes, we shall soon see that) they are also against the Unity of the Church, while they pretend this as their chiefest Argument, to draw men to their way. They set up a corrupted Faction, and condemn the far greater part of the Church, and will have
no unity with any but those of their own faction and subjection: and fix this as an essential part of their religion, creating thereby an impossibility of universal concord.

9. They also contradict the experience of many thousand saints; asserting that they are all void of the love of God and saving grace, till they become subject to the pope of Rome; when as the souls of these believers have experience of the love of God within them, and feel that grace that proveth their justification. I wonder what kind of thing it is that is called love or holiness in a papist, which protestants and other christians have not, and what is the difference.

10. They are most notorious enemies to charity, condemning most of the christian world to hell, for being out of their subjection.

11. They are notorious enemies to knowledge under pretence of obedience and unity, and avoiding heresie. They celebrate their worship in a language not understood by the vulgar worshippers. They hinder the people from reading the holy scriptures, (which the ancient fathers exhorted men and women to, as an ordinary thing.) the quality of their priests and people, testifies this.

12. They oppose the purity of divine worship, setting up a multitude of humane inventions
ventions instead thereof, and idolatrously (for no less can be said of it) adoring a piece of confeorated Bread as their God.

13. They are Oppofers of Holiness, both by the foefaid enmity to Knowledge, Charity, and purity of Worship, and by many unholy Doeftrines, and by deluding Souls with an outside histrionicall way of Religion, never re-quired by the Lord, consisting in a multitude of Ceremonies, and worfhipping of Angels, and the Souls of Saints, and Images, and Crosses, &c. Let experience fpeak how much the Life of Holiness is promoted by them.

14. They are Enemies to common Honofty, teaching the Doeftrines of Equivocations and Mental Reservations, and making many hainous firs venial, and many of the moft odi-ous firs to be Duties, as killing Kings that are excommunicated by the Pope, taking Oaths with the foefaid Reservations, and breaking them, &c. For the Jefuits Doeftrine, Montaltus the Jansenift, and many of the French Clergy have pretty well opened it: And the Pope himfelf hath lately been fain to publish a condemnation of their Apology. And yet the power and interest of the Jefuites and their followers among them, is not altogether un-known to the World.

15. They are Enemies to Civil Peace and Government,
Government, (if there be any such in the World) as their Doctrine and Practice of killing and depoing excommunicate Princes, breaking Oaths, &c. shews. Bellarmine that will go a middle way, gives the Pope power in ordine ad spiritualia, and indirectly, to dispose of Kingdoms, and tells us, that it is unlawful to tolerate Heretical Kings that propagate their Herefsie, (that is, the ancient Faith.) How well Doctor Heylin hath vindicated their Council of Laterane in this, (whose Decrees stand as a Monument of the horrid treasonable Doctrine of the Papists.) I shall, if God will, hereafter manifest: In the mean time, let any man read the Words of the Council, and judge.

upon it, is the controversy before us. And whether it should be tolerated (even the propagation of it, to the damnation of the peoples souls) is now the Question which the juggling Papists have set a foot among those that have made themselves our Rulers: and there are found men among us, that call themselves Protestants and godly, that plead for the said Toleration; (and consequently for the delivering up of these Nations to Popery, if not to Spanish, or other foreign Powers) which if they effect, and after their contrary Professions, prove such Traitors to Christ, his Gospel and their posterity, as they leave the Land of their Nativity in misery, they shall leave their stinking names for a reproach and curse to future Generations; and on such Pillars shall be written, [This pride, self-seeking, uncharitableness, and schism hath done.]

(This was written and printed under the late Usurpers.)
Postscript.

Reader,

Though the Papists have seemed to be the most discountenanced party under the late Usurpers, and to have no interest or power, yet I have still found, that those sped worst from men, that were most against them; and that I never wrote any book against them, but it brought a sharper storm upon me, then any thing that I wrote against any other Sect that was more visibly in power. And yet it was not openly professed to be for my opposition to Popery, but on some other account: and though the fountain by the taste of the waters, might be known, yet it self and secret conduits were all underground and undiscernable. The Jesuits that are the spring of these, and greater things then these, are latent, and their motion is not seen, while we see the motions which are caused by their secret force. So that by this means its only those few inquisitive discerning persons, that can see a cause in its effect, that find them out: and those few are unable to make full proof, even of the things they know; and thereby are
are prohibited from appearing openly in the cause, lest coming short in legal proof, they leave the guilty triumphing over the innocent as calumniators. For the last book that I wrote against them (My Key for Catholikes) the Parliament-house itself, and all the land did ring of my accusations; and the menaces were so high, that my intended ruine was the common talk. And I know their indignation is not abated. My crime is, that their zeal to proselyte me, hath acquainted me with some of their secrets, and let me know what the Jesuits are doing, and how great a party that are masked under the name of Seekers, Familists, &c. they have in the land. I have therefore Reader, this double request to thee: First, arm thy self diligently against Popery; if thou wouldst preserve thy Religion and thy soul. Whatever Sects assault thee openly, suspect and avoid the disease that is endeavouring with greatest advantages to be Epidemical. To this end, be well studied in the writings that have opened their vanity and shame: I hope, what I have written on that subject, will not be useless to them that are not at leisure to read the larger volumes. Read Dr. Challoners Credo sanctam Ecclesiam Catholicam. Peter Moulins Answer to Cottons Questions.
Questions: And for larger Volumes, Usher, Chillingworth, Field, Whittakers, especially de Pontif. Roman. may be numbered with the most solid, judicious and useful: And Dr. Mouline of the Novelty of Popery now in the press, with Rivet, and Chamier, to add no more.

And if ever thou fall in company with Seekers, or Familists, that are questioning all things, and endeavouring to disparage the holy Scriptures, and the Ministry, and Church, and Ordinances, though but in a questioning way, look then to thy Religion, and suspect a Papist: Secondly, because experience hath taught me to expect that my renewed assault of Popery should raise some storm, and renew my dangers, (though I know not which way it will come, and expect it should be upon pretence of something that is no kin to the real cause,) let him that hath been so exceedingly beholden to the servants of Christ for prayers, have thy prayers in particular for this, that he may be satisfied in God's approbation, and count it a small matter to be censured by man, or to suffer those soft and harmless stroaks, that the impotent arm of flesh can inflict; and may live and dye in the Army of believers, described Heb. 11, and 12. and
and be so far preserved from the contrivances of malice, as is needful to his appointed work: in which it is the top of his ambition to be found

A faithful, though unworthy servant of Christ for his Church,

Sep. 3. 1660.
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Mr. Johnson's first Paper.

The Church of Christ, wherein only Salvation is to be had, never was nor is any other than those Assemblies of Christians who were united in communion and obedience to S. Peter in the beginning since the Ascension of Christ. And ever since to his lawful successors, the Bishops of Rome, as to their chief Pastor.

Proof.

Whatsoever Congregations of Christians is now the true Church of Christ, acknowledges S. Peter and his lawful successors the Bishops of Rome, ever since the Ascension of Christ to have been; and now to be by the Institution of Christ, their chief Head
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Head and Governor on earth in matters belonging to the soul next under Christ.

But there is no salvation to be had out of that Congregation of Christians, which is now the true Church of Christ.

Ergo, there is no salvation to be had out of that Congregation of Christians which acknowledges S. Peter and his lawful successors the Bishops of Rome ever to have been since the Ascension of Christ; and now to be by the Institution of Christ their chief Head, and Governor on earth in matters belonging to the soul next under Christ.

The Minor is clear; For all Christians agree in this, that to be saved, it is necessary to be in the true Church of Christ, that only being his mystical Body, Spouse and Mother of the faithful, to which must belong all those who ever have been, are, or shall be saved.

The Major I prove thus.

Whatsoever Congregation of Christians is now the true Church of Christ, hath been alwaies visible since the time of Christ, either under persecution, or in peace and flourishing.

But no Congregation of Christians hath been alwaies visible since the time of Christ, either
either under persecution or in peace and flourishing, save that only which acknowledges S. Peter and his lawful successors the Bishops of Rome, ever to have been since the Ascension of Christ; and now to be by Christ's Institution, their chief Head and Governor on earth, in matters belonging to the soul next under Christ.

_Ergo_, whatsoever Congregation of Christians is _now_ the true Church of Christ, acknowledges St. Peter, and his lawful successors the Bishops of Rome, ever to have been since the Ascension of Christ; and _now_ to be by Christ's Institution their chief Head and Governor on earth, in matters belonging to the soul next under Christ.

The Major is proved thus.

Whatsoever Congregation of Christians hath alwaies had visible Pastors and People united, hath alwaies been visible, either under persecution, or in peace and flourishing.

But whatsoever Congregation of Christians is _now_ the true Church of Christ, hath alwaies been visible, either under _persecution_.

_Ergo_, whatsoever Congregation of Christians is _now_ the true Church of Christ, hath alwaies been visible, either under _persecution_,

B 2
Mr. Johnson's first Paper.

execution, or in peace and flourishing.

The Major of this last Sylogism is evident, for seeing a visible Church is nothing but a visible Pastor and people united: where there have always been visible Pastors and people united, there hath always been a visible Church.

The Minor I prove from Ephesians, cap. 4. ver. 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, &c.

Where S. Paul saies, that Christ had Instituted, that there should be Pastors and Teachers in the Church for the work of the Ministry, and preserving the people under their respective charges from being carried away with every wind of doctrine, &c. which evidently shews, those Pastors must be visible, seeing the work of the Ministry, which Preaching, and Administration of Sacraments, and Governing their flocks, are all external and visible actions. And this shews likewise, that those Pastors and People must be always visible, because they are to continue from Christ's Ascension, untill we all meet together in the unity of faith, &c. which cannot be before the day of judgement.

Neither can it be said (as some say) that this promise of Christ is only conditional, since to put it to be so without evident Reason,
Reason, giveth scope to every one at his pleasure, to make every other promise of Christ to be conditional. And so we shall be certain of nothing that Christ hath promised, neither that shall alwaies be a visible or invisible Church, nor any Church at all; no nor of Judgement, nor of Eternal life, or of the Resurrection of the dead, &c. for one may say with as much ground, as this is said, that some conditions were included in all those promises, which being not fulfilled, hinders the execution of them.

There remains only, to prove the Minor of the second Sylogism, viz. That no Congregation of Christians hath been alwaies visible, &c. save that which acknowledges S. Peter, and his lawful successors, &c. to be their chief Head and Governour, &c. next under Christ.

This Minor I prove, by obliging the answerers to nominate any Congregation of Christians, which alwaies till this present time, since Christ, hath been visible, either under persecution, or in peace and flourishing, save that only which acknowledges S. Peter, &c. ut supra.

Sir,

To comply with your desires of brevity, and of confining my self to half a sheet of paper;
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paper; I send you at present only one Argument, which being fully discussed, shall be followed by others God willing. To this as to all the rest of my Arguments, which may hereafter be urged: I require a Categorical and strict Syllogistical Answer in Form, by Concedo, Nego, Distinguo, Omitto, Transfer. And the particular Propositions specified, to which the Respondents apply any of them; and no more then precisely thus, neither adding Amplifications, Reasons, Proofs, &c. of their own out of form, and that this may be done with all convenient speed. To the place of Scripture, Ephes. 4. &c. is also required a Categorical answer, to what is precisely pressed in it, without directing the discourse to other things: And what is answered otherwise, I shall not esteem an answer, but an Effugium, or declining of the difficulty. By this method exactly observed, Truth will easily and speedily be made manifest; and your desires of Brevity will be punctually complied with. I also desire, that the Respondent or Respondents will (as I do to this) subscribe his, or their name or names to their answers, so often as any are by him or them returned, with the day of the month when returned.

William Johnson.

Decem. 9, 1658

The
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I received yours, and write this Answer, Jan. 4. 1658.

Sir,

Whever you are, a serious debate with so sober a Disputant, is to me an exceeding acceptable employment: I shall not, I hope, give you any cause to say, that I decline any difficulties, or balk your strength, or transgress the part of a Respondent. But because, 1. You have not (as you ought to have done) explained the terms of your Thesis. 2. And have made your Propositions so long. 3. And have so cunningly lapped up your fallacies; your Respondent is necessitated to be the larger in distinction and explication. And seeing you are so instant with me for strictness, you thereby oblige yourself, if you will be ingenious, to make only the learned, and not any ignorant men.
men the judges of our dispute: because you know that to the unlearned a bare Nego signifieth nothing; but when such have read your Arguments at length, they will expect as plain and large a confutation, or judge you to be in the right for speaking most.

To your Argument. 1. Your conclusion containeth not your Thesis, or Question. And so you give up your cause the first step, and make a new one. It should have contained your Question in terms, and it doth not so much as contain it in the plain sense: so much difference is there between [Assemblies of Christians united, &c.] and [Congregation of Christians] and between [Salvation or the Church, never was in any other then those Assemblies] and [no Salvation out of that Congregation]; as I shall shew you: besides other differences which you may see.

Ad Majorem. Resp. 1. By [Congregation] you mean, either the whole Catholike Church united in Christ, or some particular Congregation, which is but part of that whole. In the latter sense, your Subject hath a false supposition, viz. that a part is the whole; and your Minor will be false.
And your [whatsoever Congregation of Christians] seems to distinguish that from some other excluded Congregation of Christians that is not part of the Catholike Church, which is a supposing the chief part of the Question granted you, which we deny. We know no universal Congregation of Christians but one, which containeth all particular Congregations and Christians, that univocally deserve that name.

2. Either you mean that [this whole Congregation or true Church acknowledgeth] the Popes Sovereignty, or else [that some part of it doth acknowledge it.] The former I deny, and challenge any man living to prove: If it be [part only] that you mean, then either [the greater part] or [the lesser]: that it is the greater, I as confidently almost deny: for it is against the common knowledge of men acquainted with the world, &c. If you mean [the lesser part] you shall see anon that it destroys your cause.

3. Either you speak de Ecclesia quæ talis, or de Ecclesia quæ talis: and mean that this [acknowledgement] is essential to it, or at least an inseparable property, or else that it is a separable accident. The latter will do you no good: the former I deny. In summ:
summ: I grant that a small corrupt part of the Catholike Church doth now acknowledge the Pope to be Christ's Vicar, (or the Vice-christ); but I deny, 1. That the whole doth so (which is your great cause.) 2. Or the major part. 3. Or any Congregation through all ages (though if they had, it would do you no good.) 4. Or that it is done by any upon just ground, but is their corruption.

Ad minorem. Resp. 1. If you mean any [part] of the Universal Church by [that Congregation which is now the true Church] I deny your Minor: If [the whole] I grant it. 2. You say [all Christians agree] in it, &c. Resp. I think all Protestants, or near all, do: but Franciscus à Santâ Clara hath copiously told us (in Artic. Anglic.) that most of your own Doctors are for the salvation of Infidels; and then either you take Infidels for your Church members, or your Doctors for no Christians, or you play not fair play to tell us so gross an untruth, that all Christians are agreed in it.

To your conclusion. Resp. 1. Either you mean that [there is no Salvation to be had out of that Universal Church, whose part (a minor corrupt part) acknowledgeth the Popes...
Popes Soveraignty] or else [that there is no Salvation to be had out of that Universal Church which wholly acknowledgeth it] or else [that there is no Salvation to be had out of that part of the Universal Church which acknowledgeth it.] In the first sense I grant your conclusion (if really you are part of the Church.) There is no Salvation to be had out of Christ's Universal Church, of which you are a small corrupted part. In the second sense I told you we deny the supposition in the subject. In the third sense I deny the sequel; non sequitur, because your Major Proposition being false de Ecclesia universal, the conclusion must be false de parte ista, as excluding the rest.

But to the unskillful or unwary reader your conclusion seemeth to import, that the being in such a Church which acknowledgeth the Popes Soveraignty, as it is such a Church, is necessary to Salvation] and so [that the persons acknowledgement is necessary.] But it is a fallacia accidentis cunningly lapt up, that is the life of your imported cause. That part of the Universal Church doth hold to the Popes Soveraignty, is per accidens; and could you prove that the whole Church doth so (which you are unlike to do) I would say the like. And that
that your fallacy may the better appear; I give you some examples of such like sophisms.

[Whatsoever Nation is the true Kingdom of Spain is proud and cruel against Protestants: But there is no protection there due to any that are not of that Kingdom: therefore there is no protection due to any that are not proud and cruel.] Or [whatsoever Nation is the true Kingdom of France acknowledgeth the Pope: but no protection is due from the Governours to any that are not of that Kingdom; therefore no protection is due to any that acknowledge not the Pope.] Or [what ever Nation is the Kingdom of Ireland in the daies of Queen Elizabeth, was for the Earl of Tyrone: but there was no right of Inheritance for any that were not of that Nation: therefore there was no right of Inheritance for any that was not for the Earl of Tyrone.] Or suppose that you could have proved it of all the Church. If you had lived four hundred years after Christ, you might as well have argued thus.

[Whatsoever Congregation of Christians is now the true Church of Christ, is against kneeling in Adoration on the Lords daies. But there is no Salvation to be had out of that]
that Congregation of Christians, which is now the true Church of Christ: therefore there is no Salvation to be had out of that Congregation which is against kneeling on the Lords day, &c.] But yet, 1. There was Salvation to be had in that Congregation without being of that opinion. 2. And there is now Salvation to be had in a Congregation that is not of that opinion, as you will confess.

Or [whatsoever Congregation of Christians is now the true Church of Christ, doth hold the Canticles and the Epistle to Philemon to be Canonical Scripture, (and so have done, &c.) But there is no Salvation to be had out of the true Church: therefore there is no Salvation to be had out of that Congregation which holdeth the Canticles and Epistle to Philemon to be Canonical Scripture.] But yet, 1. Salvation is to be had in that Church without holding it. 2. And its possible hereafter a Church may deny those two books, and yet you will think Salvation not thereby overthrown. This is but to shew your fallacy from a corrupt accident, and indeed but of a part of the Church, and a small part.

Now to your proof of the Major. Resp. ad Major. The present matter of the Church
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Church was not visible in the last Generation, for we were not then born: but the same form of the Church was then existent in a visible Matter, and their Profession was visible or audible, though their faith itself was invisible. I will do more then you shall do, in maintaining the constant visibility of the Church.

Ad minorem. 1. If you mean that no Congregation hath been alwaies visible [but that Universal Church whose lesser corrupt part acknowledges] the Popes Soveraignty, I grant it. For besides [the whole containing all Christians as the parts] there can be no other. If you mean [save that part which acknowledgeth] you contradict your self, because a part imply-eth other parts. If you mean [save that Universal Church, all whose members (or the most) acknowledge it], there is no such subject existent. 2. I distinguish of Visibility: Its one thing to be a visible Church, that is, visible in its essentials; and another thing to be visible quoad hoc, as to some separable accident. [The Universal Church] was ever visible; because their Profession of Christianity was so, and the persons professing: But [the acknowledgement of the Vice-christ] was not alwaies visible, no not in
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In any part, much less in the whole. And it had, it was but a separable accident (if your disease be not incurable) that was visible: and therefore, 1. It was not necessary to Salvation, nor a proper mark of the Church. 2. Nor can it be so for the time to come.

I need to say no more to your conclusion. Your Argument is no better then this, whatsoever Congregation of Christians is now the true Church of Christ, hath been alwaies visible since the time of Christ: But no Congregation of Christians hath been so visible, save only that which condemmeth the Greeks, which hath a Colledge of Cardinals to choose the Popes, which denieth the cup to the laity, which forbideth the reading of Scripture in a known tongue without license, &c. Therefore whatsoever Congregation of Christians is now the true Church of Christ, hath all these; 1. In a corrupt part it hath. 2. But it had not alwaies. 3. And may be cured hereafter.

To your proof of the Major: 1. I grant your Major.

2. Ad minorem. 1. Either you mean [Universal Pastors] each one, or someone having charge and Government of the whole
whole Church,] or you mean, [unfixed Pastors having an indefinite charge of Preaching and Guiding when they come and have particular calls and opportunities] or you mean [the fixed Pastors of particular Churches] in the first sense your Minor is false, the Catholike Church was never so united to any Universal Head but Christ: no one of the Apostles governed the rest & the whole Church, much less any since their time. In the second sense, I grant that the Church hath ever had Pastors since the Ascension. In the third sense, I grant that some parts or other of the Catholike Church, have ever had fixed Pastors of Congregations since the first settling of such Pastors. But any one particular Congregation may cease to have such Pastors, and may cease it self: and Rome hath been long without any true Pastors; and therefore was then no such visible Church.

2. If by [Congregation] you mean not the Universal Church, but [a part], or if you mean it of [all the parts of the Universal Church] I deny your Minor: Communities of Christians, and particular persons have been and may be without any Pastors, to whom they are united or subject. The Indians that died in the faith while Frumen-
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tius and Edesius were there preaching, before they had any Pastor, were yet Christians and saved: If a Lay-man Convert one, or a thousand, (and you will say that he may baptize them) and they die before they can have a Pastor, or ever hear of any to whom they owe subjection, they are nevertheless saved, as members of the Church; And if all the Pastors in a Nation were murdered or banished, the people would not cease to be Christians and members of the Church. Much less if the Pope were dead or deposed, or a vacancy befell his seat, would all the Catholike Church be annihilated, or cease.

To your Confirmation of the Major [that a visible Church is nothing but a Visible Pastor, and people united] I answer: 1. Its true of the universal Church, as united in Christ, the great Pastor, but not as united in a Vice-Christ or humane head. 2. It is true of a particular Political or organized Church, as united to their proper Pastors. 3. But it is not true of every Community of Christians who are a part of the Universal Church. A company converted to Christ, are members of the Universal Church, (though they never heard of a Pope at Rome) before they
they are United to Pastors of their own.

The Proof of the Minor from Eph. 4. I grant as aforesaid: The text proveth that Pastors the Church shall have: I disclaim the vain objection [of Conditionality in the promise] which you mention. But it proves not, 1. That the Church shall have an Universal Monarch or Vice-Christ, under Christ. 2. Nor that every member of the Universal Church, shall certainly be a member of a particular Church, or ever see the face of a Pastor, or be subject to him.

You say next [There remains only to prove the Minor of the second Syllogism, viz. that no Congregation of Christians hath been alwaies visible but that which acknowledges, &c. ] This is the great point which all lyeth on: The rest hath been all nothing, but a cunning shooing horn to this. Prove this, and prove all: Prove not this, and you have lost your time.

You say [The Minor I prove, by obliging the answerers to nominate any Congregation of Christians which alwaies till this present time since Christ hath been visible —— saxe that only which acknowledges &c. ] And have I waited all this while
while for this? You prove it by obliging me to prove the contrary. Ridiculous! sed quo jure? 1. Your undertaken form of arguing obligeth you to prove your Minor: You cannot cast your Respondent upon proving and so arguing, and doing the Opponents part. 2. And in your Postscript you presently forbid it me: You require me to hold to a Concedo, Nego, Distingo, Omitto, Transseat, threatening that else you will take it for an Effugium. And I pray you tell me in your next, to which of these doth the nomination or proof of such a Church as you describe belong? Plainly, you first slip away when you should prove your Minor, and then oblige me to prove the Contrary, and then tell me, if I attempt it, you'll take it for an Effugium. A good cause needs not such dealing as this: which me thinks you should be loth a learned man should hear of. 3. Your interest also in the Matter (as well as your office as Opponent) doth oblige you to the proof. For though you make a Negative of it, you may put it in other terms at your pleasure. It is your main work to prove that All the members of the Universal Church have in all ages held the Popes Sovereignty or Universal Head-ship.] Or [the whole Visible Church
Church hath held it] Prove this, and I will be a Papist; you have my promise. You affirm, and you must prove. Prove a Catholike Church, at least that in the Major part was of that mind: (though that would be nothing to prove the condemnation of the rest.) If you are an impartial enquirer after truth, fly not when you come to the setting too. I give you this further evident reason why you cannot oblige me to what you here impose; 1. Because you require me to prove the Visibility of a Church which held not your point of Papacy; and so put an unreasonable task upon me, about a Negative: or else, I must prove that they held the contrary, before your opinion was started: And it is the Catholike Church that we are disputing about; so that I must prove this Negative of the Catholike Church. 2. It is you that lay the great stress of Necessity on your Affirmative, more then we do on the Negative; you say that no man can be saved without your Affirmative[ that the Pope is the universal Head and Governor] But we say not that no man can be saved that holdeth not our Negative, [that he is not the Vice-Chrift] For one that hath the plague or leprosie may live. Therefore it
it is you that must prove that all the Catho-
like Church was still of your mind. 3. And it
is an Accident, and but an Accident of a
smaller corrupted part of the Catholike
Church that you would oblige me to prove
the Negation of, and therefore it is utterly
needless to my proof of a Visible Catho-
like Church. For I will without it prove
to you a successive Visibility of the Catho-
like Church from the Visibility of its Essent-
tial or Constitutive parts (of which your
Pope is none.) I will prove a successive
visible Church that hath still professed faith
in God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost,
and been united to the Universal Head, and
had particular Pastors, some fixed, some
unfixed, and held all essential to a Christian.
And proving this, I have proved the
Church of which I am a member. To
prove that England hath been so long a
Kingdom, requireth no more but to prove
the two Essential parts, King and Subjects,
to have so long continued united. It re-
quireth not that I prove that it ever either
had, or opposed a Vice-King. This is our
plain case. If a man have a botch on one
of his hands; it is not needful in order to
my proving him a man heretofore, that I
prove he was born and bred without it: so
be it I prove that he was born a man, it sufficeth. Nor is it needful that I prove the other hand alwaies to have been free, in order to prove it a member of the body: It sufficeth that I prove it to have been still a hand.

I do therefore desire you to perform your work, and prove that [no Congregation hath been still visible, but such as yours] or that [the whole Catholike Church hath ever since the ascension held a Humane Universal Governour under Christ,] or else I shall take it as a giving up your cause as indefensible. And observe, if you shall prove only that a part of the Catholike Church still held this (which you can never do) then, 1. You will make the Contrary opinion as Consistent with salvation as yours. For the rest of the Catholike Church is savable. 2. And then you will allow me to turn your Argument against your self as much as it is against us (and so cast it away.) e.g. [what ever Congregation of Christians is now the true Church of Christ, hath been alwaies Visible: But no Congregation of Christians hath been alwaies Visible, but that which quoad partem denyeth the Popes universal Headship; therefore whatever Congregation
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Congregation of Christians is the true Church, denyeth the Popes universal Headship.

Well! but for all this (supposing you will do your part) I will tell you in nothing that's reasonable, which I can perform. A Catholike Church in all ages that was against the Pope, in every member of it, I hope I cannot shew you; because I hope that you are members, though corrupt. But you shall have more than a particular Congregation, or a hundred.

1. At this present, two or three parts of the Catholike Church is known to be against your Universal Monarchy. The Greeks, Armenians, Ethiopians, &c. besides the Protestants. 2. In the last age there were as many or more. 3. In the former ages till An. D. 1000, there were neer as many, or rather many more. For more be fallen off in Tendué, Nubia, and other parts then the Protestants that came in. 4. About the year 600, there were many more, incomparably; and I think then, but at least of 400 years after Christ I never yet saw valid proof of one Papist in all the world, that is, one that was for the Popes Universal Monarchy or Vice-Christship. So that C 4 most
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Most of the Catholike Church (about three parts to one) hath been against you to this day; and all against you for many hundred years. Could I name but a Nation against you, I should think I had done nothing; much less if I cited a few men in an age. 5. And all those of Ethiopia, India, &c. that are without the verge and awe of the Ancient Roman Empire, never so much as gave the Pope that Primacy of dignity, which those within the Empire gave him, when he was chief, as the Earl of Arundel is of the Earls of England that governeth none of them, and as the Lord Chancellor may be the chief judge, that hath no power in alieno foro: or as the Eldest Justice is chief in the County and on the bench, that ruleth not the rest. Mistake not this Primacy for Monarchy, nor the Romane Empire for the world, and you can say nothing.

At present, ad hominem, I give you sufficient proof of this succession. As you use to say that the present Church best knew the Judgement of the former age, and so on to the head; and so Tradition beareth you out: I turn this unresistibly against you. The far greatest part of Christians in the world that now are in possession of
The doctrine contrary to your Monarchy, tell us that they had it from their Fathers, and so on. And as in Councils, so with the Church Real, the Major part (three to one) is more to be credited than the Minor part; especially when it is a visible self-advancement that the Minor part insisteth on. 6. And were not this enough, I might add, that your western Church it self in its Representative Body at Constance and Basel, hath determined that not the Pope but a General Council is the chief Governor under Christ; and that this hath been still the judgement of the Church, and that its Heresie in whoever that hold the Contrary. 7. And no man can prove that one half or tenth part of your people called Papists are of your opinion: For they are not called to profess it by words: and their obedience is partly forced, and partly upon other principles; some obeying the Pope as their western Patriarch of chief dignity; and some and most doing all for their own peace and safety: Their outward acts will prove no more.

And now Sir, I have told you what Church of which we are members, hath been visible; yea and what part of it hath opposed the Vice-Christ of Rome. This I delayed not
not an hour after I received yours, because you desired speed. Accordingly I crave your speedy return; and intreat you to advise with the most learned men (whether Jesuites or others) of your party in London that think it worth their thoughts and time: not that I have any thoughts of being their Equal in learning, but partly because the case seemeth to me so exceeding palpable, that I think it will suffice me to supply all my defects against the ablest men on earth, or all of them together, of your way; and principally because I would see your strength, and know the most that can be said, that I may be rectified if I err (which I suspect not) or confirmed the more if you cannot evince it, and so may be true to God's Truth and my own soul.

Ricks. Baxter.
Mr. Johnson's Second
Paper.

Sir,

It was my happiness to have this Argument transmitted into your learned and quiet hands; which gratefully returns as fair a measure as it received from you: that Animosities on both sides exposed, Truth may appear in its full splendour, and seat itself in the Center of both our hearts.

To your first Exception.

My Thesis was sufficiently made clear to my friend, who was concerned in it; and needed no explication in its address to the learned.

To your second Exception.

My Propositions were long, that my Argument (as was required) might be very short, and not exceed the quantity of half a sheet: which enforced me to penetrate many Syllogisms into one; and by that means in the first not to be so precise in form, as otherwise I should have been.
To your third Exception.

Seeing I required nothing but Logical form in Answering, I conceive that regard was more to be had amongst the learned to that, then to the errors of the vulgar: that whilst ignorance attends to most words, learning might attend to most reason.

To your fourth Exception.

My Argument contains not precisely the terms of my Thesis: because, when I was called upon to hasten my Argument, I had not then at hand my Thesis. Had I put more in my Thesis, then I prove in my Argument, I had been faulty; but proving more then my Thesis contained (as I clearly do) no body hath reason to find fault with me, save my self. The real difference betwixt Assemblies of Christians, and Congregation of Christians, and betwixt Salvation is only to be had in those Assemblies, and Salvation is not to be had out of that Congregation, I understand not: seeing all particular assemblies of true Christians, must make one Congregation.

To your Answer to my first Syllogism.

He who distinguishes Logically the terms of any proposition, must not apply his
is distinction to some one part of the term only, but to the whole term, as it stands in the proposition distinguished. Now in my proposition I affirm, that the Congregation of Christians I speak of there, is such Congregation, that it is the true Church of Christ, that is, (as all know) the whole Catholike Church: and you distinguish thus, That I either mean by Congregation the whole Catholike Church, or only some part of it as, if one should say, Whatsoever Congregation of men is the Common-wealth of England, and another in answer to it should distinguish, either by Congregation of men you mean the whole Common-wealth, or some part of it, when all men know, that by the Common-wealth of England must be meant the whole Common-wealth: for no part of it is the Common-wealth of England.

Again you distinguish, that some things are Essentials, or Necessaries, and others Accidents, which are acknowledged or practised in the Church. Now to apply his distinction to my Proposition, you must distinguish that which I say is acknowledged to have been ever in the Church by the Institution of Christ, either to be meant of an Essential, or an Accident; when all the world
world knows that whatsoever is acknowledged to have been ever in the Church by Christ's Institution, cannot be meant of any Accidental thing, but of a necessary, unchangeable and Essential thing, in Christ's true Church. If one should advance this proposition, whatsoever Congregation is the true Church of Christ, acknowledges the Eucharist ever to have been by Christ's Institution a proper Sacrament of the new Law: and another should distinguish (as you do my proposition) This may be meant either of an Essential or Accidental thing to Christ's true Church: Seeing whatsoever is acknowledged to have been always in Christ's Church and instituted by Christ, cannot be acknowledged but as necessary and essential to his Church. If therefore my Major, as the terms lie expressed in it, be true, it should have been granted: if false, it should have been denied. But no Logick allows that it should be distinguished into such different members, whereof one is expressly excluded in the very terms of the proposition. These distinctions therefore, though learned and substantial in themselves, yet were they here unseasonable, and too illogical to ground an answer in forme (as you ground yours) still insisting
sitting upon them in your address almost to every proposition. Hence appears first, that I used no fallacy at all _ex Accidetne_: seeing my proposition could not be verified of _an Accident_. Secondly that all your instances of _Spain, France, &c._ which include _Accidents_, are not apposite; because your propositions, as they lie, have no term which excludes _Accidental Adjuncts_, as mine hath.

To the Proof of my _Major_.

You seem to grant the _Major_ of my second _Syllogism_; not excepting any thing material against it.

To my _Minor_.

You fall again into the former distinctions, now disproved and excluded, of the meaning of _Congregation, &c._ in my proposition, and would have me to understand determinately either the whole Catholike Church, or some part of it, (and so make four terms in my _Syllogism_:) whereas in my _Minor_, _Congregation of Christians_ is taken generically, and abstracts, as an universal, from all particulars. I say _no Congregation_, which is an universal negative; and when I say, none, _Save that Congregati-on which acknowledges Saint Peter, &c._ the term _Congregation_ supposes for the same whole Catholike Church mentioned in my former
former Syllogism, but expresses it under a general term of Congregation in confuso; as I express Homo, when I say he is Animal, a man, when I say he is a living creature, but only generically, or in confuso. Now should I have intended determinately either the whole Catholike Church, or any part of it, I should have made an inept Syllogism, which would have run thus. Whatsoever true Church of Christ is now the true Church of Christ, hath been always visible, &c. But no true Church of Christ hath been alwaies visible, save the true Church of Christ, which acknowledges Saint Peter, &c. Ergo whatsoever true Church of Christ is now the true Church, acknowledges Saint Peter, &c. which would have been idem per idem; for every one knows, that the true Church of Christ is now the true Church of Christ. But speaking, as I do, in abstractive and generical terms, I avoid this absurdity, and frame a true Syllogism.

Now my meaning in this Minor could be no other then this, which my words express; That the Congregation, that is, the whole Congregation acknowledges Saint Peter, &c. and is visible, &c. and not any part, great or small of it. For when I say, the Parliament of these Nations doth, or hath
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 Hath enacted a Statute, who would demand of me, whether I meant the whole Parliament, or some determinate part of it? You should therefore have denied, not thus distinguished my Minor quite against the express words of it. What you say again of Essentials and Accidents, is already refuted; and by that also your Syllogism, brought by way of instance. For your proposition doth not say, that the Church of Rome acknowledges those things were alwayes done, and that by Christ's Institution, as my proposition says she acknowledges Saint Peter and his successors.

To my third Syllogism.

Granting my Major, you distinguish the term Pastors in my Minor, into particular and universal, fixed and unfixed, &c. I answer, that the term Pastors (as before Congregation) signifies determinately no one of these, but generically and in confusion all; and so abstracts from each of them in particular, as the word Animal abstracts from homo and brutum. Neither can I mean some parts of the Church only, had Pastors; for I say, whatsoever Congregation of Christians is now the true Church of Christ, hath alwayes had visible Pastors and People united. Now the Church is not a part,
part but the whole Church, that is, both the whole body of the Church, and all particular Churches the parts of it. And hence is solved your argument of the Indians, of people converted by lay-men, when particular Pastors are dead, &c. For those were subjects of the chief Bishop alone, till some inferior Pastors were sent to them. For when they were taught the Christian Doctrine, in the explication of that Article, I believe the Holy Catholike Church, they were also taught, that they being people of Christ's Church, must subject themselves to their lawful Pastors, this being a part of the Christian doctrine. Heb. 13. who though absent in body, may yet be present in spirit with them, as Saint Paul faith of himself, 1 Cor. 5. 3.

Your Answer to the confirmation of my Major seems strange. For I speak of visible Pastors, and you say it is true of an Invisible Pastor, that is, Christ our Saviour, who is now in heaven, invisible to men on earth. The rest is a repetition of what is immediately before answered.

Ephes. 4. proves not only that some particular Churches, or parts of the whole Church, must alwaies have Pastors, but that the whole Church it self must have Pastors,
Pastors, and every particular Church in it; for it speaks of that Church which is the Body of Christ; which can be no less then the whole Church. For no particular Church alone is his mystical Body, but only a part of it.

_Ephes. 4._ is not directly alleged to prove an universal Monarch, (as you say) but to prove an uninterrupted continuance of visible Pastors; that being only affirmed in the proposition, which I prove by it.

2. This is already Answered.

I stand to the judgment of any true Logitian, nay or expert Lawyer, or rational person, whether a Negative proposition be to be proved otherwise then by obliging him who denies it, to give an instance to infringe it. Should you say, _no man hath right to my Benefice and Function in my parish, save myself_, and another should deny what you said; would not you, or any rational man in your case, answer him, that by denying your proposition he affirmed that some other had right to them, and to make good that affirmation was obliged to produce who that was: which till he did, you still remained the sole just possessor of your Benefice as before; and every one will judge, that he had no reason to deny your assertion,
assertion, when he brought no proof against it. This is our case.

The Contradiction, which you would draw from this, against my Nego, Concedo, &c. exacted from the Respondent, and nothing else, follows not. For that prescription is to be understood, that the Respondent of himself, without scope given him by the opponent, was not to use any other forms in Answering; But if the opponent should require that the respondent give reasons, or instances, or proofs, of what he denies, that then the Respondent is to proceed to them. And this is most ordinary in all Logical Disputations, where strict form is observed, and known to every young Logitian. Instances therefore demanded by the opponent, were not excluded, but only such excursions out of form, as should proceed from the respondent, with out being exacted by the opponent.

You say, though I make a Negative of it, I may put it in other terms at my pleasure. But the question is not what I may do, but what I did: I required not an Answer to an Argument, which I may frame, but to that which I had then framed, which was expressed in a negative proposition.

You tell me if I prove the Popes universal
Supremacy, you will be a Papist: And I tell you, I have proved it by this very Argument, That either He hath that supremacy, or some other Church; denying that he hath alwaies had it, hath been alwaies visible; and that Church I require should be named, if any such be, and whilst you refuse to name that Church (as here you do) you neither answer the Argument, nor become a Papist.

You say I affirm, and I must prove. I say in the proposition, about which we now speak, I affirm not, and so must not prove; and you by denying it, must affirm, and so must prove.

You prove it is not your part here to prove, because the Popes supremacy could not be denied, before it was affirmed; and you must be obliged to prove that denial. I oblige you not to prove a continued visible Church formally and expressly denying it, but that it was of such a Constitution as was inconsistent with any such supremacy, or could and did subsist without it, which is an Affirmative.

You affirm, that because I say you cannot be saved if you deny that Supremacy, and you say that I may be saved though I hold it, therefore you are not bound to prove what I reprove, but I to prove my negative proposition. But this would prove
as well, that a Mahumetan is not bound to prove his religion to you, but you to prove yours to him, because you say he cannot be saved being a Mahumetan; and he says, that you may be saved being a Christian. See you not, that the obligation of proof in Logical form depends not of the first position, or Thesis, but must be drawn from the immediate proposition, affirmative or negative, which is or ought to be proposed?

To what you say of an Accident and a corrupt part, I have already answered.

To what you say of a vice-king, not being necessary to the Constitution of a kingdom, but a king and subjects only, is true, if a vice-king be not instituted by the Full power of an Absolute Authority over that kingdom, to be an ingredient into the essence of the Kingdom, in the Kings absence: But if so constituted, it will be essential; now my proposition faith, and my Argument proves, that by the Absolute Authority of Christ, Saint Peter and his Successors were instituted Governors in Christ's place of his whole visible Church; and whatsoever Government Christ institutes of his Church, must be essential to his Church. You see now the Disparity.
You insist to have me prove a Negative; and I insist to have you prove that Affirmative, which you fall into by denying my Negative, and leave it to judgement, whose exaction is the more conform to reason, and logical form.

But if I prove not here, say you, the whole Catholike Churches holding ever the Popes Supremacy, you shall take it as a giving up my cause. I tell you again, that I have proved it by this very Argument, by force of Syllogistical form: and it is not reasonable to judge that I have given up my cause, if I prove not again, what I have already proved.

Your taking upon you the part of an opponent now is, you know, out of Season; when that is yours, mine shall be the Respondent.

At length you give a fair attempt to satisfy your obligation, and to return such an instance as I demanded of you. But you are too free by much in your offer. I demand one Congregation, and you promise to produce more then an hundred. But as they abound in the number, so are they deficient in the quality, which
which I require. I demand, that the Answerer nominate any Congregation of Christians, which always till this present time since Christ hath been visible, &c. and you tell me of more than an hundred Congregations, besides that which acknowledges Saint Peter, &c. whereof not any one hath been all that designed time visible: which is as if I had demanded an Answerer to nominate any Family of Gentry, which hath successively continued ever since William the Conquerour till this present time; and he who undertakes to satisfy my demand, should nominate more than a hundred Families, whereof not so much as one continued half that time. You nominate first all these present, the Greeks, Armenians, Ethiopians, besides the Protestants. These you begin with. Now to satisfy my demand, you must assert, that these, whom you first name, are both one Congregation, and have been visible ever since Christ's time. This you do not in the pursuit of your Allegations. For Numb. 2. you nominate none at all, but tell me, that in the last age there were as many or more. What were these as many or more? were they the same which you nominated first, or others? I required some determinate Congregation
congregation to be nominated all the while, and you tell me of as many or more; but say not of what determinate congregation they were. In your Num. 3. you tell me, in the former ages; till one thousand, there were near as many, or rather many more. A fair account! But in the meantime you nominate none, much less prosecute you those with whom you begun. Num. 4. You say, in the year six hundred there were many more incomparably. What many? what more? were they the same which you nominated in the beginning, and made one Congregation with them? or were they quite different Congregations? what am I the wiser by your saying many more incomparably, when you tell me not what, or who they were? Then you say, But at least for four hundred years after Christ, I never yet saw valid proof of one Papist in all the world, that is, one that was for the Popes universal Monarchy, or vice-Christship. What then? are there no proofs in the world; but what you have seen? or may not many of those proofs be valid which you have seen, though you esteem them not so? and can you think it reasonable, upon your single not-seeing, or not-judging only, to conclude absolutely, as you here do, that all have been against
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against us for many hundred years? In your Num. 5. You name Ethiopia and India, as having been without the limits of the Roman Empire, whom you deny to have acknowledged any supremacy of power and authority above all other Bishops. You might have done well to have cited at least one antient Author for this Affertion. Were those primitive Christians of another kind of Church-order and Government, then were those under the Roman Empire *? When the Roman Emperors were yet Heathens, had not the Bishop of Rome the Supremacy over all other Bishops through the whole Church? and did those Heathen Emperors give it him? How came St. Cyprian, in time of the Heathen Empire to request Stephen the Pope to punish and depose the Bishop of Arles, as we shall see hereafter? Had he that authority (think you) from an Heathen Emperour? See now how little your Allegations are to the purpose, where you nominate any determinate Congregations to satsisfie my demand.

* But how far from truth this is, appears from St. Leo, in his Sermons de natali suo, where he faies, Sedes Roma Petri, quicquid non possidet almis, Religiones te-net; and by this, that the Abyssines of Ethiopia were under the Patriarch of Alexandria antiently, which Patriarch was under the Authority of the Romane Bishops, as we shall presently see.
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I had no reason to demand of you different congregations, of all sorts and cts opposing the Supremacy, to have been own visible in all ages. I was not so ignorant, as not to know, that the Nicolai ns, Valentinians, Gnosticks, Manichees, Montanists, Arians, Donatists, Nestorians, Uyychians, Pelagians, Iconoclasts, Beren-arians, Waldensians, Albigenses, Wicleffists, Jussits, Lutherans, Calvinists, &c. each following others had some kind of visibility, divided and distracted each to his own respective age, from our time to the Apo- tles, in joyning their heads and hands togeth er against the Popes Supremacy. But because these could not be called one successive Congregation of Christians, being all together by the ears amongst themselves; should not have thought it a demand be- feeming a Scholar, to have required such a visibility as this. Seeing therefore all you determinately nominate, are as much different as these; pardon me, if I take it not for any satisfaction at all to my de- mand, or acquittance of your obligation. Bring me a visible succession of any one Congregation of Christians, of the same belief, profession, and communion, for the designed time, opposing that Supremacy,
and you will have satisfied: but till that be done, I leave it to any equal judgement, whether my demand be satisfied or not. You answer to this, That all those, who are nominated by you, are parts of the Catholike Church, and so one Congregation. But Sir, give me leave to tell you, that in your principles, you put both the Church of Rome and your selves, to be parts of the Catholike Church: and yet sure you account them not one Congregation of Christians, seeing by separation one from another they are made two: or if you account them one, why did you separate your selves, and still remain separate from communion with the Roman Church? why possessed you your selves of the Bishopricks and Cures of your own Prelates and Pastors, they yet living in Queen Elizabeths time? and drew both your selves and their other subjects from all subjection to them, and communion with them? Is this disunion, think you, fit to make one and the same Congregation of you and them? is not charity, subordination, and obedience to the same State and government required as well to make one Congregation of Christians, as it is required to make one Congregation of Commonwealths men? Though therefore you do ac-
Count them all parts of the Catholike Church, yet you cannot make them in your principles one Congregation of Christians. Secondly, your position is not true; the particulars named by you neither are, nor can be parts of the Catholike Church, unless you make Arians, and Pelagians, and Donatists, parts of the Catholike Church: which were either to deny them to be Hereticks and Schismaticks; or to affirm, that Hereticks and Schismaticks, separating themselves from the communion of the Catholike Church, notwithstanding that separation, do continue parts of the Catholike Church. For who knows not that the Ethiopians to this day are *Eutychian Hereticks. And a great part of those Greeks and Armenians, who deny the Popes Supremacy, are infected with the Herezie of Nestorius, and all of them profess generally all those points of faith with us against you, wherein you differ from us; and deny to use Mosaiical ceremonies. They mention not the council of Caledon, because (saies he) they are Eutychians and Jacobites, and confesses that their Patriarch is in Subjection to the Patriarch of Alexandria, &c. See more of the Chostri, Jacobites, Maronites, &c. p. 493, 494. where he confesses that many of them are now Subject to the Pope, and have renounced their old errors.

*See Rosse his view of Religions, p. 99. Where he saies that they circumcise their children the eighth day, they
communicate with you, or to esteem you other than Hereticks and Schismatics, unless you both agree with them in those differences of faith, and subject your selves to the obedience of the Patriarch of Constantinople, as to the chief Head and Governor of all Christian Churches next under Christ; and consequently as much a vice-Christ, in your account, as the Pope can be conceived to be. See, if you please. Hieremias Patriarch of Constantinople, his Answer to the Lutherans, especially in the beginning and end of the book; Acta Theologorum Wittebergenium, &c. and Sir Edwyn Sands, of this subject, in his Survey p. 232, 233, 242, &c.

Either therefore you must make the Eutychians and Nestorians no Hereticks, and so contradict the Oecumenical Councils of Ephesus, and Chalcedon, which condemned them as such; and the consent of all Orthodox Christians, who ever since esteemed them no others; or you must make condemned Hereticks parts of the Catholic Church, against all antiquity and Christianitv. And for those Greeks near Constantinople, who are not infected with Nestorianism and Eutychianism, yet in the procession of the Holy Ghost, against both
both us and you, they must be thought to maintain manifest Heresie; it being a point in a fundamental matter of faith, the Trinity; and the difference betwixt those Greeks and the Western Church, now for many hundred of years, and in many General Councils esteemed and defined to be real and great; yea so great, that the Greeks left the Communion of the Roman Church upon that difference alone, and ever esteemed the Bishop of Rome and his party to have fallen from the true faith, and lost his ancient authority by that sole pretended error; and the Latins alwaies esteemed the Greeks to be in a damnable error, in maintaining the contrary to the doctrine of the Western or Roman Church in that particular. And yet sure they understood what they held, and how far they differed one from another, much better then some Novel writers of yours, who preft by force of Argument, have no other way left them to maintain a perpetual visibility, then by extenuating that difference of Procession betwixt the Greek and Latin Church, which so many ages before Protestantcy sprung up, was esteemed a main fundamental error by both parts, caused the Greeks to abandon all subjection and Communion to the Bisho
shops of Rome; made them so divided the one from the other, that they held each other Hereticks, Schismaticks, and desertors of the true faith, as they continue still to do to this day, and yet you will have them both to be parts of the Catholike Church.

But when you have made the best you can of these Greeks, Armenians, Ethiopians, Protestants, whom you first name, you neither have deduced, nor can deduce them successively in all ages till Christ, as a different Congregation of Christians, from that which holds the Popes Supremacy; which was my proposition. For in the year 1500. those who became the first Protestants, were not a Congregation different from those who held that supremacy; nor in the year 500. were the Greeks a visible Congregation different from it; nor in the year 300. were the Nestorians; nor in the year 200. the Eutychians a different Congregation from those who held the said Supremacy: But in those respective years, those who first begun those Heresies, were involved within that Congregation, which held it, as a part of it, and assenting therein with it: who after in their several ages and beginnings fell off from it, as dead branches from the
the tree; that, still remaining what it ever was, and only continuing in a perpetual visibility of succession.

Though therefore you profess never to have seen convincing proof of this in the first 400 years, & labour to infringe it in the next ages, yet I will make an essay to give you a taste of those innumerable proofs of this visible Consent in the Bishop of Rome's Supremacy, not of Order only, but of Power, Authority, & Jurisdiction over all other Bishops, in the ensuing instances, which happened within the first 400, or 500, or 600, years.

(a) John Bishop of Antioch makes an Appeal to Pope Simplicius. And Flavius (b) Bishop of Constantinople, being deposed in the false Council of Ephesus, immediately appeals to the Pope, as to his judge. (c) Theodoret was by Pope Leo restored, and that by an (d) appeal unto a just judgement. (e) Saint Cyprian desires Pope Stephen to depose Marcellian Bishop of Arles, that another might be substituted in his place. And to evince the supreme Authority of the Bishops of Rome, it is determined in the (f) Council of Sardis, That no Bishop deposed by other neighbouring Bishops, pretending to be heard again, was to have any successor appointed.
appointed, until the case were defined by the Pope. Eustathius (g) Bishop of Sebast in Armenia was restored by Pope Liberius his Letters read and received in the Council of Tyana; and (h) Saint Chrysostome expressly desires Pope Innocent not to punish his Adversaries, if they do repent. Which evinces that Saint Chrysostome thought that the Pope had power to punish them. And the like is written to the Pope by the (i) Council of Ephesus in the case of John Bishop of Antioch.

(k) The Bishops of the Greek, or Eastern Church, who sided with Arius, before they declared themselves to be Arians, sent their Legates to Julius Bishop of Rome to have their cause heard before him against Saint Athanasius: the same did Saint Athanasius to defend himself against them: which Arian Bishops having understood from Julius, that their Accusations against Saint Athanasius, upon due examination of both parties, were found groundless and false, required (rather fraudulently, then seriously) to have a fuller Tryal before a General Council at Rome: which (to take away all show of excuse from them) Pope Julius assembled. Saint Athanasius was summoned by the Pope to appear before him.
him and the Councill in Judgement: which he presently did; (and many other Eastern Bishops unjustly accused by the Arians aforesaid, had recourse to Rome with him,) and expected there a year and a half: All which time his Accusers (though also summoned) appeared not, fearing they should be condemned by the Pope and his Council. Yet they pretended not (as Protestants have done in these last ages of the Kings of England) That Constantius, the Arian Emperour of the East, was Head, or chief Governour over their Church in all Causes Ecclesiastical; and consequently that the Pope had nothing to do with them, but only pretended certain frivolous excuses to delay their appearance from one time to another. Where it is worth the right of noting, that Julius, reprehending the said Arian Bishops (before they published Bishoprick, by force of an order given upon that Appeal by Leo Pope to restore him.

Concerning Saint Athanasmus being judged and righted by Julius Pope, Chambier, cit. p. 497. acknowledges the matter of fact to be so, but against all antiquity, pretends that judgment to have been unjust. Which, had it been so, yet it shews a true power of judging in the Pope, though then unduly executed; otherwise Saint Athanasmus, would never have made use of it, neither can it be condemned of injustice, unless Saint Athanasmus be also condemned as unjust, in consenting to it.
their Heresie, and so taking them to be Catholikes) for condemning Saint Athana-sius in an Eastern Councilll, gathered by them before they had acquainted the Bishop of Rome with so important a cause, ufed these words, An ignari estis hanc con-
suetudinem esse, ut primum nobis scribatur; ut binc quod justum est, definiri posset, &c.

Are you ignorant, faith he, that this is the cufrome, to write to us firft, That hence that, which is just may be defined, &c. where most cleerly it appears, that it belonged particularly to the Bishop of Rome to pass a defini-
tive sentence even against the Bifhops of the Eastern, or Greek Church; which yet is more confirmed by the proceedings of Pope Innocent the first, about 12. hundred years since, in the Case of Saint Chryfo-stome: 13.cap.34. Where firft Saint Chryfo-stome appeals to Innocentius from the Councilll assembled at Chamier. Constantinople, Wherein he was condemned. cit. p. 498. Secondly Innocentius annulls his condemn-
fayes, other Bifhops restored those who were wrongfully defoped, as well as the Pope. Which though it were so, yet never was there any single Bifhop save the Pope, who restored any, who were out of their respective Diocefs, or Patriarchates, but always collected together in a Synod, by common voice, and that in regard only of their neighbouring Bifhops; whereas the Bifhop of Rome by his sole and single authority, restored Bifhops wrongfully defoped all the Church over.
nation, and declares him innocent. Thirdly, he Excommunicates Atticus Bishop of Constantinople, and Theophilus Bishop of Alexandria for persecuting Saint Chrysostome. Fourthly, after Saint Chrysostome was dead in Banishment, Pope Innocentius Excommunicates Arcadius the Emperor of the East, and Eudoxia his wife. Fifthly, the Emperor and Empress humble themselves, crave pardon of him, and were ob- solved by him. The same is evident in those matters which passed about the year 450, where Theodosius the Emperor of the East having too much favoured the Eutychian Hereticks by the instigation of Chrysaphius the Eunuch, and Pulcheria his Empress, and so intermedled too far in Ecclesiastical causes, yet he ever bore that respect to the See of Rome, (which doubtless in those circumstances he would not have done, had he not believed it an Obligation) that he would not permit the Eutychian Council at Ephesus to be assembled, without the knowledge and Authority of the Roman Bishop Leo the first; and so wrote to him to have his presence in it, who sent his Legats unto them. And though both Leo's letters were dissembled, and his Legats affronted, and himself excommunicated by wicked
wicked Dioscorus, Patriarch of Alexandria, and president of that Coventicle, who also was the chief upholser of the Eutychians, yet Theodosius repented before his death, banished his wife Pulcheria and Chrysaphius the Eunuch, the chief favourers of the Eutychians, and reconciled himself to the Church with great evidences of Sorrow and Penance.

Presently after, Anno 451. follows the Fourth General Council of Chalcedon: concerning which these particulars occur to our present purpose. First Martianus the Eastern Emperour wrote to Pope Leo, That by the Popes Authority a General Council might be gathered in what City of the Eastern Church he should please to chuse. Secondly, both Anatolius Patriarch of Constantinople, and the rest of the Eastern Bishops, sent to the legats of Pope Leo, in his order, the profession of their Faith. Thirdly, the Popes Legats fate in the first place of the Council before all the Patriarchs. Fourthly, they prohibited (by his order given them) That Dioscorus Patriarch of Alexandria, and chief upholser of the Eutychians, should sit in the Council; but be presented as a guilty person to be judged: because he had celebrated a Council.
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cill in the Eastern Church without the consent of the Bishop of Rome; which (said the Legats) never was done before, nor could be done lawfully. This order of Pope Leo was presently put in execution by consent of the whole Counciill, and Dioscorus was judged and condemned; his condemnation and deposition being pronounced by the Popes Legats, and after subscribed by the Counciill. Fifthly, the Popes Legats pronounced the Church of Rome to be * Caput omnium Ecclesiærum, the Head of all Churches, before the whole Council, and none contradicted them. Sixthly, all the Fathers assembled in that Holy Counciill, in their Letter to Pope Leo, acknowledged themselves to be his children, and wrote to him as to their Father. Seventhly, they humbly begged of him, that he would grant, that the Patriarch of Constantinople might

In the time of Justinian the Emperor, Agapet Pope, even in Constantinople, against the will both of the Emperor and Empress, deposed Anthymus, and ordained Mennas in his place. *Liberat. in Breviario. cap. 21. Marcellinus. Comes in Chronico. Concil. Constantin. Sub Menna. act. 4. And the same St. Greg. C. 7. Ep. 63. declares that both the Emperor and Bishop of Constantinople acknowledged that the Church of Constantinople was subject to the See of Rome. And l. 7. Ep. 37. Et alibi pronounces, that in case of falling into offences he knew no Bishop which was not subject to the Bishop of Rome.
have the first place among the Patriarchs, after that of Rome: which notwithstanding that the Council had consented to (as had also the Third General Council of Ephesus done before) yet they esteemed their grants to be of no sufficient force, until they were confirmed by the Pope. And Leo thought not fit to yield to their petition, against the express ordination of the First Council of Nice; where Alexandria had the preheminence, as also Antioch and Jerusalem, before that of Constantinople.

Saint Cyril of Alexandria, though he wholly disallowed Nestorius his doctrine, yet he would not break off Communion with him, till Celestine the Pope had condemned him: whose Censure he required and expected. Nestorius also wrote to Celestine, acknowledging his Authority, and expecting from him the Censure of his doctrine. Celestine condemned Nestorius, and gave him the space of ten daies to repent, after he had received his condemnation. All which had effect in the Eastern Church, where Nestorius was Patriarch of Constantinople. (o) After this Saint Cyril having received Pope Leo's Letters, wherein he gave power to Saint Cyril to execute
his condemnation against Nestorius, and to send his condemnatory letters to him, gathered a Council of his next Bishops, and sent Letters and Articles to be subscribed, with the Letters of Celestine to Nestorius: which when Nestorius had received, he was so far from repentance, that he accused St. Cyril in those Articles, to be guilty of the Heresie of Apollinaris: so that St. Cyril being also accused of Heresie, was barred from pronouncing sentence against Nestorius, so long as he stood charged with that Accusation. Theodosius the Emperour, seeing the Eastern Church embroyled in these difficulties, writes to Pope Celestine about the assembling of a general Council at Ephesus, by Petronius afterwards Bishop of Bononia (as is manifest in his life written by Sigonius) Pope Celestine in his Letters to Theodosius, not only professeth his consent to the calling of that Council, but also prescribeth in what form it was to be celebrated; as Firmus Bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia testified in the Council of Ephesus. Hereupon Theodosius sent his Letters to assemble the Bishops both of the East and West to that Council. And Celestine sent his Legats thither, with order not to examine again in the Council the cause of Nestorius,
Nestorius, but rather to put Celestines condemnation of him, given the year before, into execution. St. Cyril Bishop of Alexandria, being constituted by Celestine his chief Legate ordinary in the East, by reason of that preeminency, and primacy of his See after that of Rome, presided in the Council: yet so, that Philip, who was only a Priest and no Bishop, by reason that he was sent Legatus a Latere from Celestine, and so supplied his place as he was chief Bishop of the Church, subscribed the first, even before St. Cyril, and all the other Legats and Patriarchs. In the sixth Action of this holy Council, Juvenalis Patriarch of Hierusalem, having understood the contempt, which John Patriarch of Antioch, who was cited before the Council, shewed of the Bishops and the Popes Legats there assembled, expressed himself against him in these words, Quod Apostolica ordinatione & Antiqua Traditione (which were no way opposed by the Fathers there present) Antiochena sedes perpetuo a Romana dirigiaturque, That by Apostolical ordination and ancient Tradition the See of Antioch was perpetually directed and judged by the See of Rome: which words not only evidence the precedency of place,
Dr. Hammond would have it, but of power and judicature in the Bishop of Rome over a Patriarch of the Eastern Church; and that derived from the time and ordination of the Apostles. The Council therefore sent their decrees, with their condemnation of Nestorius, to Pope Celestine, who presently ratified and confirmed them.

Not long after this, in the year 445, valentinian the Emperor makes this manifesto of the most high Ecclesiastical authority of the See of Rome, in these words:

Seeing that the merit of St. Peter, who is the Prince of the Episcopal Crown, and the Dignity of the City of Rome, and no less the authority of the holy Synod, hath established the primacy of the Apostolical See, lest presumption should attempt any unlawful thing against the authority of that See, (for then finally will the peace of the Churches be preserved every where, if the whole universality acknowledge their Governour) when these things had been hitherto inviolably observed, &c. Where he makes the succession from St. Peter to be the first foundation of the Roman Churches primacy; and his authority to be, not only in place, but

See this at length in Baronius, in the year 445.
but in power and Government over the whole visible Church: And adds present-
ly, that the definitive sentence of the Bishop of Rome, given against any French
Bishop, was to be of force through France, even without the Emperor's Letters Pat-
tents. For what shall not be lawful for the authority of so great a Bishop to exercise
upon the Churches? And then adds his Imperial precept, in these words. "But this
occasion hath provoked also our com-
mand, that hereafter it shall not be law-
ful, neither for Hilarinus (whom to be
still entitled a Bishop, the sole humanity
of the meek Prelate (id est, the Bishop of
Rome) permits) neither for any other to
mingle arms with Ecclesiastical matters,
or to resist the commands of the Bishop
of Rome, &c. We define by this our per-
petual decree, that it shall neither be
lawful for the French Bishops, nor for
those of other Provinces, against the an-
cient custom, to attempt any thing with-
out the authority of the venerable Pope
of the eternal City: But let it be for a
law to them and to all, whatsoever the
authority of the Apostolick See hath de-
termined, or shall determine. So that
what Bishop soever, being called to the
Tribunal
"Tribunal of the Roman Bishop, shall neglect to come, is to be compelled by the Governor of the same Province, to present himself before him. Which evidently proves, that the highest, Universal, Ecclesiastical Judge and Governor was, and ever is to be the Bishop of Rome: which the Council of Chalcedon before mentioned, plainly owned, when writing to Pope Leo they say, Thou Governest us, as the head doth the members, contributing thy good will by those which hold thy place. Behold a Primacy, not only of Precedency, but of Government and Authority; which Lerinensis confirms, contr. Hares. cap. 9. where speaking of Stephen Pope, he saies, Dignum, ut opinor, existimans, si reliquos omnes tantum fidei devotione, quantum loci authoritate, superabat: esteeming it (as I think) a thing worthy of himself, if he overcame all others as much in the devotion of faith, as he did in the Authority of his place. And to confirm what this universal Authority was; he affirms, that he sent a Law, Decree, or Command into Africa, (Sanxit,) That in matter of re-baptization of Hereticks nothing should be innovated; which was a manifest argument of his Spiritual Authority over those of Africa;
Africa; and à paritate rationis, over all others. I will shut up all with that which was publickly pronounced, and no way contradicted, and consequently assented to in the Council of Ephesus, (one of the four first general Councils) in this matter; Tom. 2. Concil. pag. 327. Aet. I. where Philip, Priest and Legate of Pope Celestine, says thus, "Gratias agimus sanctae vere-
"randaque synodo, quod litteris sancti beati-
"que Papa nostri vobis recitatis, sanctas
"chartas, sanctis vestris vocibus, sancto ca-
"piti vestro, sanctis vestris exclamati-
"bus, exhibueritis. Non enim ignorat
"vestra beatitudo; totius fidei; vel etiam
"Apostolorum, caput esse beatum Apo-
"lum Petrum. And the same Philip, Aet.
"3. p. 330. proceeds in this manner, Nulli
"dubium, imo saeculis omnibus notum est,
"quod sanctus beatissimusque Petrus, Apo-
"stolorum Princeps & caput, Fideique
"columna; Ecclesia Catholicae Fundamen-
"tum, à Domino nostro Jesu Christo, Sal-
"vatore generis humani ac redemptore
"nostro claves regni acceptit; solvendique
"ac ligandi peccata possitas ipsi data est;
"qui ad hoc usque tempus ac semper in suis
"successoribus vivit & judicium exer-
"cit:——Hujus itaque secundum ordinem
successor
successor & locum-tenens, sanctus beatissimus Papa noster Celestinus, nos ipsius praefentiam supplentes huc mittit. And Arcadius another of the Popes Legats enveighing against the Heretick Nestorius, accuses him, (though he was Patriarch of Constantinople, which this Council requires to be next in dignity after Rome) as of a great crime, that he contemned the command of the Apostolick See, that is, of Pope Celestine. Now had Pope Celestine had no power to command him (and by the like reason to command all other Bishops) he had committed no fault in transgressing and contemning his command. By these testimonies it will appear, that what you are pleased to say, That the most part of the Catholike Church hath been against us to this day, and all for many hundred of years, is far from truth: seeing in the time of the holy Decumenical Councils of Ephesus and Church, Chalcedon, the universal consent of the whole Catholike Church was for us in this point.

For the age 630. See St. Gregory Pope, ep. 30.
where Heretics and Shisma-
ticks rece-
penting, were re-
ceived then into
the
Decumenical Councils of Ephesus and Church, Chalcedon, the universal consent of the whole Catholike Church was for us in this point.

As
As to what you say of Congregation of Christians in the beginning, I answer, I took the word Christians in a large sense, comprehending in it all those (as it is vulgarly taken) who are Baptized and profess to believe in Christ, and are distinguished from Jews, Mahumetans and Heathens, under the denomination of Christians.

What you often say of an universal Monarch, &c. if you take Monarch for an Imperious sole Commander, as temporal Kings are, we acknowledge no such Monarch in the Church: if only for one who hath received power from Christ, in meekness, charity, and humility to govern all the rest, for their own eternal good, as brethren or children, we grant it.

What also you often repeat of a Vice-Christ, we much dislike that title, as proud and insolent, and utterly disclaim from it; neither was it ever given by any sufficient Authority to our Popes, or did they ever accept of it.

As to the Council of Constance, they never questioned the Supremacy of the Pope, as ordinary chief Governor of all Bishops and people in the whole Church: nay they expressly give it to Martinus Quintus, when he was chosen.
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But in extraordinary cases, especially when it is doubtful who is true Pope, as it was in the beginning of this Council, till Martinus Quintus was chosen: Whether any extraordinary power be in a general Council, above that ordinary power of the Pope: which is a question disputed by some amongst our selves, but touches not the matter in hand; which proceeds only of the ordinary and constant Supream Pastor of all Christians, abstracting from extraordinary tribunals and powers, which are seldom found in the Church, and collected only occasionally, and upon extraordinary accidents.

Thus honoured Sir, I have as much as my occasions would permit me, hastened a reply to your answer; and if more be requisite, it shall not be denied. Only please to give me leave to tell you, that I cannot conceive my Argument yet answered by all you have said to it.

Feb. 3. 1658.

William Johnson.

Sir,

It was the 21. of January, before your Answer came to my hands; and though my Reply
Reply was made ready by me the third instant, yet I have found so great difficulties to get it transcribed, that it was not possible to transmit it to you before now. But I hope hereafter I shall find Scribes more at leisure. I must desire you to excuse what errors you find in the Copy which I send; As also, that being unwilling to make a farther delay, I am enforced to send a Copy which hath in it more interlineations than would otherwise become me to send to a person of your worth. Yet I cannot doubt, but your Candor will pass by all things of this nature. I am Sir,

Your very humble servant,

Feb. 15. 1658. William Johnson.

Worthy Sir,

I have now expected near three moneths for your rejoynder to the Reply which I made to that answer which you were pleased to send, and return to my Argument concerning the Church of Christ; but as yet nothing hath appeared. I must confess, I have wondered at it, considering the earnestness which appeared in you at the first, to proceed with speed in a business of this nature: what the impediment hath
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What hath been, I am only left to guess: but certainly truth is strong, and it will not be found an easie thing to oppose her while we keep close to form. I am now necessitated to go out of London, so that if your Papers come in my absence, I shall hope you will have the patience to expect until they can be sent from London to me, and my Answers returned by the way of London: but I do engage not to make a delay longer then the circumstances of the place and times shall enforce.

Sir, I do highly honour and esteem your parts and person; and shall be very glad to bring that business to an handsome issue which hath been so calmly and soberly prosecuted. I am an enemy to passion; and as I have hitherto found you sweet and gentle in your proceedings towards me, so shall you alwaies find me.

Worthy Sir,

Your friend to serve you,

May 2, 1659. William Johnson.

Sir,

Be pleased to return your Answer, Papers or Letters which you intend for me, to the same place to which you directed your former; by which means, I shall be secure to receive them.
To Mr. T.L. (who called me to this work.)

them at my house, which is fourscore miles from London.

To Mr. T. L. (who called me to this work.)

Sir,

Though I am a stranger to you, I thought meet to take notice of the Letters which you sent your friend here (T. H.) It seems you urge hard for a Reply, and intimate somewhat of triumph in my delay: you speak as an incompetent Judge. God is the Master of my time and work; and him I must serve: and not neglect his greater work, for such trivial objections as your friend hath sent me, which are answered over and over by many so long ago. Had you read Blondel, Molineus de novitate Papismi, Whitaker, Sibrandus, Lubbertus, Chamier, Abbots, Cranthorp, Spalatensis, or one of many that have confuted them, you would sure call for no more: Or if in English you had read Dr. Field, Dr. White; yea, or but Sir Humphery Lind (to pass by multitudes) you might have seen their vanity. Yea plainly read impartially my two books against
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against Popery, and be a Papist if you can. But it seems you take it for a poor answer to be referred to books. Do not fear it. But yet let me tell you, that my hand is not more legible than my printed books: and if I had sent you this in print, would that have made it a poor answer? Or rather, is not this a poor exception, and shews that it is not truth that is looked after: for truth may be printed as well as written. If you be deceived by the men of the Papal way, let me yet intreat you, but to read over those two books (The Safe Religion, and the Key for Catholikes): If your soul be not worth so much labour, take your course: I did my duty.

But I must say, that it is a doleful case that professors are so ungrounded, that such vanities should carry them away from Catholike verity and unity, to a faction that usurps the name of Catholikes. To be free with you, I think it is that pride and levity that brings them first to separation from our Churches into Sects, and the guilt which they there incur, that prepareth professors to be so far forsaken of God, as to be given up to believe a lie, and to turn Papists.

O dreadful case! that one Bishop can-
not swell in pride, but men must make a Religion of his pride! yea and make a Catholike Church of it! yea and plead for it, and make the sin their own; yea condemn all Christians that lift not themselves under this Prince of pride. He is culpably, if not wilfully blind, that hath read Scripture and Church history, and knoweth not, that the Pope for three hundred years after Christ, was not the creature that now he is; nor had for most of that time any more Government over other Bishops, then I have over neighbour Pastors: and after that time, he was no more an universal Head, or Governor, or Vicar of Christ, then the Archbishop of Canterbury was; having indeed a far larger Diocess then he, but never was more then the Swelled Primate of one National (Imperial) Church. When Synods began to be gathered out of a Principality (the Emperours desiring that means of unity within their Empire), the pride of the Prelates set them presently a striving for superiority, who should sit highest, and write his name first, and have the largest Diocess, &c! And now men make a Religion of the fruits of this abominable pride. What are all their disputings for, and all this stir that they make
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make in the world, but to set up one man over all the earth? and that to do a spiritual work, which consisteth not with force, but is managed on conscience: One wretched man must govern the Antipodes on the other side of the earth, that is indeed uncapable of truly and justly Governing the City of Rome it self. Popes, that their own Councils have condemned for ravishing maids and wives at their doors, for Murders, Simony, Drunkenness, Herefie, denying the Resurrection and the life to come (that is, being no Christians) these forsooth must be the universal Governours, or we are all undone; and we are damned if we believe it not: O how dreadful are the effects of sin; and how great a judgement is a blinded mind! This comes of falling into Sects and parties, which leads men into the gulf of the most odious Schism (even Popery) in the world.

But if you are engaged in this party, its two to one but you are presently made partial, and will not so much as read what is against them; or will believe them if they do but tell you that we write lies; when they are things done in the open sun, and which they cannot confute, nor dare attempt, lest they manifest their shame.

Take
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Take from them their Clergies vast Dominions, Principalities, Lands and Lordships, Riches and worldly Honours, with which they so much abound, and then try how many will plead for the Pope: then they'll say, If Baal be a God, let him plead for himself. But I confess, I have little hopes of turning any of them, though I could shew it them written by an Angel from heaven that Popery is a deceit: for the Scripture that's above Angelical authority declareth it; and by making it a nose of wax, they take it as if it were not sense, nor intelligible without the Popes interpretation (which in difficult cases he dare not give). They cry up the Church, and when we would have them stand to the Church, they shamefully turn their backs; and when two or three parts of the Churches through the world are against the Papal Soveraignty, they refuse them as Hereticks or Schismatics. They cry up Tradition, and when we offer them in the main point to be tried by it, they disclaim the Tradition of two or three parts of the universal Church as being all Hereticks. And may not any Sect do so too as honestly as they? yea among the ignorant that know not Chaffe from Corn, they have some of them the faces to per-
Swade them that their Church is the greater half of the Christian world! when they know they speak notoriously falsly, or else they are unworthy to speak of such things that they understand not.

But to what purpose should any words be used with men, that have taught so great a part of the world, not to believe their eyes and other senses! Can any writing make any matter plainer to you, then that Bread is Bread, and Wine is Wine, when you see them, and taste, and eat, and drink them? And yet their general Councils approved by the Pope, have made it an Article of their faith, that the whole substance of the Bread and Wine is turned into the Body and Blood of Christ, so that there is left no Bread or Wine, but only that colour, quantity and taste that before belonged to it. And if you know not Bread when you eat it, or Wine when you drink it, and when the senses of all the sound men in the world concur with yours, is it not vain for me, or any man to dispute with you? Can you have any thing brought to a surer judgement then to all your senses? And yet no doubt but your seducers can say something to prove that Bread is not Bread when you see and eat it: No wonder then
then if they can confufe me. But do they indeed believe themselves? how is it possible? there is no exercise of reason, and belief that supposeth not the certainty of sense. If I cannot know Bread and Wine when I see, touch, taft them; then cannot I know the Pope, the Councils, the Scripture, the Priest, or any thing else. If you think to let go this point of Popery and hold the rest, you know not what Popery is: for a Pope and Council having determined it, you are damned by them for denying the faith: and if you depart from the infallibility of their Rule and judge in points of faith, or at least from the obligation of it, in one thing, they will confefs to you that you may as well do it in more; False in this, and certain in nothing, is their own conclusion. Sir, I have not been unwilling to know the truth, having a soul to save or lose as well as you, and having as much reason to be loth to perish. If you have so far forfeited the Grace of God, as meerly to follow the pride of a pretended Vice-Christ (that hath turned doctrine into error, worship into superstition and dead formality, light into darkness, discipline into confusion mixt with tyranny); if meerly to set up one Tyrant over the con-

sciences-
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Sciences (and bodies too) of all believers in the world, you can fall into a Sect, deny Scripture, Reason, the Judgement and Tradition of most of the Church, and your own and all mens eye-sight, taste and other senses, the Lord have mercy on you, if you be not past it: I have done with you, yet remaining

An unfeigned desirer of your Welfare, and lamentor of the Apostacies and giddiness of these times.


Did you know what it is, by loose and false allegations, to be put to read so many Volumes (in great part) in folio, to try whether the alleager say true or false, you would not expect that I should return an answer, and read so much of so many folios in any less than ten or eleven days, which I think hath been all that I have had to write and read so much.
The Reader must take notice that I wrote the former Letter to the person that sent Mr. Johnsons Letters, with a charitable jealousy, that if he were himself in doubt, he might be resolved: But in his return he fully disclaimed Popery, and assured me, that it is for the sake of some friends that he desired my labour, and not for his own.

R. B.
The Reply to Mr. Johnson's
second Paper.

Sir,

The multitude and urgency of my employments gave me not leave till this day (May 2.) so much as to read over all your Papers; But I shall be as loth to break off our Disputation, as you can be, though perhaps necessity may sometime cause some weeks delay. And again, I profess, my indignation against the Hypocritical Jugling of this age, doth provoke me to welcome so ingenuous and candid a disputant as your self, with great content. But I must confess also, that I was the less hasty in sending you this Reply, because I desired you might have leisure to peruse a Book which I published since your last, (A Key for Catholikes;) seeing that I have there answered you already, and that more largely then I am like to do in this Reply.

For
For the sharpness of that I must crave your patience; the persons and cause I thought required it.

Ad 1°. What explications were made to your Friend of your Thesis, I could not take notice of, who had nothing but your writing to Answer.

2. If you will not be precise in Arguing, you had little reason to expect (much less strictly to exact) a precise Answer; which cannot be made as you prescribed, to an Argument not precise.

3. I therefore expect accordingly that the unlearned be not made the Judges of a dispute which they are not fit to judge of; seeing you desire us to avoid their road.

4. Again I say, if you will not be precise in arguing, I can hardly be so in answering. And by [a Congregation of Christians] you may mean [Christians politically related to one Head,] whether Christ, or the Pope: But the word [Assemblies] expresseth their actual Assembling together, and so excludeth all Christians that are or were Members of no particular assemblies, from having Relation as Members to Christ (our Head) or the Pope (your Head,) and so from being of the Congregation, as
5. I had great reason to avoid the snare of an equivocation, or ambiguity, of which you gave me cause of jealousy by your whatsoever] as I told you: as seeming to intimate a false supposition: To your Like, I answer, it is unlike, and still more intimates the false supposition. [Whatsoever Congregation of men is the Common-wealth of England] is a phrase that importeth that [There is a Congregation of men which is not the Common-wealth of England.] Which is true, there being more men in the world. So whatsoever Congregation of Christians is now the true Church] doth seem to import, that you suppose [there is a Congregation of Christians (univocally so called) that are not the true Church] which you would distinguish from the other: Which I only let you know at the entrance, that I deny, that you may not think it granted.

Yet I must tell you that nothing is more ordinary then for the Body to be said to do that which a part of it only doth; As that [the Church administreth Sacraments, Discipline, Tithes, &c. the Church is assembled in such a Council &c.] when yet it is but
but a small part of the Church that doth these things. And when Bellarmine, Grot-fer, &c. say [the Church is the infallible judge of Controversies of faith,] they mean not [the whole Church] which containeth every Christian, when they tell you that It is the Pope they mean. and therefore I had reason to enquire into your sense, unless I would willfully be over-reach't.

You now satisifie me that you mean it universally, viz. [All that Congregation (or Church) of Christians which is now the true Church of Christ, doth acknowledge, &c.] which I told you I deny.

6. To my following distinction you say [that all the world knows that whatsoever is acknowledged to have been ever in the Church by Christ's institution, cannot be meant of any accidental thing, but of a necessary unchangeable and essential thing, in Christ's true Church,] To which I Reply, Either you see the gross fallacy of this defence, or you do not: If you do not, then never more call for an exact Disputant, nor look to be delivered from your errors by argumentation, though never so convincing. If you do, then you are not faithfull to the truth. In your Major proposition the words being many (as you say, you penetrated divers arguments
arguments together,) ambiguities were the easier hidden in the heap. That which I told you is Accidental to the Church (and that but to a corrupted part) was [the Acknowledging of the Papacy as of Christ's Institution, ] and therefore if it were granted that a thing [of Christ's Institution] could not be Accidental, yet [the Acknowledgment] that is, the Opinion or asserting of it may. If the Church by mistake should think that to be Essential to it which is not, though it will not thence follow that its Essence is but an Accident, yet it will follow that both the false opinion, and the thing itself so falsely conceited to be essential, are but accidents, or not essential. You say [It cannot be meant of any Accidental thing] But 1. That Meaning itself of theirs may be an Accident. 2. And the question is not what they [Mean, that is, Imagine or affirm] it to be; But what it is in deed and truth. That may be an Accident, which they think to be none. 2. But that which you say [all the world knows] is a thing that [all the world of Christians except your selves,] that ever heard of, do know, or acknowledge to be false. What! doth all the world know that Christ hath instituted in his Church nothing
nothing but what is essential to it? I should hope that few in the Christian world would be so ignorant as ever to have such a thought, if they had the means of knowledge that Protestants would have them have. There is no natural body but hath natural Accidents as well as Essence: Nor is there any other society under heaven (Community or Policy) that hath not its Accidents as well as Essence: And yet hath Christ instituted, a Church that hath nothing but Essence without Accidents? Do you build upon such foundations? What! upon the denial of common principles and sense? But if you did, you should not have feigned all the world to do so too. Were your assertion true, then every soul were cut off from the Church, and so from salvation, that wanted any thing of Christ's Institution, yea for a moment. And then what would become of you. You give me an instance in \[the Eucharist\] But 1. Will it follow that if the Eucharist be not Accidental or integral, but Essential, that therefore every thing Instituted by Christ is Essential? Surely no? 2. The Question being not whether the Being of the Eucharist in the Church be Essential to the Universal Church: But whether
whether the Belief or Acknowledgment of it by All and every one of the members, be Essential to the Members? I would crave your answer but to this Question (though it be nothing to my cause.) Was not a Baptized person in the primitive and ancient Churches a true Church-member, presently upon Baptism? And then tell me also, Did not the ancient Fathers and Churches unanimously hide from their Catechumens, even purposely hide, the mystery of the Eucharist, as proper to the Church to understand? and never opened it to the auditors, till they were Baptized? This is most undeniable in the concurrent vote of the ancients. I think therefore that it follows that in the Judgement of the ancient Churches the Eucharist was but of the Integrity, and not, the Essence of a member of the Church; and the acknowledgement of it by all the members, a thing that never was existent.

Where you say, your Major should have been granted or denied without these distinctions: I Reply, 1. If you mean fairly, and not to abuse the truth by Confusion, such distinctions as you your self call, Learned and substantial, can do you no wrong. They do but secure our true understanding.
of one another: And a few lines in the beginning by way of distinction are not vain, that may prevent much vain altercation afterwards. When I once understand you, I have done: And I beseech you, take it not for an injury to be understood.

As to your conclusion, that you used no fallacy ex Accidente, and that my instances are not apposite; I Reply, that's the very life of the Controversie between us; And our main Question is not so to be begged. On the grounds I have shewed you, I still aver, that [the holding of the Papacy is accidental to the universal Church, as a Cancer in the breast is to a woman;] And though you say, It is Essential, and of Christ's Institution, that maketh it neither Essential, nor of Christ's Institution; nor doth it make all his institutions to be essentials.

Now of your second Syllogism. 1. I shall never question the successive Visibility of the Church.

Whereas I told you out of your Franciscan Schoolmen agree not to that which you say [All Christians agree to,] you make no reply to it.

As to your Minor, I have given you the Reasons
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sons of the necessity and harmless ness of my distinctions: we need say no more to that [a Congregation of Christians] and [a Church] are Synonimia: But the word [true] was not added to your first term by you or me; and therefore your instance here is delusory. But to say [whatsoever Congregation of Christians, is now the true Church] is all one as to say whatsoever Church of Christians is now the true Church.] When I know your meaning I have my end.

Though my syllogism say not that [the Church of Rome acknowledgeth those things alwaies done, and that by Christ's institution] it nevertheless explicateth the weakness of yours, as to the fallacy accidentis: For 1. The holding it alwaies done, and that of Christ's Institution, may be either an Accident, or out of the Integrity, and ad bene esse, yea possibly an error. 2. And I might as easily have given you Instances of that kind.

To your 3. Syllogism I Reply. 1. When you say the Church [had Pastors] as you must speak of what existed, (and Universals exist not of themselves) so it is necessary that I tell you, How far I grant your Minor, and how far I deny it.

My argument from the Indians and others, is not solved by you. For 1. You can
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can never prove that the Pope was preached to the Iberians by the Captive maid, nor to the Indians by Frumentius. 2. Thousands were made Christians and baptized by the Apostles, without any preaching or profession of a papacy, Act. 2. & passim. 3. The Indians now Converted in America by the English and Dutch, hear nothing of the Pope, nor thousands in Ethiopia. 4. Your own do or may baptize many without their owning the Pope, who yet would be Christians. And a Pastor not known, or believed, or owned, is actually no Pastor to them.

To your confirmation, I Reply: You misread my words: I talk not of [Invisible.] I say it is true that the Universal Church is united to Christ as their universal Head: and is Visible 1. In the members. 2. In the profession. 3. Christ himself is visible in the Heavens, and as much seen of most of the Church as the Pope is, that is, not at all. As the Pope is not Invisible, though one of a million see him not, no more is Christ, who is seen by most of the Church, and by the best part, even by the glorified. You know my meaning: Whether you will Call Christ visible or not, I leave to you. I think he is visible: But that
that which I affirm, is, that the universal Church hath no other visible universal Head or Pastor: But particular Churches have their particular Pastors all under Christ.

Of Eph. 4. I easily grant that the whole Church may be said to have Pastors, in that all the particular Churches have Pastors. But I deny that the whole have any one universal Pastor but Christ. Of that which is the point in controversy, you bring no proof. If you mean no more then I grant, that the whole Church hath Pastors both in that each particular Church hath Pastors, and in that unfixed Pastors are to preach to all as they have opportunity, then your Minor hath no denyall from me.

Instead of prosecuting your Argument, when you had cast the work of an Opponent upon me, you here appeal to any true Logician or expert Lawyer. Content, I admit of your Appeal. But why then did you at all put on the face of an Opponent? could you not without this lost labour at first have called me to prove the successive visibility of our Church? But to your Appeal, Ho all you true Logicians, this Learned man and I refer it to your tribunal, whether
whether it be the part of an Opponent, to con-
trive his Argument so as that the Negative
shall be his, and then change places, and be-
come Respondent, and make his adversary
Opponent at his Pleasure.] We leave this
cause at your bar, and expect your sen-
tence.

But before we come to the Lawyers bar, I
must have leave more plainly to state our
case.

We are all agreed that Christianity is the
ture Religion, and Christ the Churches
Universal Head; and the holy Scriptures the
Word of God. Papists tell us of another
Head and Rule; the Pope and Tradition,
and judgement of the Church. Protest-
ants deny these Additionals, and hold to
Christianity and Scripture only; Our Religi-
on, being nothing but Christianity, we have
no Controversie about: Their Papall Re-
ligion, superadded, is that which is Contro-
verted: They affirm 1. the Right. 2. the
Antiquity of it. We deny both: The
Right we disprove from Scripture, though it
belongs to them to prove it. The Anti-
quity is it that is now to be referred. Pro-
testancy being the Denyall of Popery, it is
we that Really have the Negative, and the
Papists that have the Affirmative. The
Essence
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Essence of our Church (which is Christian) is confessed to have been successively visible: But we deny that theirs as Papal hath been so; and now they tell us, that it is Essential to ours to deny the succession of theirs, and therefore require us to prove a succession of ours, as one that still hath denied theirs: Now we leave our case to the Lawyers, seeing to them you make your appeal, 1. Whether the substance of all our cause lie not in this Question, Whether the Papacy or universal Government by the Pope, be of heaven, or of men? and so whether it hath been from the beginning? which we deny, and therefore are called Protestants; and they affirm, and are therefore called Papists. 2. If they cannot first prove a successive visibility of their Papacy and Papal Church, then what Law can bind us to prove that it was denied, before it did arise in the world, or ever any pleaded for it? 3. And as to the point of Possession, I know not what can be pretended on your side. 1. The Possession of this or that particular Parish Church or Tythes, is not the thing in question; but the universal Headship is the thing: But if it were, yet it is I that am yet here in Possession; and Protestants before me for many ages successively:
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cessively: And when possessed you the Headship of the Ethiopian, Indian, and other extra-imperial Churches? never to this day. No nor of the Eastern Churches, though you had communion with them. 2. If the Question be, who hath Possession of the universal Church; we pretend not to it; but only to be a part, and the soundest safest part. 3. The case of Possession therefore is, whether we have not been longer in Possession of our Religion, which is bare Christianity, then you of your superadded Popery. Our Possession is not denied, of Christianity. Yours of Popery we deny: (and our denial makes us called Protestants): Let therefore the reason of Logicians, Lawyers, or any rational sober man determine the case, whether it do not first and principally belong to you, to prove the visible succession of a Vice-Christ over the universal Church.

As to your contradictory impositions I reply, 1. Your exception was not expressed, and your imposition was peremptory. 2. I told you I would be a Papist if you prove [that the whole visible Church in all ages hath held the Popes universal headship] you say that you [have proved it by this argument, that either he hath that supremacy, or
or some other Church; denying that he hath alwaies had it, hath been alwaies visible, and that Church you require should be named. I Reply, 1. Had not you despaird of making good your cause, you should have gone on by Argumentation, till you had forced me to contradict some common principle. 2. If you should shew these Papers to the world, and tell them that you have no better proof of the succession of your Papacy, then that we prove not that it hath alwaies been denied by the visible Church, you would sure turn thousands from Popery, if there be so many rational considering impartial men that would peruse them, and believe you. For any man may know that it could not be expected that the Churches should deny a Vice-Christ before he was sprung up. Why did not all the precedent Roman Bishops disclaim the title of universal Bishop or Patriarch, till Pelagius and Gregory? but because there was none in the world that gave occasion for it. How should any Heresie be opposed or condemned before it doth arise?

But you fairly yield me somewhat here, and say that you oblige me not to prove a continued visible Church formally and expressly
premly denying it; but that it was of such a constitution as was inconsistent with any such supremacy, or could and did subsist without it.] Reply, I confess your first part is very ingenuous and fair. Remember it hereafter, that you have discharged me from proving [a Church that denied the Papacy formally & expressly.] But as to what you yet demand. 1. I have here given it you, because you shall not say I lie fail you: I have answered your desire. But 2. It is not as a thing necessary, but ex abundanti, as an overplus. For you may now see plainly, that to prove that the Church was without an universal Pastor, (which you require) is to prove the Negative, viz. that then there was none such; whereas its you that must prove that there was such. I prove our Religion: do you prove yours: though I say to pleasure you, I lie disprove it, and have done it in two books already.

My reason from the stress of necessity, which you lay on your Affirmative and Additions, was but subservient to the foregoing Reasons, not first to prove you bound, but to prove you the more bound to the proof of your Affirmative. And therefore your instance of Mahumetans is impertinent. He that faith, you shall be damned if
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if you believe not this or that, is more obliged to prove it, then he that affirmeth a point as of no such moment.

To what I say of an accident and a corrupt part, you say you have answered, and do but say so, having laid nothing to it that is considerable.

Me thinks you that make Christ to be corporally present in every Church in the Eucharist, should not say, that the King of the Church is absent. But when you have proved, 1. That Christ is so absent from his Church, that there's need of a Deputy to essentiate his Kingdom, and 2. That the Pope is so Deputed, you will have done more then is yet done for your cause. And yet let me tell you, that in the absence of a King, it is only the King and Subjects that are essential to the Kingdom. The Deputy is but an officer, and not essential.

Your naked assertion, that whatsoever Government Christ instituted, of his Church, must be essential to his Church, is no proof, nor like the task of an Opponent. The Government of inferior officers is not essential to the universal Church, no more then Judges and Justices to a Kingdom. And yet we must wait long before you will prove
prove that Peter and the Pope of Rome are in Christ's place, as Governor of the universal Church.

Sir, I desire open dealing, as between men that believe these matters are of eternal consequence. I watch not for any advantage against you. Though it be your part to prove the Affirmative which our Negative supposeth; yet I have begun the proof of our Negative; but it was on supposition that you will equally now prove your Affirmative, better then you have here done. I have proved a visible Church successively that held not the Popes universal Government: do you now prove [that the universal Church in all ages did hold the Popes universal Government] which is your part; or I must say again, I shall think you do but run away, and give up your cause as unable to defend it: I have not failed you; do not you fail me.

You complain of a deficiency in quality, though you confess that I abound in number. But where is the defect! you say, I must [assert both that these were one Congregation, and ever visible since Christ's time] Reply, If by [one Congregation] you meant [one assembly met for personal Communion] which
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which is the first sense of the word [Congregation] it were ridiculous to feign the universal Church to be such. If you mean, One as united in one visible humane Head, that's it that we deny, and therefore may not be required to prove. But that these Churches are One as united in Christ the Head, we easily prove; In that from him the whole family is named; the body is Christ's body, 1 Cor. 12. 12, 13. and one in him, Eph. 4. 4, 5, 6, &c. All that are true Christians are one Kingdom or Church of Christ; but these of whom I speak are true Christians; therefore they are one Kingdom or Church of Christ. And that they have been visible since Christ's time till now, all history, even your own affirms: As in Judea, & from the Apostles times, in Ethiopia, Egypt and other parts, (Rome was no Church in the time of Christ's being on earth.) And to what purpose talk you of determinate Congregations? Do you mean individual assemblies? those cease when the persons die; or do you mean assemblies meeting in the same place? so they have not done still at Rome. I told you, and tell you still, that we hold not that God hath secured the perpetual visibility of his Church in any one City or Country; but if it cease in one place,
place, it is still in others. It may cease at Ephesus, at Philippi, Colosse, &c. in Tenduc, Nubia, &c. and yet remain in other parts. I never said that the Church must needs be visible still in one Town or Country. And yet it hath been so de facto, as in Asia, Ethiopia, &c. But you say, I nominate none. Are you serious! must I nominate Christians of these Nations, to prove that there were such? you require not this of the Church Historians. It sufficeth that they tell you, that Ethiopia, Egypt, Armenia, Syria, &c. had Christians, without naming them. When all history tells you that these Countries were Christians, or had Churches, I must tell you [what and who they were]! must you have their names, surnames, and Genealogies? I cannot name you one of a thousand in this small Nation, in the age I live in: How then should I name you the people of Armenia, Abassia, &c. so long ago? You can name but few of the Roman Church in each age: And had they wanted learning and records as much as the Abassins and Indians, and others, you might have been as much to seek for names as they. You ask [were they different Congregations? ] Answer. As united in Christ they were one Church: but as assembling at
at one time, or in one place, or under the same guide, so they were *not one*, but divers Congregations.

That there were any *Papists* of 400 years after Christ, do you prove if you are able.

My conclusion, that *all have been against you for many hundred years*, must stand good, till you prove that *some were for you*: yet I have herewith proved that *there were none*, at least that could deserve the name of the Church.

Do you think to satisfy any reasonable man by calling for positive proof from Authors, of such *Negatives*? yet proof you shall not want, such as the nature of the point requireth, *viz.* That *the said Churches of Ethiopia, India, the outer Armenia, and other extra-imperial Nations, were not under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome*. 1. You find all these Churches, or most of them at this day (that remain) from under your jurisdiction: and you cannot tell us when or how they turned from you. If you could, it had been done. 2. These Nations profess it to be their Tradition, that the Pope was never their Governour. 3. No history or authority of the least regard, is brought by your own writers to prove these Churches under
under your jurisdiction: no not by Baro-

nius himself, that is so copious, and so skil-

ful in making much of nothing. No credi-

ble witnesses mention your Acts of juris-
diction over them, or their Acts of subje-

tion, which Church history must needs

have contained, if it had been true, that they

were your subjects. 4. Their absence from

general Councils, and no invitation of them

thereunto, (that was ever proved, or is

shewed by you) is sufficient evidence.

5. Their Liturgies, even the most ancient,
bear no footsteps of any subjection to you.

Though your forgeries have corrupted

them: as I shall here (digressively) give

one instance of: The Ethiopick Liturgy,
because of a [Hoc est corpus meum] which

we also use, is urged to prove that they are

for the corporal presence, or Transubstan-
tiation: But faith Usher, desucces. Eccles.

In Ethiopicarum Ecclesiarum universali

Canone, descripturn habebatur [Hic panis est

corpus meum]: In Latina translatione contra

sidem Ethiopic. Exemplarium (ut in prima

operis editione confirmat Pontificius ipse

Scholastes) expunctum est nomen [Panis.]

6. Constantines Letters of request to the

King of Persia for the Churches there

(which Euseb. in vit. Constant. mentioneth)
do intimate that then the Roman Bishop ruled not there. 7. Even at home, the Scots and Britains obeyed not the Pope, nor conformed about the Easter observation, even in the daies of Gregory; but resisted his changes, and refused communion with his Ministers. 8. I have already elsewhere given you the testimony of some of your own writers: as Reynerius contra Waldens. Catal. in Biblioth. Patr. Tom. 4. p. 773; saying [The Churches of the Armenians, and Ethiopians, and Indians, and the rest which the Apostles converted, are not under the Church of Rome.] 9. I have proved from the Council of Chalcedon, that it was the Fathers, that is, the Councils that gave Rome its preheminence: But those Councils gave the Pope no preheminence over the extra-imperial Nations: For 1. Those Nations being not called to the Council, could not be bound by it. 2. The Emperours called and enforced the Councils, who had no power out of their Empire. 3. The Diocesses are described and expressly confined within the verge of the Empire; see both the description, and full proof in Blondel de Primatu in Ecclesia. Gall. And 10. The Emperours themselves did sometime (giving power to the Councils Acts) make...
Rome the chief; and sometime (as the Councils did also) give Constantinople equal priviledge; and sometime set Constantinople highest, as I have shewed in my Key, p. 174, 175. But the Emperours had no power to do thus with respect to those without the Empire.

But what say you now to the contrary? Why 1. You ask, [Were those Primitive Christians of another kind of Church order and Government then were those under the Roman Empire?] Answer. When the whole body of Church history satisfieth us that they were not subject to the Pope, which is the thing in question, is it any weakening of such evidence in a matter of such publick fact, to put such a question as this, Whether they were under another kind of Government? 1. We know that they were under Bishops or Pastors of their own: and so far their Government was of the same kind. 2. If any of them, or all, did suit their Church associations to the several Commonwealths in which they lived, and so held National Councils, and for order sake made one among them the Bishop prima sedis, then was that Government of the same kind with that of the Imperial Churches, and not of another kind. The Roman Government was
was no other, but One, thus Ordered, in one Empire: And if there were also One, so ordered, in England, one in Scotland, one in Ethiopia, &c. this was of the same kind with the Roman. Every Church suited to the form of the Common-wealth, is even (as to that humane mode) of the same kind (if a humane mode must be called a Kind.) It may be of that same kind, and mode, without being part of the same Individual.

But 2. You say that [How far from truth this is, appeareth from St. Leo in his Sermons de Natali suo, where he sayes,[Sedes Roma Petri; quicquid non possidet armis, Religione tenet.] Reply, If you take your Religion on trust, as you do your authorities that are made your ground of it, and bring others to it when you are deceived your selves, how will you look Christ in the the face when you must answer for such temerity? Leo hath no Sermons de Natali suo, but only one Sermon affixed to his Sermons, lately found in an old book of Nicol. Fabers. And in that Sermon there is no such words as you here alledge. Neither doth he Poetize in his Sermons, nor there hath any such words which might occasion your mistake: and therefore
doubtless you believed some body for, this
that told you an untruth; and yet ven-
tured to make it the ground of charging my
words with untruth. Yet let me tell you,
that I will take Pope Leo for no competent
judge or witness, though you call him a
Saint: as long as we know what past be-
tween him and the Council of Chalcedon,
and that he was one of the first tumified
Bishops of Rome, he shall not be judge in his
own cause.

3. But you add that [The Abassines of
Ethiopia were under the Patriarch of Alex-
andria anciently, and he under the authority
of the Roman Bishop.] Reply. I. Your bare
word without proof shall not perswade
us that the Abassines were under the Patri-
arch of Alexandria for above three hun-
dred, if not four hundred years after Christ.
Prove it, and then your words are regard-
able. 2. At the Council of Nice the con-
trary is manifest by the sixth Can. [Mos
antiquus perdurat in Aegypto, vel Lybia &
Pentapolis, ut Alexandrinus Episcopus horum
omnia habeat potestatem, &c.] And the
common descriptions of the Alexandrian
Patriarchate in those times confine it to the
Empire, and leave out Ethiopia (Pisanus
new inventions we regard not.) 3. I de-
ny that the Patriarch of Alexandria was under the Government of the Bishop of Rome, any more then the Jury are under the Foremen, or the junior Justices on the bench are under the senior, or York is under London, or the other Earls of England are under the Earl of Arundel. 4. But if both these were proved, that Ethiopia was under Alexandria, and Alexandria under Rome, I deny the consequence, that Ethiopia was under Rome: for Alexandria was under Rome but secundum quid, and so far as it was within the Empire, and therefore those without the Empire that were under Alexandria, were not therefore under Rome. 5. And if it could (as it never can) be proved of Abassia, what is that to all the other Churches in India, Persia, and the rest of the world? Sir, If you have impartially read the ancient Church history, and yet can believe that all these Churches were then under the Pope, despair not of bringing your self to believe anything imaginable that you would have to be true.

3. Your next question is [When the Roman Emperours were yet Heathens, had not the Bishops of Rome the supremacy over all other Bishops through the whole Church?] Answ. No: they had not; nor in the Empire
Empire neither. Prove it, I beseech you, better then by questioning. If you askt, Whether men rule not Angels? your Question proves not the Affirmative.

4. But you ask again [Did those Heathen Emperours give it him?] Answ. 1. Power over all Churches none ever gave him, till titularly his own Parasites of late. 2. Primacy of meer degree in the Empire, for the dignity and many advantages of the Imperial seat, the Bishops of the Empire gave him by consent (Blondel de primatu, gives you the proof and reason at large:) yet so as that [small regard was had to the Church of Rome before the Nicene Council] as faith your Aneas Sylvius, Pope Pius the Second.

5. [Whether the Bishop of Rome had power over the Bishop of Arles by Heathen Emperours,] is a frivolous question. Arles was in the Roman Patriarchate, and not out of the Empire. The Churches in the Empire, might by consent dispose themselves into the Patriarchal orders, without the Emperours, and yet not meddle out of the Empire. Yet indeed Cyprians words intimate no power Rome had over Arles, more then Arles had over Rome: that is, to reject communion with each other upon dissent.
dissent. Nay it more confuteth you, that even under Heathen Emperours, when Church associations were by voluntary consent of Pastors only; and so if they had thought it necessary, they might have extended them to other Principalities: yet de facto they did not do it, as all history of the Church declareth, mentioning their Councils and associations, without these taken in.

See now how little your objections are worth; and how groundlesly you bid me [See now how little my allegations are to the purpose.]

As for the rabble of Hereticks which you reckon up, (as you esteem them,) some of them are no Christians univocally so called, and those cannot be of the Christian Church. Others of them were better Christians than the Romanists, and so were of the same Church with us: And it is not many reproachfull names put on them by malice that makes them no Christians, or of many Churches or Religions. If an arrogant usurper will put nick-names on all that will not bow to him as the Vice-Christ, and call them Iconoclasts, Berengarians, Waldensians, Albigenses, Wickliffists, Huf- fites, Lutherans, Calvinists (you may as well give
give them a thousand more names) this makes them not of various Religions, nor blots out their names from the book of life. I have in my most retired thoughts perused the History of those mens lives, and of the lives of many of your Popes, together with their several doctrines; and with death and judgement in my eyes, as before the great God of Heaven, I humbly beg of him, that I may rather have my everlasting portion with those holy men whom you burned, as Waldenses, Albigenses, Hussites, &c. then with the Popes that burned them, or those that follow them in that cruelty, unless reconciling grace have given them repentance unto life. The Religion of all these men was one, and they were all of one universal Church.

Where you again call for One Congregatation, I tell you again that we know no Unity essentiall, from whence the Church can be called one, but either Christ or the Vice-Christ: the former only is asserted by us, and the latter also by you, which we deny: And therefore we cannot call the universal Church One, in any other formal respects, but as it is Christian, and so One in Christ. Yet have I herewith satisfied your demand, but shewed you the unreasonableness of it.
You next enquire whether we account Rome and us One Congregation of Christians? I answer, the Roman Church hath two Heads, and ours but one, and that's the difference. They are Christians, and so One Church as united in Christ, with us and all other true Christians. If any so hold their Papacy and other errors as effectively and practically to destroy their Christianity, those are not Christians, and so not of the same Church as we. But those that do not so, but are so Papists, as yet to be truly and practically Christians, are and shall be of the same Church with us, whether they will or not: And your modest style makes me hope that you and I are of one Church, though you never so much renounce it. As Papall, we are not of your Church; that's a new Church form; But as Christian, we are and will be of it, even when you are condemning, torturing and burning us (if such persecution can stand with your Christianity.)

But you ask [Why did you then separate your selves, and remain still separate from the Communion of the Roman Church.] Answ. I. We never separated from you as
you are Christians; We still remain of the Church as Christian, and we know (or will know) no other form; because the Scripture and primitive Churches knew no other. Either you have by Popery separated from the Church as Christian, or not; If you have, its you that are the (damnable) Separatists. If you have not, then we are not separated from you, in respect of the form of the Christian Church. And for your other form (the Papacy) 1. Neither I nor my Grand-father, or great grand-father did separate from it: because they never entertained it. 2. Those that did so, did but Repent of their sin, and that's no sin. We still remain separated from you as Papists even as we are separate from such as we are commanded to avoid, for impenitency in some corrupting doctrine or scandalous sin; Whether such mens sins or their profession Christianity be most predominant at the heart, we know not: but till they shew Repentance we must avoid them; yet admonishing them as brethren, and not taking them as men of another Church, but as finding them unfit for our Communion.

But O sir, what manner of dealing have we from you! must we be imprisoned rackt.
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ackt, hang’d or burn’d, if we will not believe that bread & wine, are not bread and wine, contrary to our own and all men’s senses; and if we will not worship them with Divine worship, and will not obey the Pope of Rome in all such matters contrary to our consciences: and then must we be chidden or separating from you, if we can but a while escape the strappado and the flames? What! will you blame us for not believing that all men’s senses are deceived, and the greater part of Christians and their Traditions (against you) are false, when we read, and study, and suspect our selves, and pray for light, and are willing to hear any of our reasons, but cannot force our own understandings to believe all such things that you believe, and meerly because the Pope commands it: and when we cannot thus force our own understandings, must we be burn’d, or else called Separatists? would you have the Communion of our Ashes, or say, We forsake your Communion? In our Churches we cannot have leave to me, without lying against God and our consciences, and saying, We believe what our senses contradict; and without committing that which our consciences tell us are most grievous sins. We solemnly protest that we
we would do as you do, and say as you say, were it not for the love of truth and honesty, and for fear of the wrath of God, and the flames of hell; but we cannot, we do not rush upon these errors, and sell our souls to please the Pope. And must then either be murdered, or taken for charitable? Will you say to so many poor souls, that are ready to enter into another world [Either sin against your conscience, and so damn your souls, or else let us burn a murder you, or else you do not love us; you are uncharitable if you deny us leave to follow you, and you separate from the Communion of the Church.] We appeal from the Pope and all unreasonable men, to the great God of heaven and earth, to judge righteously between you and us concerning our dealing.

As for possessing our selves of your Bishopricks and Cures, if any particular person had personal injury in the change being cast out without cause, they must answer for it that did it, and not I; though I never heard any thing to make me believe it. But must the Prince and people alone delinquent Pastors for fear of being blamed for taking their Bishopricks? Ministers of the same Religion with us, may
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not out for their crimes: Princes have power over Pastors as well as David, Solomon, and other Kings of Israel had. *Gnilarklay* and some few of your own knew this. The Popes treasonable exemption of the Clergy from their Soveraigns' judgment, will not warrant those Princes before God, that neglect to punish offending Pastors. And I beseech you tell us, when our consciences (after the use of all means that we can use to be informed) cannot reconcile all our fences, nor our reason, nor the judgement of the most of the Church, of antiquity, or the Word of God, and yet we must do so, or be no members of our Church, what wrong is it to you if we choose us Pastors of our own, in the order that God hath appointed? Had not the people in all former ages the choice of their Pastors? we and our late forefathers here were never under your oversight: but we know not why we may not now choose our Pastors as well as formerly. We do it not by tumults: we kill not men, and shed not in their blood, while we choose our Pastors, as Pope *Damiasus* was chosen. The tythes and other temporal maintenance we take from none, but the Magistrate disposeth of it as he seeth meet for the Churches.
Churches good. And the maintenance is for the cure or work: and therefore, they that are justly called out of the cure, are justly deprived of the maintenance. And surely when they are dead, none of you can with any shew of reason, stand up and say, These Bishopricks are yours: or these Parsonages yours. It is the Incumbent personally that only can claim title; saving the supereminent title of Christ, to whom they are devoted. But the successive Popes cannot have title to all the tithes and Temples in the world; nor any of his Clergy that never were called to the charges. If this be disunion, it is you that are the Separatists and cause of all. If you will needs tell all the Christian world, that except they will be ruled by the Pope of Rome, and be burned if they believe not as he bids them in despite of all their senses, he will call them Separatists, Schismatics, and say they are disunite and are uncharitable: again, we appeal to God and all wise men that are impartial, whether it be he or we that is the divider?

You ask me [Is not charity, subordination, and obedience to the same state and Government, required as well to make one Congregation of Christians, as it is required to make a Cong-
Congregation of Commonwealths men?

Answer. Yes, it is: But as all the world is one Kingdom under God the universal King, but yet hath no universal Vice-King, but every Commonwealth only hath its own Soveraign, even so all the Christian world is one Church under Christ the universal King of the Church, but hath not one Vice-Christ, but every Church hath its own Pastors, as every School hath its own Schoolmaster. But all the anger is because we are loth to be ruled by a cruel usurper therefore we are uncharitable.

Your next reason against me, is, because [They cannot be parts of the Catholike Church, unless Arrians, and Pelagians, and Donatists be parts] and so Hereticks and Schismaticks be parts.] Reply 1. You know sure, that your own Divines are not agreed whether Hereticks and Schismaticks are parts of the Church. And if they were, yet it is not de fide with you, as not determined by the Pope. If it be, then all yours are Hereticks that are for the affirmative [Bellarmine nameth you some of them.) If it be not, then how can you be sure its true; and so impose it on me, that they are no parts.

2. Arrians are no Christians, as denying that
that which is essential to Christ, and so to Christianity. Pelagianism is a thing that you are not agreed among your selves of the true nature of. Many of the Dominicans and Jansenists think the Jesuits Pelagianize, or Semipelagianize at least. I hope you will not shut them out. Donatists were Schismaticks, because they divided in the Catholiche Church, and not absolutely from it; and because they divided from the particular Churches about them that held the most universal external Communion. I think they were still members of the universal Church: but I'll not contend with any that will plead for his uncharitable denial. Its nothing to our case.

That the Æthiopians are Eutychian Hereticks, I will see better proved before I will believe it. Rosjes words I so little regard, that I will not so much as open his book to see whether he say so or not. I know that Herefie is a personal crime, and cannot be charged on Nations, unless you have evidence that the Nations consent to it: which here you have none: Some are called Hereticks for denying points essential to Christianity: these are no Christians, and so not in the Church: but many also are called Hereticks by you, and by the Fathers, for
or lesser errors consistent with Christianity: and these may be in the Church. the Abassines, and all the rest have not been yet tried, and convicted before any competent Judge: and slanderers we regard not.

2. Many of your own writers acquit them of Heresie, and say, the difference is now found to be but in words, or little more.

To what you say of their disclaiming us, less we take the Patriarch of Constantinople for the Vice-Christ; you many ways stake. 1. If this were true, that they rejected us, it were no proof that we are of one universal Church. 2. They not claim to be Vice Christi, the universal Governours of the Church: the title of universal Patriarch they extended but to the then Roman Empire; and that not to universal Government, but Primacy. And any of them have been of brotherly charity to our Churches of late. (Cyril I need it name to you, whom your party professed Murdered for being a Protestant.) Blectius (first Patriarch of Alexandria and of Constantinople) was highly offended with the fiction of a submission of the Alexandrian Church to Rome, (under a counterfeit
counterfeit Patriarch-Gabriel's name); and wrote thus of the Pope in his Letters Sigismund King of Poland An. 1600. [Per-
spiceret Majestas tua, nos cum majoribus nostris, non ignorare (quem precaris ut a noscamus) Pontificem scilicet Romanum veluti & Constantinopolitanum Pontificem Pontificem Constant. Ceterosque Apostolicarum sedium Pontifices. Qui non un omnium, sed inter omnes & ipsos unus.

Unum universale Caput, quod sit D. I Jesus Christus; alius esse non possit, ne biceps aliquid sit corpus, aut potius monstrum corporis. Perspiceres, Rex serenissime, (interim de Concilio illo Florentino, veluti re silentio digna taceam) non Nos, ut Patri tum Orientalium, tum Occidentalium dogmas tibus traditionibusque que per septem universalia concilia nobis consignarunt atque observarunt, egressos: Illos egressos, qui novitatem tibus in dies delectantur.] In the same Letters he commendeth Cyril. And what can a Protestant say more against the Vice Christship, and your novelties?

And for Jeremias his predecessor, whom you mention, though they that dispute with him by Letters (Stephanus Gerlochius & Martinus Crusius) did not agree in a things with him, yet he still professed hi
Fire of unity and concord with us, and
the beginning of his second answer reduceth, that we agreed with them in so
many things. And John. Zygomalus in his
Letters to Crusius 1576. May 15. faith,
persepicuum tibi & omnibus futurum est,
pd in continuis, & causam fidei praeced
Lintentibus articus, consentiamus: que
tem videntur consensum inter vos & nos
vedire, talia sunt, si velit quis, ut facile ea
frigere possit. —— Gaudium in calo &
er terram erit, si cohib in unitatem
raque Ecclesia, & idem sentiems, & fi-
ul vivemus in omni concordia & pace secun-
Deum & in sincera charitatis vinculo.]  
But as it is not the Patriarch that is the
pole Greek Church, so it is not their
errors in some lesser or tolerable points
rat prove us of two Churches or Religions.
Whereas you say, It is against all Anti-
qity and Christianity to admit condemned
heretics into the Church. I Reply,
I hate their condemnation, rather then
verence it, that (even being non judices)
are condemn whole Nations without
haring one man of them speak for himself,
hearing one witness that ever heard
tem defend Heresie; and this meerly be-
Kuse some few Bishops have in the daies
of
of old maintained Heresie, and perhaps some may do so still, or rather differ from you in words, while you misunderstand each other. Did I find such errors with them as with you, yet I durst charge them on no one man that I had not reason to hold guilty of them: I dare not accuse whole Nations of your errors. But of all these things (and of Sandys words which you cite) I have spoken already in two Books, and in the latter fully proved that you differ in many points of faith, and greater things then you call Heresies in others among your selves, even your Popes, Saints, and Councils, and yet neither part is judged by you to be out of the Church. See my Key, p. 124, 125, 127, 128, 129. p. 52. ad 62.

When you say so much to prove the Greeks guilty of manifest Heresie, and pretend that it is but some novel writers of ours that deny it, as forced by your arguments, I must say, that you prove but your own uncharitableness instead of their Heresie, and you shew your self a stranger to your own writers, who frequently excuse th Greeks from Heresie, and say the difference at the Council of Florence was found to be more about words then faith. Thomas.
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Jesus de Convers. omn. gentium, lib. 6. cap. 8. 281. faith, [His tamen non obstantibus illi opinantur Gracos tantum esse schismaticos: Ita ex junioribus docet Pater Azorius et prima Institut. Moral. lib. 8. cap. 20. p. 10. Qquaremerito ab Ecclesia Catholica non haeretici, sed schismatici consentur & appellantur: Ita aperte insinuat D. Bernardino (no Novel Protestant) in Epist. ad Eugenium, lib. 3. [Ego addo (inquit) de pertinacia Gracorum qui nobiscum sunt, & non sunt: juncti fide, pace divisi; quanquam & in fide ipsa claudicaverint a rectis semitis.]

Idem aperte tenet D. Thomas Opuscul. 2. ubi docet patres Gracos in Catholico sensu esse exponendos. Ratio hujus Opinionis est quoniam ut predictus author docet, in predictis fidei articulis, de quibus Graci accusantur ab aliquibus ut haeretici, potius Nomine, quam Re ab Ecclesia Romana dissident. Inprimis insipientur illi Spiritum Sanctum a Patre Filioque procedere ut in Bulla Unionis Eugenii 4. dicitur, existimantes Latinos sentire a Patre Filioque procedere tamquam a duobus principiis, cum tamen Latina doceat Ecclesia procedere a duabus personis tamquam ab uno principio & spiratore; quare Graci ut unanim principium significent, dicunt Spiritum Sanctum a Patre per Filium procedere ab omni aternitate.]

14 Your
Your Paulus Veridicus (Paul Harris Dean of your Academy lately in Dublin) in his Confutation of Bishop Ushers Sermon, faith that the Greeks Doctrine about the Procession of the Holy Ghost à Patre per Filium, and not à Patre Filioque, was such that [When they had explicated it, they were found to believe very Orthodoxly and Catholically in the same matter, and for such were admitted] and that [He findeth not any substantial point that they differ from you in, but the Primacy] (So the Armenians were received in the same Council of Florence.) Many more I have read of your own writers that all vindicate the Greeks (and others that disown you) from Heresie, I think more then I have read of Protestants that do it. And do you think now that it is not a disgrace to your cause, that a man of your learning, and one that I hear hath the confidence to draw others to your opinions, should yet be so unacquainted with the opinions of your own Divines, and upon this mistake so confidently feign that it is our Novel writers forced to it by your arguments that have been so charitable to these Churches against antiquity that knew better? If the Greeks and Latins tear the Church of Christ by their Condemna-
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As of each other, they may both be schismatical, as guilty of making divisions in the arch, though not as dividing from the arch. And if they pretend the denial of the Christian faith against each other as a cause, you shall not draw us into the lift of the uncharitablenes, by telling us they know better than we. If wise men out and fight, I will not justify either, because they are wise and therefore better than I to know the cause. But what led we more to open your strange mistake of unjust dealing, then the authority of our so much approved Council of Florence, at received both Greeks and Armenians; and the very words of the Popes Bull of the union, which declare that the Greeks and Latins were found to mean Orthodoxly both? the words are these: [Convenientes notini & Graci in bac sacrosancta Oecumenas] a synodo magnostudio invicem usi sunt, ut alia articulus etiam ille de Divina SPIRITUS SANCTI processione summa cum diligentia & affidua inquisitione discuteretur. Pro-lis vero testimoniiis ex Divinis Scripturis, primaque authoritatibus sanctorum doctorum orientalium & occidentalium, aliquibus eadem ex Patre & Filio, quibusdam vero ex Patre per Filium procedere dicentibus Spiritu Sanctum,
Sanctum, & ad eandem intelligentiam aspicientibus omnibus sub diversis vocabulis: Grauidem asseruerunt quod id quod dicit Spiritum Sanctum ex Patre procedere, non bmente proferrent ut excludant Filii, sed quies videbatur, ut aient, Latinos assererent Spiritum Sanctum ex Patre Filioque procedere, tanquam ex duobus principiis & duabus Spiritationibus, ideo absinuerunt a dicendo quod Spiritus Sanctus ex Patre procedat & Filii Latini vero afferuaverunt non se hac mens dicere Spiritum Sanctum ex Filioque procedere ut excludant Patrem, quin sit fons principiorum totius Deitatis, Filii scilicet, Spiritus Sancti, aut quod id quod Spiritus Sanctus procedat ex Filio, Filius a Patre non habeat, sive quod duo ponant esse principium seu duas spirationes, sed ut unus tantum afferunt esse principium, unicumque spirationem Spiritus Sancti, prout haec consensua afferuerunt; & cum ex his omnibus unus & id eliciatur veritatis sensus, tandem, &c.—"

I pray you now, if it is true, that it is true, that some Novel writers of ours, prest by force of argument, that have been the authors of the extenuation. My heart even trembleth to think that there should be a thing calle Religion among you, that can so far extinguish both Charity and Humanity, as t
because you to pass so direful a doom (without authority or tryal) on so great a part of the Christian world, for such a word as this, about so exceeding high a mysterie, when your Pope and Council have pronounced a union of meanings!

And what mean you in your Margin to refer me to Nilus, as if he asserted [That the Greeks left the Communion of the Roman Church upon that difference alone.] Verily Sir, in the high matters of God, this dealing is scarce fair! (pardon this plainness: consider of it your self.) The substance of Nilus book is about the Primacy of the Pope: The very contents prefixed to the first book are these [Oratio demonstrans non aliam, &c. An Oration demonstrating that there is no other cause of the dissension between the Latin and Greek Churches, than that the Pope refuseth to defer the cognisance and judgement of that which is controverted to a general Council: but he will sit the sole Master and Judge of the Controversie; and will have the rest as Disciples to be hearers of (or obey) his word, which is a thing alien from the Laws and actions of the Apostles and Fathers.]

And he begins his Book (after a few words) thus, [Causa itaque hujus dissidii, &c. The
The cause therefore of this difference, as I judge, is not the sublimity of the point exceeding man's capacity: For other matters that have divers times troubled the Church, have been of the same kind: This therefore is not the cause of the dissension; much less is it the speech of the Scripture itself, which, as being concise, doth pronounce nothing openly of that which is controverted. For to accuse the Scripture, is as much as to accuse God himself. But God is without all fault. But who the fault is in, anyone may easily tell, that is well in his wits.] He next shews, that it is not for want of learned men on both sides, nor is it because the Greeks do claim the Primacy, and then concludes it as before. He maintaineth that your Pope succeedeth Peter only as a Bishop ordained by him, as many other Bishops that originally were ordained by him in like manner do succeed him; and that his Primacy is no Governing power, nor given him by Peter, but by Princes and Councils for order sake: and this he proves at large, and makes this the main difference. Bellarmines answering his so many Arguments might have told you this, if you had never read Nilus himself. If you say that, This point was the first cause, I deny it; but if it were true, yet was it not the only or chief
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chief cause afterward. The Manner of bringing in the [filique] by Papal authority without a general Council, was it that greatly offended the Greeks from the beginning.

But you say that when I have made the best of these Greeks, Armenians, Ethiopians, Protestants, I cannot deduce them successively in all ages till Christ as a different Congregation of Christians from that which holds the Pope's supremacy, which was your proposition. Reply. I have oft told you we own no universal informing Head but Christ. In respect to him I have proved to you, that it is not my interest or design to prove us or them [a different Congregati- from you as you are Christians.] Nor shall you tempt me to be so uncharitable, as to damn, or unchristen all Papists as far as you do others, incomparably safer and better then yourselves. But as you are Papal, and set up a new informing head, I have proved that you differ from all the antient Churches, but yet that my cause requireth he not to make this proof, but to call you to prove your own universal succession.

You add your Reason, because these be-renamed were at first involved in your Congregation, and then fell off as dead branches.

Reply.
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Reply. This is but an untruth in a most publick matter of fact. All the truth is this.

1. Those Indians, Ethiopians, Persians, &c. without the Empire, never fell from you, as to subjection, as never being your subjects. Prove that they were, and you have done a greater wonder than Baronius in all his Annals. 2. The Greeks, and all the rest within the Empire, without the Roman Patriarchate, are fallen from your Communion (if renouncing it be a fall) but not from your subjection, having given you but a Primacy, as Nilus shews, and not a Governing power over them. The withering therefore was in the Roman branches; if the corruptions of either part may be called a withering. You that are the lesser part of the Church may easily call your selves the Tree, and the greater part (two to one) the Branches; but these beggings do but proclaim your necessities.

In good time you come to give me here at last some proof of an ancient Papacy, as you think. But first, you quite forget (or worse) that it is not a man or two in the whole world in an age, but the universal Church.
Church, whose judgement (and form) we are now enquiring after. You are to prove that all the Church in every age was for the Papal universal Government] and that none can be saved that is not.

2. But instead of this which you should prove, you prove not that those very single persons named by you, had any opinion of the Papal Soveraignty.

1. Your first Testimony is from Liberaus, c. 16. [John Bishop of Antioch makes an appeal to Pope Simplicius.] Reply. 1. I see you are deceived by going upon trust: But is pitty so to deceive others. There was no such man as John Bishop of Antioch in Simplicius reign. John of Antioch was he that made the firsts and divisions for Nestorian, against Cyril and called the Schismatical Council at Ephesus, and dyed, Anno 36. having reigned thirteen years, as Baro- nius faith, and eighteen as Nicephorus: He dyed in Sixtus the fifts time. But its laid indeed that John Bishop of Alexandria made some address to Simplicius: of which Baronius citeth Liberatus words (not c. 16. but c. 18.) ad An. D. 483. that John being expelled by the Emperor Zeno’s command, went first to Calendion Bishop of Antioch, and so to Rome to Simplicius, (if Baronius were
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were to be believed; as his judge) Liberatus, faith, that he took from Calendion Bishop of Antioch Letters to Simplicius, to whom he appealed as Athanasius had done, and persuaded him to write for him to Acacius Bishop of Constantinople; which Simplicius did. But Acacius upon the receipt of Simplicius Letters, wrote flatly to him, that he knew no John Bishop of Alexandria, but had taken Petrus Mogus as Bishop of Alexandria into his Communion, and that without Simplicius, for the Churches unity, at the Emperour's command.] Here you see how little regard Acacius made of your Pope: and that the appeal was but to procure his Letters to Acacius, which did him no good. 2. But do you in good earnest think that all such addresses, or appeals are ad superiorem judicem? What more common then to appeal or make such addresses to any that have advantage of interest, for the relief of the oppressed? Young men appeal to the aged in Controversies: and the less learned to the more learned: and the poor to the rich, or to the favorites of such as can relieve them. John's going first to Antioch was no acknowledgement of superiority. 3. But of this I must refer you to a full answer of Blondel against Perron, de Primatu
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in Eccles. cap. 25. sect. 76. where you may be satisfied of the vanity of your instance. Whereas therefore you infer (or you say nothing) that because this John thus appealed to Rome, therefore he appealed thereto the Universal Ruler of the Church. The story derideth your consequence. Much more that therefore the Universal Church held the Pope then to be the Universal Head or Governor. Heres nothing of Government but intrety, and that but within the Empire, and that but upon the seeking of one distressed man that would be apt to go to those of most interest that might relieve him, and all this ejected by Acacius and the Emperour. A

2. Your 2. instance is, that Flavianus appeals to the Pope as to his Judge. Epist. praembul. Concil. Chalced. Reply. I have erused all the Council of Chalcedon, as it in Binnins, purposely to find the words you mention of Flavian's appeal, and I find not any such words. In Flavianus own pistle to Leo there are no such words, nor any other that I can find, but the word appeal] once in one of the Emperours pistles (as I remember) but without mentioning any Judge. I will not use to turn over
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over Volumes thus in vain for your citations, while I see you take them on trust, and do not tell me in any narrow compass of cap. sect. or pag. where to find them. But had you found such words, 1. An appeal is oft made from a partiall to an impartiall Judge, though of equal power. 2. He might appeal to the Bishop of Rome as one of his Judges in the Council where he was to be tried, and not as alone. And it is evident in the History, that it was not the Pope, but the Council that was his Judge. 3. The greatnesse of Rome, and Primacy of Order (not of Jurisdiction) made that Bishop of speciall interest in the Empire: and distressed persecuted men will appeal to those that may any whit relieve them. But this proves no Governing power, nor so much as any Interest without the Empire.

It being the custome of the Churches in the Empire, to make the Votes of the Patriarchs necessary in their general Councils, no wonder if appellations be made from those Councils that wanted the Patriarch consent to other Councils where they consented; in which as they gave Constanti

nople the second place, without any pre
tence of a Divine Right, and frequent ap
d
peals were made to that Seat, so also they gave Rome the first Seat. Of this whole matter Perron is fully answered already by Blondell de primatu, cap. 25. sect. 63. to which I refer you, it being as ease to read it in Print as Writing. Adding this only, that as Flavian (in his necessity) seeking help from the Bishop of the prime Seat in the Empire, did acknowledge no more but his Primacy of Order by the Laws of the Empire and the Councils thereof, so the Empire was not all the world, nor Flavian all the Church, nor any more then one man, and therefore if he had held (as you will never prove he did) the Universal Government of the Pope, if you would thence argue that it was held by all the Church, your consequence must needs be marvelled at, by them that believe that One man is not the Catholick Church, no more then seeking of help was an acknowledging an Universal Headship or Governing power.

And it is undeniably evident, that the Church of Constantinople and all the Greek Churches did believe that Universal Primacy which in the Empire was set up, to be of humane right, and new, and changeable, as I prove not only by the express testimony of the Council of Chalcedon, but by the
stating of the Primacy at last in Gregories dayes on Constantinople it self, whose pre-
tence neither was nor could be any other then a humane late institution. And if the Greek Churches judged so of it in Gregories daies, and at the Council of Chalcedon in Leo's daies, we have no reason to think that they ever judged otherwise; at least not in Flavius daies, that were the same as Leo's, and the businesse done about 449. This Argument I here set against all your instances at once; and it is unanswerable:

3. Your next instance is of Pope Leo's restoring Theodoret, upon an appeal to just judgement ] Reply. 1. Every Bishop hath a power to discern who is fit for his own Communion; and so Leo and the Bishops of the West perceiving Theodoret to be Orthodox, received him as a Catholick into their Communion; and so might the Bishop of Constantinople have done. But when this was done, the Council did not hereupon receive him, and restore him to his Bishoprick, no nor would hear him read the passages between Pope Leo and him, no nor make a Confession of his faith, but cried out against him as a Nestorian, till he had expressly Anathematized Nestorius and Eutiches before the Council, and then they received
received and restored him: so that the final judgement was not by Leo, but by the Council. But if in his distresse he appealed as you say, to a just judgement, from an unjust, or sought to make Leo his friend, no wonder; but this is no grant of an Universal Sovereignty in Leo: and if it had granted it in the Empire, that's nothing to the Churches in other Empires: Or if he had granted it as to all the world, he was but one man of the world, and not the Catholic Church. The Council expressly take on them the determination after Leo, and they flight the Legates of the Pope, and pronounce him a creature of the Fathers, and give Constantiopcle equall privileges, though his Legates refuse to consent. But of the frivolousnesse of this your instance, see Dr. Field of the Church, lib. 5. cap. 35. pag. 537, 538. and more fully Blondell de primatu, ubi sup. cap. 25. sect. 53, 65.

4. Your next instance is of Cyprians desire that Stephen would depose Martian Bishop of Arles. [Reply 1. That Epistle cannot be proved to be Cyprians: for the Reasons I refer you to M. de Lanny on that subject, and Rivets Critica Sacra: only adding that there are eight copies of Cypri-
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an, ancient M. S. S. in the English Universities, that have none of them this Epistle to Stephen (of which see Jerem. Stephens Edition of Cyprian de unitate Ecclesiae) 2. Could you prove this Epistle to be Cyprians, it makes against you more then for you. Not for you: for the distance of Cyprian, the nearness of Stephen might make it a matter more concerning him, and fitter for him to transact: And it was within his Patriarchate, and therefore no wonder if he were minded of it. And yet Cyprian only writes to him to write to the Bishops of France to restrain Martian: [§. 2. Qua-pröpter facere te oportet plenissimas literas ad coepiscopos nostros in Gallia constitutos, ne ultra Martianum pervicacem & superbum, & divine pietatis ac fraterna salutis inimicum, collegio nostro insultare patiantur.] Cyprian did as much to Stephen, as he desired Stephen to do to the Bishops of France: This therefore is against you, if any thing to the purpose: Had you found but such words of a Pope to another Bishop as Cyprian useth to your Pope, you would have taken it as an evidence of his superiority. §. 3. Dirigantur in provinciam et plebem in Are-late coexistantem á te litera, &c. [Let thy Letters be directed to the Province and people at
And its plainly an act of non-Communion common to all Bishops towards those unfit for their Communion, that Cyprian speaks of [§3. Idcirco enim, frater charissime, copiosum corpus est sacerdotum concordiae mutua glutino atque unitatis vinculo copulatum, ut siquis ex collegio nostro haeresin facere, & gregem Christi la- cerare & vastare tentaverit, subveniant cæteri, & quasi pastores utiles & misericordes oves dominicas in gregem coUigant. ] You see it is a common duty of brotherhood, and not an act of jurisdiction that Cyprian speaks of.

5. Your next instance is, that [the Coun- cil of Sardis determined that no Bishop depo- sed by other neighbouring Bishops, pretending to be heard again, was to have any successor appointed till the case were defined by the Pope: Conv. Sard. cap. 4. cited by Athanas. Apol. 2. pag. 753; ] Reply. It seems you are well acquainted with the Council, that know not of what place it was! It was the Council at Sardica, and not at Sardis, that you would mean. Sardis was a City of Lydia, apud 1molum montem, olim Regio Cræsi, intcr Thiatiram & Philadelphiam. But this Sardica was a City of Thrace in the confines of the higher Mysia, intcr Na-
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Issum Myssia & Philippopolim Thracia. As to the instance, 1. This Council was by Augustine rejected as heretically, though I defend not his opinion. 2. It was of so little note and authority, that it was not known to the Council of Carthage to have the next antecedent Canons (which you would not have omitted if you had read them, its like) in which your writers glory as their chiefest strength; and which Bellarmini thinks Pope Zosimus call'd, the Nicene Canon: or rather is it not suspicious that this Canon is but forged, when those Carthage Fathers plainly say, In nullo Patrum concilii decretum invenimus; mentioning that antecedent Canon proposed by Hofsus, to which this mentioned by you proposed by Gaudentius is but an addition or supplement. And it is not like that all these African Fathers could be ignorant of those Canons of Sardica, when such abundance of African Bishops were at the Council, and that but about 50 years before: you may see in Binnius how hard a strait he is put to, to give any tolerable reason of this, and only faith, that its like some how the Canons were lost: sure Tradition was then grown untrusty. Your Cardinal Cusanus de Concord. Cath. l.2.c.25. makes a doubt whether the
Canon of appeals be indeed a Canon of the Council. 3. But grant it be, yet take these observations, and you shall find small case of confidence in that Canon.

1. It was made in a Case of the distress of Athanasius and other Orthodox Oriental Bishops, merely in that strait, to save them and the Churches from the Arrians. The Arrians withdrew from the Council ting the minor part, and excommunicated Plins with Athanasius, and other Occiden-
tals; and the Occidental Bishops excom-
municated the Oriental. Athanasius him-
self was a chief man in the Council, and had before been rescued by the help of Ju-
ius, and therefore no wonder if they de-
filed this safety to their Churches. 2. Note,
that this is a thing newly granted now by this Canon, and not any ancient thing.

Note, that therefore it was of Humane light, and not of Divine. 4. Note, that this Canon was not received or pra-
ticed in the Church, but after this the con-
tary maintained by Councils, and pra-
ticed, as I shall anon prove. 5. That it is
not any antecedent Governing Power that
the Canon acknowledgeth in the Pope; but
in honour of the Memory of S. Peter, as
they say, (yet more for their present security)
138 The Reply to Mr. Johnson's second Paper, they give this much to Rome; it being the vulgar opinion that Peter had been there Bishop. 6. That it is not a Power judging alone that they give, but of causing the re-examination of Causes by the Council, and adding his assistants in the judgment, and so to have the putting of another into the place forborne till it be done. 7. And I hope still you will remember, that at this Council were no Bishops with the Empire, and that the Roman world was narrower then the Christian world, and therefore, if these Bishops in a part of the Empire had now given (not a Ruling Power) to the Pope, so far is there expressed, this had been far from proving that he had a Ruling Power, as Vice-Chrift over all the world, and that Divine right: Blame me not to call on you to prove this consequence. 8. There is much for Appeals to Constantinople, that never claimed a Vice-Chriftship as Jure Divino.

6. Your sixth instance out of Basil's Epistle I imagine you would have suppressed, if ever you had read that Epistle, and had thought that any others would be induced by your words to read it. I have given you out of this and other Epistles.
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eil, a sufficient proof of his enmity to
dery, in my Key, cap. 26. pag. 170, 171,
. and cap. 27. pag. 177. that very Epi-
of Basil was written to the Western
ops, and not to the Bishop of Rome
ry, nor so much as naming him: The
that he desireth is either a Visit, or
swasive Letters, never mentioning the
Power that the Pope had more then
her Bishops, but only the interest of
it that the Western Bishops had more
in Basil and his Companions: faith he
or what we say is suspected by many, as if
ertain private contentions, we would
ike a fear and pusillanimity into their
ads: But for you, the further you dwell
m them, so much the more credit you have
th the common people: to which this is
ded, that the grace of God is a help to you
are for the oppressed. And if many of you
animously decree the same things, it is ma-
fest that the Multitude of you decreeing the
ne things, will cause an undoubted recep-
of your opinion with all.] You see here
on what terms Liberius his Letters
ght bestead Eustathius. He having re-
ved him into his own Communion, and
stathius being Orthodox in words, no
onder that the Synod of Teana receive
him
him upon an Orthodox confession, their fellow-Bishops reception and Letters. No doubt but the Letters of many another Bishop might have persuaded them to reception; though he had more advantage from Rome. Is it not now a fair Argument that you offer? Liberius (sometime an Arrian Pope of Rome) by his Letters prevailed with a Synod at Tyana to restore Eustathius (an Arrian) that dissembled an Orthodox confession: What then? Ergo Pope of Rome is the Vice-Christ, or then the Governor of all the Christ world. Soft and fair. 1. Basil gives you other reasons of his interest. 2. He never mentioneth his universal Government when he had the greatest need to be helped by it, if he had known of such a thing. 3. The Empire is not all the world: If I knew the Roman Sovereignty, I am certain he was a wilful Rebel against it.

7. Your seventh proof is from Chrysostome, who, you say [expressly diereth Pr. Innocent not to punish his adversaries if they do repent: Chrys. Epist. 2. ad Innoc. ] Apply. You much wrong your soul in taking your Religion thus on trust; some Book hath told you this untruth, and you believe it, and its like will persuade others of
You would do me. There is no such word as Epift. of Chryfotome to Innocent, nor anything like it.

8. Your eighth proof is this [The like is given to the Pope by the Council of Ephes in the Case of John of Antioch: Con-Ephes. p. 2. Act. 5.] Reply. 1. The Council at Ephesus (which no doubt mean) is in Binnius enough to make a desirable Volume, and divided into sixes, and each of those into Chapters, not into Acts. And if you expect that I could exactly read six Tomes in Folio be-

I can answer your severall sentences strands, you will put me on a twelfths work to answer a few sheets of er. If you mean by [p. 2. ] [Tom. 2. ] by [Act. 5. ] [Cap. 5. ] then I must tell there is not a word of that you say, like it. Only there is reference to Celines and Cyrils Epiftles; and Celeftine is Epiftle recited Tom. 1. cap. 17. threa-

Neftorinus, that if he repent not, he will communicate him, and they will have no communion with him, which others as well as he; but not a word of John hop of Antioch there. Nor can I find such thing in the 4. Tome, where John's life is handled. Indeed the Notes of your Historian
Historian divide the Council into Sessions. But in his fifth Session there is nothing of John, but of Nestorius. And in the 4th Session, John and his Party excommunicate Memnon, and theirs. And it was the Council that suspended first, and after excommunicated John. And it is the Emperor whom he appeals. Indeed your AnnotatorAT in Sess. 6, mentions some words of venals; that he should at least have guarded the Roman Legates, it being the same that his Church be directed by the Pope. But I see no proof he brings of these words; and it is known, that Cyril of Alexandria did preside, and subscribed fore the Roman Legates, even to the several Letters of the Synod, as you may see Tom. 2. cap. 23. and passim.

2. But if your words were there to be found, what are they to your purpose? The Pope can punish the Bishop of Antioch. But how? Why by excommunicating him. True, if he deserve it: that is, by pronouncing him unfit for Christ Communion, and requiring his flock, and exhorting all others to avoid him. And thus may another Bishop do: and thus John by Cyril of Alexandria, though he was himself of the inferior Seat: and th
A hath the Bishop of Constantinople done the Bishop of Rome, and so may o-

ey.

Your ninth proof is from the applications that the Arrians and Athanasius made

JohntonsfecMdPtfer.

bulius: Ex Athan. ad solit. Epift. Julius


dodoret. lib. 2. c. 4. Athan. Apol. 2. Zo-

c. 7. ] Reply. I marvel you urge

rancid instances, to which you have

fully and often answered: I re-

you to Blondell de Primatu cap. 25.

14, 15. Whittaker de Roman. Pontif.

150. & passim. Dr. Field of the Ch.

c. 35, &c. Briefly, this may shew the

ity of your proof. 1, Sozomen in that

faith, that though he alone wrote for

yet he wrote in the Name and by the

ment of all the Bishops of the West.

The advantages of Rome by its reputa-

and greatness, and the number and

ity of the Western Bishops, made their

gement and Communion valuable to

ers: Basil before cited tells you on

grounds when Churches disagree,

bse that are distanl are supposed to be im-

icially, especially when numerous. To

ich is added, which Basil intimates, that

hope of help from the Secular

powers,
powers, by the interposition of the Western Bishops, made them the more to. 3. And the Primacy of Rome (though it had no Soveraignty) made it seem irregular, that a Patriarch should be deposed without the knowledge and judgment of the Patriarchs of the precedent Seats. This was the custom that Julius spoke of, and the Patriarchs of Constantinople and Alexandria might have said as much, if the Patriarch of Jerusalem or Antioch had been deposed without them. 4. Every Patriarch might absolve the Innocent, and hold communion with them in his own Patriarchate; and if any be against it, (as the Arians here were, and sent false accusations against Athanasius to Julius) he may require them to prove their accusations, they will have him moved by them. Our own Communion with men, is to be directed by the judgment of our own well formed consciences. Julius desired not an more then to be one with a Council that should decide the case. Councils then had the Rule, and Patriarchs were the most honourable Members of those Councils, but no Rulers of them. 5. Yet Sozomen and others tell you, that Julius, when he had done his best to befriend Athanasius and
Paulus could do no good, nor prevail with the Bishops of the East, till the Emperors commands prevailed: yea the Eastern Bishops tell him that he should not meddle with their proceedings no more then they did with his, when he dealt with the Novans; seeing the greatness of Cities maketh not the power of one Bishop greater then another: and so they took it ill that he interposed, though but to call the matter to a Synod, when a Patriarch was deposed. Any Bishop might have attempted to relieve the oppressed as far as Julius did: specially if he had such advantages as foresaid to encourage him. All your consequences here therefore are denied. 1. It is denied, that because Julius made this attempt, that therefore he was Universal Ruler in the Empire. 2. It is denied that it ill thence follow, if he were so, that it had been by Divine Right, any more then Constantinople had equal privileges by Divine Right. 3. It is denied that it hence followeth, that either by Divine or humane Right, he had any Power to govern the rest of the world without the Empire. Had you all that you would rack these testimonies to speak, it is but that he was made by Councils and Emperours the chief Bishop
shop or Patriarch in a Nationall Church (I mean, a Church in one Princes Domini-
on) as the Archbishop of Canterbury was in England. But a Nationall or Imperiali-
Church is not the Universall. And with all, oppressed men will seek relief from any
that may help them.

In your Margin you adde that [Concern-
ing S. Athanasius being judged, and rightly,
by P. Julius, Chamier acknowledgeth the
matter of fact to be so: but against all anti-
quity pretends that judgment to have been un-
just.] Reply. Take it not ill Sir I befeech
you, if I awake your conscience, to tell me,
how you dare write so many untruths,
which you knew, or might know, I could
quickly manifest. Both parts of your say-
ing of Chamier p.497, are untrue. 1. The
matter of fact is it that he denieth: He
provehth to you from Sozomens words, that
Athanasius did make no appeal to a Judge,
but only fled for help to a friend: He
shews you that Julius did not play the
Judge, but the helper of the spoiled, and
that it was not an act of Judgement. 2. He
therefore accuseth him not of wrong judge-
ing, but only mentioneth his not hearing
the accused, to shew that he did not play
the part of a Judge, but a friend; as Chry-
so...
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softome did by some that fled to him. I pray answer his reasons.

And for what you say again in your Margin of Theodoret; I say again, that he appealeth to the Bishop of Rome for help; as a person who with the Western Bishops might sway much against his adversaries, but not as to an Universal Governour or Judge: no not as to the Universal Judge of the Church Imperiall; much less of all the Catholic Churchilles.

10. Your tenth proof is from Chryfo-

stome Case, where you say some things un-

true, and some impertinent. 1. That Chry-

stome appeals to Innocent from the Coun-

cil of Constantinople is untrue, if you mean

of an Appeal to a superior Court or Judge; much more if as to an Universal Judge: But indeed in his banishment, when all other help failed, he wrote to him to interpose and help him as far as he could. I need no other proof of the Negative then,

That there is no proof of the Affirma-

ve, that ever he made any such appeal.

In his first Epistle to Innocent, he tells him ver and over, that [he appealed to a Synod, and required judgement] and that he was cast into a ship for banishment [because he ap-

pealed to a Synod and a righteous judgement]

L 2 never
never mentioning a word of any such appeal to the Pope. Yea he urgeth the Pope to befriend and help him, by that argument, that he was still ready to stand to uncorrupt ed Judges, never mentioning the Pope as Judge. By all which it appears it was but the assistance of his intercession that he requireth: and withall, perhaps the excommunicating of the wicked, which another Bishop might have done. Yea, and it seems it was not to Innocent only, but to others with him that he wrote; for he would scarce else have used the terms

But what need we more then his own words to know his request: faith he [Let those that are found to have done so wickedly, be subject to the penalty of the Ecclesiastical Laws: but for us that are not convicted, nor found guilty, grant us to enjoy your Letters, and your charity, and all others whose society we did formerly enjoy.] The Ecclesiastical Laws enabled each Patriarch and Bishop to sentence in his own Diocess; though the person sentenced lived out of their Diocess, yet they might renounce all communion with him: Churches that have no power over one another, may have communion with one another; and that communion they
hey may hold and renounce as there is cause. Now if a neighbour Patriarch with many Bishops of the West had renounced Communion with Chrysostomes enemies, and also written their Letters on his behalf, and aken him still as in their Communion, this he hoped would much further his restaurati- on: which yet he doubted, as he had cause. For in his second Epistle he thanks him for doing his part, though it did no good, or lid not avail.

And it is to be noted, that your Author Nicephorus tells you, lib. 13. cap. 31. that Chrysostomes Letters, and his fellow-Bishops also, and the Clergies of Constantinople, were all written both to the Emperor Honorius and to Innocent: And therefore you may see by that on what account it was, and what help they did expect. The Emperor was not to excommunicate, but his Letters might do much.

Well, but you allledge Niceph. l.13.c.34. to prove 1. Chrysostomes appeal: But you have better or worse eyes then I, for I can find there no such thing, but a seeking for help as aforesaid. 2. You say [Innocentius nulls his condemnation, and declares him innocent. ] Anf. So might another Bishop have declared him: But how far it should be
be regarded, was not in his power.

3. You say he excommunicates Atticus and Theophilus, and 4. Arcadius the Emperor also, and Eudoxia. ¶ Reply. 1. If he did so and did well, another Bishop might as well have done it. Memnas excommunicated Vigilius of Rome. Excommunicating is not always an act of Jurisdiction, but a renouncing of Communion, with a Ministerial binding, which any Pastor on a just occasion may exercise, even on those that are not of his Diocese; examples in Church-history are common. 2. But I would have you answer Dr. Whittakers Reasons, by which he proves that Nicephorus is a fabler in this relation, and that that Epistle is not Innocents which cap. 34. he reciteth, Lib. de pontif Rom. Contr. 4. Qu. 4. pag. 454, 455. 1. Neither Socrates, Theodoret or Sozomen make any mention of this excommunication, who yet write much of the Case of Chrysothem and Arcadius: And would these men that lived so near that time have all silenced so great and rare a thing, as the excommunication of the Emperor and Empress, which would have made so great a noise and stir, that yet mention Ambrose his censure of Theodosius? 2. This Bull of Innocents, ( as Nicephorus would have
I have us believe it) hath such falshoods, contrary to more credible history, as bewray the orgery. For Socrates lib. 6. c. 19. writeth, that Eudoxia died the same year that Chrysostome was banished, and that Chrysostome died the third year of his banishment: And Sozomen faith l. 8. c. 28. that Chrysostome was in banishment three years after the death of Eudoxia: But, if Nicephorus were to be believed, Eudoxia was alive and excommunicated by Innocent after Chrysostomes death. Nor can it be said that Innocent knew not of her death; for his Legats were sent to Constantinople in Atticus time, who succeeded Arsacius, who outlived Eudoxia.] This is the summe of Dr. Whitakers confutation of Nicephorus. And withall, who knows not how full of fictions Nicephorus is?

In your Margin you pretend to confute Chamier p. 498. as saying [That other Bishops restored those wrongfully deposed as well as the Pope,] to which you say that never single Bishop restored any who were out of their respective Diocess, &c. whereas the Bishop of Rome by his sole and single authority, restored Bishops wrongfully deposed all the Church over.] Reply. 1. It feems you took Chamiers words on trust: peruse
that page, and see his words.

2. Single Bishops have censured, and therefore might as well remit their own censures. Ambrose censured Theodosius, who was no fixed Member of his charge, and he remitted their Censure. Epiphanius presumed even at Constantinople to excommunicate Dioscorus and his Brethren, Socrat. lib. 6. c. 14. And many instances may be brought both of excommunicating, and again receiving to communion by particular Bishops, even as to those that were not of their charge. And if the fact were not proved, yet the forbearance proveth not the want of power.

3. I deny your unproved assertion, that the Bishop of Rome singly restored all the Church over: It is a meer fiction. How many restored he out of the Empire? Or in the Empire out of his Patriarchate, but suasorially or Synodically.

Your next instance of Theodosius his not permitting the Council at Ephesus to be assembled, and his reconciling himself to the Church, is meerly impertinent: We know that he and other Princes usually wrote to Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, &c. or spoke or sent to more than one of the Patriarchs before they called a Council. You cannot but know that Councils have been
But neither this, nor an Emperour forfaking his errour, is a sign of the Popes Universal government. That Emperour gave sufficient testimony, and so did the Bishops that adhered to Dioscurus, that in those dayes the Pope was taken for fallible and controllable, when they excommunicated him: But when you cite out of any Author the words that you build on, I shall take more particular notice of them. Till then this is enough, with this addition, that the Emperours subjection, if he had been subject not to an Ambrose, or other Bishop, but only to Rome, would have been no proof that any without the Empire were his subjects: No more then the King of England's subjection to the Archbishop of Canterbury, would have proved that the King of France was subject to him.

12. Your twelfth proof from the Council of Chalcedon, is from a witness alone sufficient to overthrow your cause, as I have roved to you. This Synod expressly determineth, that your Primacy is a novel humane invention; that it was given you by the Fathers, because Rome was the Imperial seat. If you believe this Synod, the Controversie is at an end: If you do not, why do
do you cite it? and why pretend you to believe Generall Councils?

But what have you from this Council against this Council? Why, 1. You say Martian wrote to Leo, that by the Popes Authority a generall Council might be gathered in what City of the Eastern Church he shoule please to choose. ] Reply. 1. Whereas for this you cite Act. Concil. Chalcedon. 1. You tell me not in what Author, whether Crabbe, Binnius, Surius, Nicolinus, or where I must seek it. I have perused the Act. 1. in Binnius, which is 63 pages in Folio (such tasks your citations set me) and find no such thing; and therefore take it to be your mistake. But in the preambul. Epist. I find that Valentinian and Martian desire Leo's prayers, and contrary to your words, that they say. [Hoc ipsum nobis propriis literis tua sanctitas manifestet, quatenus in omnem Orientem & in ipsam Thraciam & Illyricum sacræ nostræ literæ dirigantur, ut ad quendam definitum locum qui nobis placuerit, omnes sanctissimi Episcopi debeant convenire.] It is not [qui vobis placuerit] but [qui nobis.] But what if you had spoke truth, doth it follow that Leo was Christ's Vicar-general Governour of the world, because that the Sovereign of one Commonwealth
wealth did give him leave to choose place of a Council? Serious things
uld not be thus jefted with.

You say Anatolius and the rest of the
ern Bishops sent to Pope Leo the profesi-
of their faith by his order. ] Reply.
And what then? therefore Pope Leo was
Governour of them and all the Chri-
world. You should not provoke men
laughter about serious things, I tell you.
you prove this Consequence? Confel-
es were ordinarily sent in order to Com-
ion, or to satisifie the offended, without
ct to superiority. 2. But I see not
proof of your impertinent words. Pul-
us Epistle to Leo, expresseth that Leo
sent his Confession first to Anatolius, to
ch Anatolius consented. By your Rule
Leo was subject to Anatolius.

3. You say the Popes Legates sate first in
uncil. ] Reply. What then? therefore
Pope was Governour of the Christian
ld, though not a man out of the Empire
re of the Council. Are you still in jeft?
if it must be so, then I can prove that
ers were the Universal Governours, be-
se at Nice, and other Councils they sate
ore the Legates of the Pope, and in
ny his Legats had no place. Is this ar-
ument
Ij6

11:

1

O

unfaithful partiality in the matters of salvation!

4. You say, they prohibited Dioscorus not sit by his order] Reply. 1. What then therefore he was Universal Governour of the Church. All alike. Any accuser in Parliament or Synod may require that the Accused may not sit as judge, till he be tried. 2. But did you not know that Legates were not obeyed; but that the Gloriosissimi judices & amplissimus senatus required that the cause should be first made known: and that it was not done till Em- bius Episcop. Dorylai had read his bill of complaint? Binnius AE 1. pag. 5.

5. You say the Popes Legates pronounced the Church of Rome to be Caput omnium Ecclesiarum] Reply. 1. What then therefore he was Governour of all the Christian world? I deny the consequence. You do nothing but beg: not a word of proof Caput was but membrum principale, the Patriarch prima sedes, and that but in the Empire. 2. The Popes Legates were not the Council, nor judges in their own cause, an not opposing, signifies not always a consent. 3. But the Council do as I said, expressly define the point, both what your Primacy is, and of how long standing, and of whol
vose institution, and that Constantinople
the same grounds had equall privi-

6. You say, all the Father's acknowledged
themselves Leo's Children, and wrote to him
their Father.] Reply. Of this you give
not any proof, but leave me to read 190
ages in Folsio, to see whether you say true
no. And what if you do, (as I believe you
) can a man of any reading be ignorant
ow ordinarily other Bishops were stiled
others, even by their fellow-Bishops as
well as the Bishop of Rome?

7. You add, that they humbly begged of
him that the Patriarch of Constantinople
might have the first place next Rome, which
withstanding the Council had consented to,
not also the third general Council at Ephes-
s before, yet they esteemed their grants of no
sufficient force, till they were confirmed by the
ope. ] Reply. So far were the Council from
that you falsely say of them, that they put it
their Canons, that Constantinople should
ave the second place, yea and equal privi-
dges with Rome; and that they had this on
the same grounds as Rome had its Primacy,
even because it was the Imperial Seat: Vid.
Bin. pag. 133, 124. col. 2. And not only
Ephesus, but the second general Council at
Con-
Constantinople, they tell you had decreed the same before. You see then (contrary to your fiction) that three general Councils (of the greatest, likened by Gregory to the 4 Evangelists) not only judged without the Pope, but by your own confession against him (if you say, he consented not) yea so much did they slight the Popes consent, that when the Legates dissented, they were not heard. See Bin. pag. 134, 136. They persisted the Council to maintain their Canon notwithstanding the contradiction of Lactantius and Paschasinus, and by the Judges it was accordingly pronounced, p. 137. And unanimously the whole Synod consented never stopping at the Roman dissent. Pergaminus Bishop of Antioch saith [in omnibus sanctissimum Archiepiscopum Regiae civitatis novae Romæ in honore & cura sicut Patrem praecipium habere nos convenit.] No man contradicted this: And is not this as much or more, then you alledge as spoke to Leo? They call Leo (you say) Father: And the Bishop of Constantinople is pronounced the Chief Father in all things, in honour and Cure. And Eusebius Bishop of Doryl, the chief adversary of Dioscorus, witnessed that he himself, in the presence of the Clergy of Constantinople, did read this Canon to the Pope.
pe at Rome, and he received it. Upon
which your Historian hath no better an ob-
viation, then that [either Eusebius lyed,
else at that hour he deceived Leo.] It is
true that the Synod writ to him for his con-
test; but not as suspending any of their
crees on it; but telling him over and
over, that the things were by them defined
and confirmed already, pag. 140. that which
they desired of him was, what Synods ordi-

rily did of Bishops of their Communion
but were absent [Hæc, sicut propria, &
ita, & ad decorum convenientissima, dig-
ere complecti, sanctissime & beatissimae
rer.]

13. In your Margin you tell me that A-
met in the time of Justinian deposed Ari-
mus in Constantinople against the will of
the Emperour & the Empress. ] Reply. 1. And
th it follow, that because he did it, there-
ere he did it justly, yea and as the Gover-
our of that Church? when Menna Bisho-
Constantinople excommunicated Pope Vi-
inus, was he not even with him? and did
it prove that Rome was subject to Con-
tinople? Niceph. l. 17. c.26. When Dio-
rus excommunicated Leo, and an Eastern
nod excommunicated Julian (Sozom. l.3.
11.) that proves not that they did it just-
ly,
ly, or as his Governours. Honorius the Em-
peror deposed Boniface 1. Othe with a S-
nod deposed Johan. 13. Justinian deposed
Sylverius and Vigilins: Will you conf-
it therefore justly done? 2. As to the
story I refer you to the full answer of Blon-
to Perron. cap. 25. sect. 84, 85. 3. Usu-
pation and deposing one another by ra-
sentences was then no rare thing, Eusebi
of Nicomedia threatened the deposing
Alexander of Constantinople, who sure w
not his subject, Socrat. lib. 1. c. 37. (vel. 25
Acacies of Caesarea and his party deposed
only Eleudi, Basilius and many other
but with them also Macedonius Bifhop of
Constantinople: Socrat. lib. 2. c. 33. (vel. 42
Did this prove Acacies the Vice-Chrift
What should I instance in Theophilus a
against Chrysoftome, or Cyril against John
Antiochen. and many such like? 4. Still yo
suppose one Empire to be all the Chriftia
world: We muft grant you that in all yo
instances!

14. For what you allledge from Gregory
I shall give you enough of him anon fo
your satisfaction, if you will be indifferent
As to your citation what can I say? A year
time were little enough to search after you
citations, if you should thus write bu
any more sheets. (If a man had so much
me and so little wit as to attend you) You

You turn me to Greg. cap. 7. ep. 63. but what

book, or what Indiction, you tell me not:

it whatever it be, false it must needs be,

ere being no one Book of his Epistles (ac-

cording to all the Editions that I have seen)

here c. 7. and ep. 63. do agree or meet to-

gether. But at last I found the words in

7. c. 63. ep. 63. To which I say, that ei-

ther your great Gregory by [subject] meant

that the Bishop of Constantinople was of an

feriour Order, as the Patriarch of Ale-

ndria and Antioch were to Constantinople,

yet yet had no Government of them; or

he he could say and unsay: But I doubt

but this was all his sense. But if it had

en otherwise, Constantinople and the Em-

pe was not all the Christian world.

Your next citation is lib. 7. ep. 37. But its

fly cited: There is no such word; and

are in so much haste for an answer, that

will not read over all Gregories Epistles.

You say Cyril would not break off

munion with Nestorius till Celestine had

named him; of this you give us no

: But what if it be true? Did you

ink that it proved the Pope to be the Vice-

rist? Prudence might well make Cyril

au-
 cautelous in excommunicating a Patriarch. And we still grant you, that the Order of the Empire had given the Roman Bishop the Primacy therein: and therefore no wonder if his consent were expected. But that Nestorius was condemned by a Council need no proof: And what if Celestine began and first condemned him? Is he therefore the Universal Bishop? But it was not Celestine alone, but a Synod of the Western Bishops. And yet Cyril did not hereupon reject him without further warning: And what was that he threatened, but to hold no Communion with him? *Vid. Concil. Ephes. 1. Tom. 1. cap. 14.* And though Pride made Communication an Engine to advance one Bishop above others, I can easily prove that if I had then lived, it had been my duty to avoid Communion with a notorious Heretic, though he had been Pope.

The long story that you next tell, is but to fill up Paper, that Cyril received the Pope Letters, that Nestorius repented not, that accused Cyril, that Theodosius wrote to Celestine about a Council; and many such pertinent words: But the proof is, that Cyril was the Pope's chief Legate Ordinary. Forsooth because in his absence he was the chief Patriarch; therefore he is said *Cele*
locum tenere, which he desired. Well, your Pope sit highest, seeing he so troubles all the world for it. Christ will shortly boll him come down lower, when he humb and them that exalt themselves. That Ce subscribed before Philip, you may see, Bm. 2. cap. 23. but where I may find that Philip subscribed first, you tell me not. But what if the Archbishop of Canterbury sate highest, and subscribed first in England? Both it follow that he was Governor of the world? no nor of York it self either.

16. And here you tell us of Juvenal, Act. Repl. 1. The Council is not divided into its in Binnius, but many Tomes and Chapters; but your words are in the Notes ded by your historian; but how to prove em Juvenals words I know not, nor find him or you. 2. But why were not the antecedent words of the Bishop of Antioch and his Clergy as valid to the contrary, as Juvenals for this? 3. If these words were ipken, they only import a Judgeing in Council as a chief member of it, and not of himself. And his apostolica ordinatione is exactly contrary to the forecited Canon of Council of Chalcedon, and therefore to be believed. Yet some called things done
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done Ordinatione apostolica, which were ordained by the Seats which were held Apostolike. 4. But still you resolve to forget that Antioch or the Empire extended not to the Antipodes, nor contained all the Catholick Church.

17. You next tell me of Valentinians words A.D. 445. Reply. It is the most plausible of all your testimonies, but worth nothing to your end. For 1. Though Theodosius name pro forma were at it, yet it was only Valentinians act, and done at Rome, where Leo prevailed with a raw unexperienced Prince to word the Epistle as he desired; so that it is rather Leo's, then the Emperours originally: And Leo was the first that attempted the excessive advancement of his Seat above the rest of the Patriarchs. 2. It is known that the Emperours sometime gave the Primacy to Rome, and sometime to Constantinople, as they were pleased or displeased by each of them. So did Justinian, who A.D. 530. Lampadio & Oreste Cof. C. de Episcopis lib. 1. lege 24. faith [Constantinopolitan Ecclesia omnium aliarum est Caput] [The Church of Constantinople is the Head of all other.] 3. It is your fiction, and not the words of Valentinian (or Leo) that [the succession from Peter was the foundation
of Romes Primacy. It was then believed that Antioch and other Churches had a succession from Peter. It is the Merit of Peter, and the Dignity of the City of Rome, and the Authority of the Synod jointly that he ascribeth it to. The Merit of Peter was nothing but the Motive upon which Leo would have men believe the Synod gave the Primacy to Rome: And Hesius in the Council of Sardica indeed useth that as his motive, [Let us for the honour of Peter, &c.] They had a conceit that where Peter last preached, and was martyred and buried, and his relics lay, there he should be most honoured.

4. Here is not the least intimation that this Primacy was by God's appointment, or the Apostles, but the Synods: Nor that it had continued so from Peter's dayes, but that jointly for Peter's Merits (and honour) and the Cities dignity, it was given by the Synod. 5. And it was but Leo's fraud to persuade the raw Emperor of the authority of a Synod, which he would not name, because the Synod of Sardica was in little or no authority in those daies. The rest of the reasons were fraudulent also; which though they prevailed with this Emperor, yet they took not in the East. And Leo himself it seems durst not pretend to a Divine Right and
and Institution, nor to a succession of Primacy from the Apostles. 6. But nothing is more false than your assertion, that he extendeth the power [over the whole visible Church]. The word [Universitas] is all that you translate in your comment, [the whole visible Church]. As if you knew not that there was a Roman Universality, & that Roman Councils were called Universal, when no Bishops out of that one Commonwealth were present; and that the Church in the Empire is oft called [the whole Church]. Yea [the Roman world] was not an unusually phrase. And I pray you tell me, what power Valentinian had out of the Empire? who yet interposed his authority there, [Nequid prater authoritatem sedis istius illicitum, &c.] [et ut pax ubique servetur.] And in the end, it is All the Provinces, that is, the University that he extends his precepts to. 7. And for that annexed [that without the Empeorous Letters, his authority was to be of force through France; for what shall not be lawfull, &c.] I Ans. No wonder: For France was part of his Patriarchate, and the Laws of the Empire had confirmed his Patriarchal power; and those Laws might seem, with the reverence of Synods, without new Letters, to do much:
much: But yet it seems, that the rising power needed this extraordinary secular help: Hilary it seems with his Bishops thought, that even to his Patriarch he owed no such obedience as Leo here by force exacteth. So that your highest witness (Leo by the mouth of Valentinian) is for no more then a Primacy, with a swelled power in the Roman Universality; but they never medled with the rest of the Christian world: It seems by all their writings and attempts, his never came into their thoughts.

And its no credit to your cause, that this Hilary was (by Baronius confession) a man of extraordinary holiness and knowledge, and is Sainted among you, and hath his Day in your Calendar. And yet Valentinian had great provocation to interpose (if Leo told him no untruths, for his own advantage): For it was no les then laying siege to Cities, to force Bishops on them without their consent, that he is accused of; which shews to what odious pride and usurpation, prosperity even then had raised the Clergy: fitter to be lamented with floods of tears, then to be defended by any honest Christian: Leo himself may be the principal instance.

18. You next return to the Council of Chalcedon, Act. i. & seq. where you refer me
to that Act. 1. where is no such matter: but you add [\& seq.] that I may have an hundred and ninety pages in Folio to peruse, and then you call for a speedy answer: But the Epistle to Leo is in the end of Act. 16. pag. (Bin.) 139. 2. And there you do but falsly thrust in the word [thou governst us] and so you have made your self a witness, because you could find none: The words are [Quibus tu quidem siue membris caput pra- eras, in his qui tuum tenebant ordinem benevolentiam præferens: Imperatores vero ador- nandum decentissime præsidebant.] Now [to go before] with you must be [to Govern]: If so, then Aurelius at the Council of Car- thage, and others in Councils that presided, did govern them. It was but [benevolentiam prætulisse] that they acknowledged: And that the Magistrates not only presided indeed, but did the work of Judges and Governours, is express in the Acts: its after wrote in that Epistle [Hac sunt, qua tecum, qui spiritu præsens eras, & complacere tan- quam fratribus deliberasti, & qui pene per tuorum vicariorum sapientiam videbaris, à nobis effecimus] And [hac à tua sanctitate fuerint inchoata] and yet [Qui enim locum vestra sanctitatis obtinent, iis ina constitutis vehementer resistere tentaverunt.] From all which
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which it appeareth, that he only is acknowledged to lead the way, and to please them as his brethren, and to help them by the wisdom of his substitutes; and yet that the Council would not yield to their vehement resistance of one particular.

But I have told you oft enough that the Council shall be judge, not in a comple-mentall Epistle, but in Can. 28. where your Primacy is acknowledged; but 1. As a gift of the Fathers. 2. And therefore as new. 3. For the Cities dignity. 4. And it can be of no further extent then the Empire; the Givers and this Council being but the Members of that one Commonwealth: So that all is but a novel Imperial Primacy.

19. And for the words of Vincentius Lirinenensis, c. 9. what are they to your purpose? [quantum loci authoritate] signifieth no more then we confess, viz. that in those times the greatness of Rome, and humane Ordination thereupon, had given them that precedency, by which their [loci auctoritas] had the advantage of any other Seat: Or else they had never swelled to their impious Usurpation.

I have plainly proved to you in the End of my [safe Religion] that Vincentius was no Papist.

But
But you draw an argument from the word [*sanxit*]. As if you were ignorant that bigger words then that are applied to them that have no governing power; *Quantum in se sanxit*, he charged them that they should not innovate: And what is it *P. Stephen* that is the Law-giver of the Law against unjust innovation? Did not *Cyprian* believe that this was a Law of Christ before *Stephen* medled in that business? What *Stephens* authority was in those days, we need no other witnesses then *Firmilian, Cyprian*, and a Council of *Carthage*, who flighted the Pope as much as I do.

I pray answer *Cyprians* testimony and arguments against Popery, cited by me in the *Disputation of my [safe Religion.]*

20. You say you will conclude with the saying of your priest *Philip*, and *Arcadius* at *Ephesus*: And 1. You take it for granted that all consented to what they contradicted not: But your word is all the proof of the consequence. Nothing more common, then in Senates and Synods to say nothing to many passages in speeches, not consented to. If no word not consented to in any man's speech must pass without contradiction, Senates and Synods would be no wiser Societies then *Billingsgate* affords; nor more
more harmonious then a Fair or vulgar rout: What confusion would contradictions make among them?

2. You turn me to Tom. 2. pag. 327. Act. 1. I began to hope of some expedition here: But you tell me not at all what Author you use: And in Binnius which I use, the Tomes are not divided into Acts, but Chapters, and pag. 327. is long before this Council. So that I must believe you, or search paper enough for a weeks reading to disprove you: This once I will believe you, to save me that labour, and supposing all rightly cited, I reply: 1. Philip was not the Council. You bear witness to your selves, therefore your witness is not credible. Yet I have given you instances in my [Key] (which I would transcribe if I thought that you could not as well read Print as M. S.) of higher expressions then Caput and fundamentum, given to Andrew by Ischius, and equal expressions to others, as well as Rome and Peter. And who is ignorant that knoweth any thing of Church-history, that others were called successours of Peter as well as the Bishop of Rome? And that the Claves regni were given to him, is no proof that they were not given also to all the rest of the Apostles. And where
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where you say [Arcadius condemneth Nectarius for contemning the command of the Apostolick Sea.] (You tell me not where to find it.) I answer you still, that its long since your Sea begun to swell and rage, but if you must have us grant you all these consequences, [Celestine commanded, therefore he justly commanded, therefore another might not as well have commanded him: (as one Pastor may do another, though equal, in the name of Christ): and therefore he had power to command without the Empire, even over all the Catholick Church; and therefore the Council was of this mind: yea, therefore the universal Church was of this mind, that the Pope was its universal head.] You still are guilty of sporting about serious things, and moving pity, instead of offering the least proof.

Yet fear you not to say [that in the time of the holy Oecumenical Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon, the universal consent of the whole Catholick Church was for you in this point.] The Lord keep our consciences from being the servants of our opinions or interests. 1. Was the Popes Legate the whole Catholick Church? 2. Was there one man at either of these Councils but within the Empire, yea a piece of the Empire?
Pire? So that they were but such as we now call National Councils, that is, consisting only of the subjects of one Republick. 3. Did the Council speak a word for your power without the Empire? 4. Do they not determine it so expressly to be of humane right, that Bellarmine hath nothing regardable to say against it (Can. 28. Conc. Chalced.) but that they spoke falsely? And yet your opinion or interest hath tempted you to appeal. viz. to the Sun that there is no such thing as light.

21. After the conclusion you have a supernumerary in your Margin, from Greg. lib. 10. Epist. 30. But there is no such word in that Epistle, nor is it of any such subject. But its like that your leader meant. And there's no more but that a Bishop not named (person or place) having fallen into Schism voluntarily, swore never more to depart from the Unity of the Catholick Church, or the Sea of Rome. But 1. So may a Bishop of the Roman Province do (or Patriarchate) without believing Rome to be the Universal Head. So might one in any other Province have done: And yet it follows not that he ought to do so, because he did so. You see now what all your proofs are come to, and how shamefully
fully naked, you have left your cause.

In sum, of all the testimonies produced,

1. You have not named one man that was a Papist (Pope Leo was the nearest of any man) nor one testimony that ever a Pope of Rome had the Government of all the Church without the verge of the Roman Empire; but only that he was to the Roman Church, as the Archbishop of Canterbury to the English Church: And as between Canterbury and York, so between Rome and Constantinople, there have been contentions for preheminency: But if I can prove Canterbury to be before York, or Rome before Constantinople, that will prove neither of them to be Ruler at the Antipodes, or of all the Christian world. 2. Much less have you proved that ever any Church was of this opinion, that the Pope was by Divine Right the Governour of all the world; when you cannot prove one man of that opinion.

3. Much less have you proved a succession of such a Church from the Apostles; having said as much as nothing concerning the first 300 years. 4. And yet much less have you proved, that the whole Catholick Church was of this opinion. 5. And least of all have you proved, that the whole Church took this Primacy of Rome, to be of necessity
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to the very Being of the Church, and to our
salvation; and not only ad melius esse, as a
point of Order. So that you have left your
Cause in shameful nakedness, as if you had con-
fessed, that you can prove nothing.

In the end you return to terms. To what
you say about the word [Christians] I only
say, that its but equivocally applied to any
that profess not all the Essentials of Chri-

About the word [Monarch] in good fad-
ness, do you deny the Pope to be [an impe-
rious sole Commander.] Which of these is
it that you deny? not that he is [a Com-
mander] not that he is [imperious] not
that he is [sole] in his Soveraignty! I
would either you or we knew what you hold
or deny. But perhaps the next words shew
the difference [as Temporal Kings.] But
this faith not a word wherein they differ
from [Temporal Kings]: sure your fol-
lowing words shew not the difference.
1. Kings may [receive power from Christ.] 2. Kings must rule [in meekness, charity and
humility.] But I think the meekness, charity
and humility of Popes, hath been far below
even wicked Kings (if cruel murdering Chris-
rians for Religion, and setting the world

on fire may be witness) as your own Histories assure us. 3. The Government of Kings also is for \[\textit{mens eternal good}\] however Papists would make them but their executioners in such things. 4. Brethren, as such, are no subjects: and therefore if the Pope Rule men but as Brethren, he rules them not by Governing authority at all. 5. Children to him we are not: You must mean it but Metaphorically! And what mean you then? Is it that he must do it in Love for their good? So also must Kings: So that you have yet express no difference at all.

But our Question is not new, nor in unusual terms: What Sovereignty you claim, you know or should know. Are you ignorant that Bellarmine, Boverius, and ordinarily your Writers labour to prove that the Government of the Church is Monarchical, and that the Pope is the Monarch? the supreme Head and Ruler, which in English is the Sovereign. Are you ashamed of the very Cause or Title of it, which you will have necessary to our salvation?

Next you say, that you \[\textit{very much dislike the Title of Vice-Christ, as proud and insolent, and utterly disclaim from it, neither was it ever given by any sufficient authority}\]
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To your Popes, or did they ever accept of it.]

Reply. Now blessed be God that makes sin a shame to itself, that the Patrons of it dare scarce own it without some paint or wizard.

1. Is not the very life of the Cause between you and us, whether the Pope be the Universal Head of the Church, vice Christi, & vicarius Christi? Are not these the most common titles that Papists give them, and that they take unto themselves? Nay look back into your own papers here pag. 6. whether you say not that they are [Instituted Governours in Christ's place of his whole Visible Church.]

2. Doth not Bellarmine (as I have cited elsewhere) labour to prove, that it is not as an Apostle that the Pope succeeds Peter, but as a Head of the Church in Christ's head? Doth not Boverius (cited in my Key) labour to prove him the Vicar of Christ, and to be Vice Christi? And what fitter English have we for the Kings deputy in a distant Kingdom, who is Vice Regis, then the Vice-King? Or a Chancellor's deputy, then [the Vice-Chancellor]: Vice Christi is your own common word, and Vicarius Christi; none more common scarce then the latter: And what English is there fitter for this, then the Vice-Christ, or Vicar of Christ?
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It is indeed the very term that expresseth properly as man can speak, the true point and life of the Controversie between us. And how could you suffer your pen to set down that the Popes did never accept of this, when it is their own common phrase

[Vice Christi, & Vicarius Christi?] But here again remember (and let it be a witness against you) that you dislike and utterly disclaim the very name that signifieth the Papal Power, as Proud and Insolent. And if you abhor Popery while you tice men to it, let my soul abhor it, and let all that regard their souls abhor it. Blessed be that Light that hath brought it to be numbered with the works of darkness.

Were it not more tedious then necessary, I would cite you the words [Vice Christi & Vicarius Christi] out of Popes and multitudes of your Writers. But alas that's not the highest: The Vice-God is a Title that they have not thought insolent, or words of the same signification. Would you have my proof? Pardon it then for proving your pen so false and deceitful (that's not my fault.)

Pope Julius the Second in his General Council at the Laterane, faith (Cont. Pragmat. sanct. monitor. Binnius Vol. 4. pag. 560.)

[Though
[Though the institutions of sacred Canons, holy fathers, and Popes of Rome—and their Decrees be judged immutable, as made by Divine inspiration; yet the Pope of Rome, who, though of unequal Merits, holdeth the place of the eternall King, and the Maker of all things, and all Laws on earth, may abrogate these decrees when they are abused.] Here from your Judge of faith it self, you hear [that the Pope holds the place of the eternal King, the Maker of all things and Laws.]

Pope Sixtus Quartus in passagio five Bulla contra Turcos, sent to Philip Palatine Elector 1481. in Breberi Tom. 2. pag. 162. Vol. 2. faith [Universos Christianos Principes, ac omnes Christi fideles requirere, eisque mandare Vice Dei, cujus locum, quamvis immeriti tenemus in terris—] that is, we are constrained [to require all Christian Princes, and all believers of Christ, and to command them, in the stead of God, whose place on earth we hold, though undeserving—] Here is a Vice-God, holding his place on earth, and commanding all Princes and Christians to a War against the Turks in God's stead.

I know to a particular people Gods Emassadors are said to speak in his name and say, as if God did beseech men by us.

N 2 2 Cor.
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2 Cor. 5. 19. But this is only as to a narrow and limited Embassage, not that they hold God's place on earth, as Rulers over the Universal Church, &c.

The same Pope Sixtus 4. faith ibid. pag. 163. [Sola superest Romana sedes: sedes utique immaculati agni: sedes Viventis in secula seculorum: Hac quippe praeeditas Patriarchales genuit Ecclesias: que quasi filiae in ejus gremio residebant, & in circuitu tanguam femula in ipsius adstitabant obsequio.] that is, [Only the Roman seat remaineth: even the seat of the Immaculate Lambe: the seat of him that liveth for ever (my flesh trembleth to write these things): This did beget the foresaid Patriarchal Churches (notorious falsehood!) which rested as daughters in her bosom, and as servants stood about in her obedience. ] Here you see from the Pope himself, that the other Patriarchs are his servants, and so to obey him; and that Rome begot them all (that were before it, except Constantinople) and neither made Christians nor Patriarchs by it, and that Rome is now become the seat of the Immaculate Lambe, and of him that liveth for ever. ] Truly the reading of your own Historians, and the Popes Bulls, &c. hath more persuaded me, that the Pope is Antichrist, then the Apo-
Apocalypse hath done (because I distrusted my understanding of it.)

Benedictus de Benedictis wrote a Book against Dr. Whittaker, to prove that it is false that the Pope is Antichrist, as that Christ is Antichrist, and dedicated it to Pope Paul. 5. with this inscription, Paul. 5. Vice Deo: To Paul 5. the Vice-God.] printed at Bononia 1608.

Caraffa’s Theses printed at Naples 1609. had the same inscription [Paulo 5. Vice Deo] to Paul 5. the Vice-God.

Alcazar in Apocalypse ad Johannem Apostolum, faith of the same Pope Paul. 5. [Quem numinis instar, Vera colit pictas.] [whom as a God true piety adores.]

Christopher Marcellus in his Oration before Pope Julius 2. in the approved Council at Lateran, Sess. 4. (and you take not contradicting to be consenting, and verily to such blasphemy in a Council, so it is) faith thus [Quum tanta reipublica unicus atque supremus Princeps fueris institutus, beatissime pontifex, cui summa data potestas, addivinus injunctum imperium, &c.]— & ante [sub tuo imperio] & [Unus princeps qui summam in terris habeat potestatem.] But these are small things [Teque omnis aevi, omnium seculorum, omnium gentium Principi-
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But yet [the Prince and Head of all ages and Nations] is too low [Cura Pater beatissime ut sponsa tua forma decorque redeat.] But yet to make the Church [his spouse] is nothing [Cura denique ut salutem quam dedisti nobis, & vitam & spiritum non amissamus: Tu exim Pastor, tu medicus, tu gubernator, tu cultor, tu denique alter Deus in terris.] That is, [See that we lose not the health that thou hast given us, and the life and spirit. For thou art the Pastor, the Physician—to conclude, thou art another God on earth.]

If you say that the Pope accepteth not this; I answer it was in an oration spoken in a Generall Council, in his presence, without contradiction, yea by his own command, as the Oratour profesteth [Jesus est, Pater sancte, & parvi] [you commanded me, Holy Father, and I obeyed.] Binnius pag. 562, 563, 564. you may find all this.

In Gloss. extravag. Joan. 22. de Verb. signif. cap. Cum inter, in Glossa: Credere Dominum nostrum Deum Papam conditorem dicta decretales & istius, non potuisse sit: there propt statuit, hereticum censeatur.] So that by your Law we must believe the power of your Lord God the Pope, or be hereticks.
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If you meet with any Impressions that leave out [Deum] take Rivets note [haberi in editione formata iussu Greg. 13. a corectoribus Pontificiis, nec in censuris Glossa iussu Pii 5. editis, que in expurgatorio indice habentur, nomen Deierafum suisse.]

Pope Nicolas 3. de Elest. cap. fundamenta in 6. faith [that Peter was assumed into the Society of the individual Trinity.]

Angelus Politi. in Orat. ad Alex. 6. Pontificem ad Divinitatem ipsam sublatum, afferit: In faith, the Pope was taken up to the Godhead itself.

At the foresaid Council at Laterane, Antonius Puccius in an Oration before Leo the tenth in the Council, and after published by his favour, said [Divina tua Majestatis consulpetus, rutilante ejus fulgere imbecillas oculi mei caligant.] His eyes were darkened with beholding the Pope's Divine Majesty.

None contradicted this.

In the same Council, Simon Begnius Modrusiensis Episcopus, in an Oration Sess. 6. calls Leo [The Lion of the Tribe of Juda, the root of Jesse, him whom they had looked for as the Saviour.]

In the same Council, Sess. 10 Stephanus Patracensis Archiep. faith [Reges in comple- dibus magnitudinis magni Regis ligae, & no-
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biles in maniacis ferreis censuratum constringe, quoniam tibi data est omnis potestas in caelo & in terra — and before [qui totum dicit, nihil excludit.] So that all Power in heaven and earth is given to the Pope.

Paulus Æmilius de gestis Francorum, lib. 7. faith, that the Sicilian Embassadours lay prostrate at the Popes feet, and thrice repeated, [Then that takest away the sins of the world, have mercy on us.]

And prove to me that ever any such man was reprehended for these things by the Popes of late.

August. Triumphus in Prefat. sum. ad Joan. 22. faith [That the Popes power is infinite: for great is the Lord, and great is his power, and of his greatness there is no end.

And qu. 36. ad 6. he faith that [the Pope influenceth (or giveth) the Motion of direction, and the sense of cognition, into all the Members of the Church, for in him we live and move and have our being.]

And a little after he faith, [The will of God, and consequently of the Pope, who is his Vicar, is the first and highest cause of all corporal and spiritual motions.]

Would you have any more witness of the falshood of your words: faith Zabarella I.C. lib.
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lib. de schism. Innocent. 7. & Bened. pag. 20.

[For this long time past, and even to this day, those that would please the Popes, persuaded them that they could do all things: and so that they might do what they pleased, even things unlawful, and so more than God.]

Antonius parte 3. tit. 21. cap. 5. §. 4. faith [The Pope receiveth from the faithful adorations, prostrations, and kisses of his feet, which Peter permitted not from Cornelius, nor the Angel from John the Evangelist.]

Cardinalis Bertrandus Tract. de origin. jurispr. q. 4. num. 4. ( & in Gloss. extrag. com. l. i. fol. 12.) faith [Because Jesus Christ the son of God while he was in this world, and even from eternity, was a Natural Lord, and by Natural right could pronounce the sentence of deposition on Emperors, or any others, and the sentence of damnation, and any other, as upon the Persons which he had created, and endowed with natural and free gifts, and also did conserve; it is his will that on his account his Vicar may do the same things. For the Lord should not seem discreet (that I may speak with his reverence) unless he had left behind him one Vicar that can do all these things.]

Tell me now whether you said true in the
The Paragraph about the Title Vice-Christ? yea, whether it be not much more that hath been given and accepted?

But what name else is it that you agree on as proper to express the power which is controverted? I know no name so fitted to the real controversy? And therefore in disclaiming the Name, for ought I know, you disclaim your Cause, and confess the shame of Popery. If he that seeks to be King of England, should say he disclaimeth the Title of King as insolent and proud, doth he not allow me to conclude the like of the thing, which he conclude of the proper name?

The name [Papa] [Pope] you know (its like) was usually by the ancients given to other Bishops as well as to him of Rome; and therefore that cannot distinguish him from other men: The same I may say of the Titles [Dominus, Pater sanctissimus, beatissimus, Dei amantissimus, and many such like].—And for [summus Pontifex] Baronius tells you (Martyrol. Rom. April. 9.) that [it was the ancient custome of the Church to call all Bishops, not only Pontifices, Popes, but the Highest or Chief Popes] citing Hierom. Ep. 99. And for the word Head of the Church, or of all Bishops, it hath been given to Constantinople, that yet claimeth not
nor (as Nilus tells you) neither a precedent to Rome, nor an Universal Government, much less as the Vice-Chrift. And that the Bishop of Constantinople was called [the Apostolick Universal Bishop] Baronius testifieth from an old Vaticane monument, which on the other side calls Agapetus [Episcoporum Princeps.] The Title [Apostolick] was usually given to others. Hierufalem was called [the mother of the Churches.] A Council gave Constantinople the Title of [Universal Patriarch] which though Gregory pronounced so impious and intolerable for any to use, yet the following Popes made an agreement with Constantinople, that their Patriarch should keep his Title of Universal Patriarch] and the Bishop of Rome be called [the Universal Pope;] which can signifie nothing proper to him (the name Pope being common) more then [Universal Patriarch] doth. The Foundations, and Pillars of the Church, and the Apostles successors, yea Peters successors, were Titles given to others as well as him; and more then these. It being therefore the point in controversy between us, whether the Bishop of Rome, be in the place of Christ or as his Vicar, the Head, Monarch, or Governor of the Church universal, and the terms
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terms [Vice Christi & Vicarius Christi] being those that Popes and Papists choose to signify their claim, what other should I use?

As to what you say of the Council of Constance (which you must say also of Basil, and of the French Church, Venetians, &c.) you pretend the doubt to be only between Ordinary and extraordinary Governors. But 1. of old the Councils called Generall (indeed but of one Principality) were more ordinary, then now the Pope hath brought them to be: (and I blame him not, if he will hold his greatness, to take heed of them.) 2. The way not to have been extraordinary, if the Council of Constance had been infallible, or of sufficient power, who decreed that there should be one every ten years. 3. The Councils that continue so many years as that at Trent did, are then become an Ordinary Government. 4. What is given to the Church Representative, is by many of you given to the Church real or essential (as you call it) which is ordinarily existent, only not capable of exerting the power it hath: The singulis major, at universis minor, is no rare doctrine with you. 5. But let it be as extraordinary as you please, if while these Councils sit, the Pope
Pope lose his Headship, your Church is then two Churches specifically distinct, and the form of it changeth when a Council sitteth: which is a two-headed, mutable Church, not like the Spouse of Jesus Christ. 6. As your Popes are said to live in their constitutions, and Laws, when the person dyeth; and your Church is not thought by you to die with them; so why may not Councils do? The Laws of Councils live when they fit not, and the French think that these Laws are above the Pope; though I shewed you even now that *Julius 2. in Conc. Later.* concluded otherwise of Decrees, and the Council of the Popes power. 7. If a Nation be Governed by Trienniall (and so Decenniall) Parliaments as the highest power, and Councils of State in the intervals, who shall be accountable to Parliaments; will you say that these Parliaments are extraordinary, and not the ordinary Soveraign? No doubt they are. And the Council of State is not the Soveraign, but the chief Officer or Magistrate for execution in the intervals.

Having begun this Reply *May 2.* I was again taken off it about *May 5,* or 6. And about
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about May 11. I received a Letter from you, wherein you tell me of a quarter of a years expectation. Be patient good Sir! These matters concern Eternity: Believe it, I have somewhat else to do of greater hast and moment. Even some of your own friends find me more work. What if ten of you write to me at once, is it fair for each one of you to call for an answer as hastily as if I had but one in hand? This is not my case, but it is more then thus. Fear not left I give you over, till you first prove the desenter, and turn your back (if God enable me:) Only I must tell you, that I take it for a flight already, and a forsaking of your Cause, that you turn to these rambling impertinent citations and discourses, in stead of a Syllogisticall arguing the case, and that when you had spoken so much for it. I have here (that you may have no cause of exception, nor pretence of cause) in this Paper replied to your last; and in another proved the Visibility of our Church syllogistically; and (as overplus) also disproved yours, and proved it to be an upstart, the sprout of Pride, upon occasion of the greatness of the City of Rome, and of the forming the Church to the Civil State, in that one Empire. If now you will deny to do the like, I  

shall...
Shall conclude you fly and forsake your Cause. Besides your Rejoinder to this Reply, I principally expect that you syllogistically (in close and faithfull Arguing) do prove to us the Affirmative of these Questions following.

Qu. [Whether the Church, of which the subjects of the Pope are Members, hath been visible ever since the days of Christ on earth.] In which these three Questions are involved, which you have to prove: 1. Whether the Papacy, that is, the Universal Monarchy, or Sovereign Government, or Vice-Christship of the Pope (take which term you like) hath continued from Christ's days till now. 2. Whether all the Catholick Church did still submit to it, and were subjects of the Pope. 3. Whether those that did submit to it, did take it to be necessary to the Being of the Church, and the salvation of all believers, or only to the more peaceable and better being.] If you call for Catalogues, or proof of Visible succession, and pretend so high to it your selves, and yet will give us none when we importune you to it, you tell us that you seek not to reveal the truth and Church but to hide them. I urge you the harder (though it may seem immodest) because as the Cause doth lie upon your proof here, so I know you
you cannot do it: Pardon my confidence: I know you can do no more then Baronius Bellarmine, Bullinger, &c. set together have done: and therefore I say, I know you cannot do it. I know your Vice-Christ (I doubt the Antichrist) is of humane introduction, springing out of a Nationall (I mean Imperiall) Primacy, which also was of humane invention. It was but one Civil Government or Commonwealth, in which your Bishop had his Primacy, and that long without a Governing power. And this National Primacy, because of the greatness of the Empire, was at last called Universal: And even this was long after the days of Christ (some hundreds of years) a stranger in the Church, unless as the Greatness of the Church of Rome, and advantages of the place, did give that Church such authority as ariseth from magnitude, splendour, honour, and accidental advantages from the populousness, wealth, and glory of the City of Rome.

The carnall Church is led by the Vice-Christ, the earthly Prince of Pride, contending in the world for command and superiority; and prosecuting his Cause with Strappados, fire, sword, and gunpowder, when Christ gave no Pastor a Coercive power,
The true spirituall Church is Headed and commanded by Jesus Christ the Prince of Peace, and knoweth no other Universal Head, because no other hath either Capacity or Authority. It obeyeth his Laws; and learneth of him to be charitable, patient, meek, and lowly; and wonders not at errors and divisions on earth, nor therefore accuseth the providence of God; but knoweth by faith, that the Universal Judge of Controversies is at the door, and that it is but a very little while, and we shall see that the Church had an Universal Head, that was alone sufficient for his work; for he that cometh will come, and will not tarry:

Amen, Even so come Lord Jesus!

Sir, I desire you presently to send me word, whether you will by close Syllogistical arguing, prove the successive visibility of your Church as Papal, or not, that I may know what to expect?

And once more I pray you take the help of the ablest of your party, both that I may not be so troubled with wrong, or impertinent allegations, and that I may be sure that your insufficient arguings are not from any imperfection of the person, but of the Cause.

O If
If you meet in these Papers with any passages which you think too confident and earnest, I beseech you charge them not with uncharitableness or passion, for I hope it proceeded not from either; but I confess I am inclined to speak confidently where I am certain, and to speak seriously about the things of God, which are of everlasting consequence.

May 18, 1659.

For Mr. William Johnson.
THE SECOND PART:

Wherein the successive Visibility of the Church, of which the Protestants are chief Members, is clearly proved: And the Papists exceptions against it confuted.
Qu. Whether the Church, of which the Protestants are Members, have been Visible ever since the days of Christ on earth? Aff.

He terms explained.

1. [The Church] sometime signifieth a particular Congregation actually met, or associated for such personal meeting, for Communion in God's worship.

2. Sometime it signifieth an Association of Churches, and that either of fewer, or of more, as they have opportunity of Communion or correspondence by their Pastors; and also the Assemblies of the Pastors of the particular Churches so associated. Scripture useth it in the first sense, and Later custom (whether Scripture also I omit) in the later.

3. Both Scripture and Custom have used the word signifie the Church Universal, of which all particular Churches are Members. This is [the Church] that we speak of in the Question.

Defin. The Universal Church, of which
The successive visibility of the Church

The successive visibility of the Church is, *The Kingdom of Jesus Christ: or, The Whole company of Believers (or true Christians) upon earth, subjected to Jesus Christ their Head.* The constitutive parts, or the Relate and Correlate are, (as in every Politick Body) the *Pars Imperans,* and *Pars subdita:* which is Christ and Christians. The form consisteth in the mutual Relation. The End is the common good of the Church, and the glory of the Head, and the accomplishment of the will of God.

2. [The Protestants] Defin. [Protestants are Christians protesting against, or disowning Popery.] The word [Protestant] expresseth not the essence of our Religion. And therefore it must not denominate the Universal Church, of which we are Members: we are not to call it [A Protestant Universal Church.] Nor doth it signify an inseparable proper accident. For when the Catholick Church had no Popery, there was none to protest against, and therefore there could be no Protestants. *And Ethiopia, India, and other Nations that never had Popery, or those Nations that never heard of it, have no occasion to protest against it.* Nor doth it signify any *positive part* (directly) of our Religion: but only the
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the Negation, or Rejection of Popery: Even as when a man is called [Homo purga-
tus, sanatus, liberatus, à leprâ, peste, tabæ, &c.] a man purged, healed; freed from the leprosy, plague, consumption, &c. it is no positive part, nor inseparable proper accident, much less any essential part of the man, that is signified by the word [Healed, Purged, &c.] Nor is it necessary in order to the proving him [a man] or [a health-
full man,] to prove that he was ever [a purged, or healed man.] We undertake not therefore to prove that there have been always Protestants, that is, men Pro-
testig against Popery: Nor have we any need, in order to the proof of our Thesis, to prove that the Catholick Church hath all been free from Popery in all ages, or in any age since the Apostles, no more then that it hath been free from Pride, Ambition, or Contention. (But yet we shall do it ex
abundanti.) The Religion then of a Prote-
tant is Christianity, and he knoweth and owneth no other. Which is called [the Pro-
testant Religion] as cleansed from Po-
pery.

[Members] that is, true integral parts.

[Of which---are---] By Profession. We professe our selves to be of no other Church.

O 4 And
And before men, a man is to be taken to be of that Religion and Church of which he professeth himself to be, till he be proved false in that Profession. If a Papist affirm himself a member of the Roman Church, in disputing with him we will take it for granted that he is so; every man being best acquainted with his own mind, and fittest to describe the Religion which he owns. So that two things I here include. 1. It is only such a Catholick Church that hath been still visible, [that Protestants own.] 2. And only such that really they are of, their Profession being valid.

Note also, that it is not directly the inexistence by internal invisible faith, that is in question among us, or that I mean: but the inexistence by external Visible Profession. Bellarmine thinks the bare Professors that are wicked, are best termed [Dead members] and [the true Professors, [Living members] we will not stick needlessly on words: We take the Living members only to be in strict propriety members; but Sincerity and Hypocrisy being known only to God and the possessors, we speak of Professors as Professors abstractively from their Sincerity or Hypocrisy.

[ Hath been Visible.] 1. Not visible to man
man in its Internal faith; but in its external Profession.

2. Not Visible at once to any one man: for no man can see all the Christian world at once: But Visible in its parts, both in Congregations and individual persons.

3. Not Visible in the soundness of its professed faith unto Infidels and Heretics: For they cannot see that faith to be sound, which they take to be fabulous and false: But Visible in the soundness of its professed faith to themselves, that know the soundness of faith.

4. Not Visible in the excellent degree of soundness in the better parts, unto the corrupter or infirmer parts: For though de facto they may know what Doctrine the better part do hold (as Infidels know what Doctrine the Church holdeth) yet they know it not to be true and sound in the points wherein they differ.

And note again, that it is not the Visibility of every accident of the Church, nor of every Truth or duty that is but of the Integrity of Religion, and necessary only ad melius esse Ecclesia, to the Better being of the Church, but it is the Visibility of the Church that we speak of.

Lastly, it is the Body and not the Head, who
whose Visibility is in Question by us. Though the Head also is truly Visible in Heaven; and Visiblity, ven to the most excellent Triumphant part of his Body, who are fittest to be his Courtiers, and in his presence: (and as much seen on earth, as the Pope is to most of the Church, which is not at all.)

1. But not still in one and the same place on earth. It might be in one age much of it in Judea, at Ephesus, Sardis, Laodicea, Colosse, Philippi, and other parts of Asia; and in other ages removed thence, either wholly or for the most part: It might be in one age in Tenduc, Nubia, and other great Kingdoms, where it shall after cease to be: But in some part or other of the earth it hath been still.

2. Not equally visible in all Times and Places of the earth. In some Times (as in the Arrians prevalent) it was so oppressed and obscured, that the world groaned to find it self turn'd Arrian, and the Arrians in General Councils and number of Bishops (to whom the true Christians were very few) did seem to carry away the Name and glory of the Catholick Church; so that in their eyes, and in the eyes of strangers by that were of neither party, the most Visible Catholick
holick Church was theirs: who yet had no part in it, because they were not Chri- 

tians as denying that which is essentia\ll to 

crist, the object of the Christian faith) 

and therefore none of the Church, and therefore though most visible and nune-

ous, yet not the visible Church: And the 

Church, which to others was as wheat hid- 

den in this chaffe, or rather a few ears 

among so many tares, was yet Visible to it 

self in its Truth of faith, and visible to its 

Enemies in its Profession and assemblies, 

though in number far below them.

So also in some places it may be Latent 

through persecution & the paucity of belie-

vers, when in other places it is more Patent.

And its Degrees of soundness being va-

rious, are accordingly variously visible. One 

part may be really and visibly more strong, 

and another more weak in the faith: One 

part much more corrupt then others, and 

other parts retain their purity: And the 

same Countries increase or decrease in that 

purity, as is apparent in the case of the 

Churches of Galatia, Corinth, the seven 

Asian Churches, Rev. 2. and 3. &c.

Last\ly note, that it is only that part of the 

Church which is on earth whose visibility 

we assert, though that in Heaven be 

also
also a true part of the Body of Christ.

Nor is it in the same Individuals that the Church continueth Visible, but in successive Matter. So much for explication of the terms.

Thes. The Church of which the Protestants are Members, hath been Visible ever since the days of Christ on earth.

Arg. 1. The Body of Christians on earth subjected to Christ their Head, hath been (in its parts) Visible ever since the days of Christ on earth.

But the Body of Christians on earth subjected to Christ their Head, is the Church of which the Protestants are Members:

Therefore the Church of which the Protestants are Members, hath been Visible ever since the days of Christ on earth.

I have not sagacity enough to conjecture what any Papist can say against the Major proposition.

The Minor is proved by our own Professions: As the profession of Popery, proveth a man a Papist, so the profession of Christianity as much proveth us to be Christians.

[α] Those that profess the true Christian Religion in all its essentials, are Members of that Church which is the Body of Christians on earth subjected to Christ the Head.
But the Protestants profess the true Christian Religion in all its essentials: therefore the Protestants are Members of that Church which is the Body of Christians on earth subject to Christ the Head.

The Major is undeniable. The Minor is thus proved. 1. Those that profess so much as God hath promised salvation upon in the Covenant of Grace, do profess the Christian Religion in all its Essentials. (For God promiseth salvation in that Covenant to none but Christians.) But the Protestants profess so much as God hath promised salvation upon, in the Covenant of Grace:

Therefore the Protestants do profess the Christian Religion in all its essentials.

The Minor is thus proved. All that profess faith in God the Father, Son, and holy Ghost, our Creator, Redeemer and Sanctifier, and love to him, and absolute obedience to all his Laws of Nature and holy Scripture, with willingness and diligence to know the true meaning of all these Laws as far as they are able, and with Repentance for all known sin, do profess so much as God hath promised salvation upon, Job. 3. 16, 17. Mark 16. 16. Heb. 5. 9. Rom. 8. 28. 1. Act. 26. 18. But so do the Protestants: Therefore the Protestants profess
profess so much as God hath promised salvation on.

2. Those that profess as much and much more of the Christian faith and Religion, as the Catechumens were ordinarily taught in the ancient Churches, and the Competentes at Baptism did profess, do profess the true Christian Religion in all its essentials.

But so do the Protestants: Therefore, &c.

3. Those that explicitly profess the belief of all that was contained in the Churches Symbols, or Creeds, for six hundred years after Christ (and much more holy truth) and implicitly to believe all that is contained in the holy Scriptures, and to be willing and diligent for the explicate knowledge of all the rest, with a Resolution to obey all the will of God which they know, do profess the true Christian Religion in all its Essentials. But so do the Protestants. Therefore, &c.

Ad hominem, I confirm the Major (and most that went before) from the Testimonies of some most eminent Papists.

Bellarmine's Faith, de Verbo Dei, lib. 4 c. 11. In the Christian doctrine both of faith and manners, some things are simply necessary to salvation to all; as the knowledge of the Articles of the Apostles Creed, of the ten Command-
Commandments, and of some Sacraments: The rest are not so necessary that a man cannot be saved without the explicite knowledge, belief, and profession of them—These things that are simply necessary, and are profitable to all, the Apostles preached to all—All things are written by the Apostles which are Necessary to all, and which they openly preach to all—

Costerus Enchirid. c. i. p. 49. [We deny not, that those chief heads of Belief, which are necessary to all Christians to be known to salvation, are perspicuously enough comprehended in the writings of the Apostles.]

But all this the Protestants profess to believe.

[6] If sincere Protestants are Members of the true Church, as intrinsically informed (or as Bellarmine speaks, Living Members) then professed Protestants are Members of the true Church as extrinsically denominated (or as it is Visible, consisting of Professors.) But the Antecedent is true: Therefore so is the Consequent.

The Reason of the Consequence is, because it is the same thing that is professed by all Professors, and existent in all true Believers: and that as to Profession is necessary to Visibility of Membership; and as
The successive visibility of the Church to sincere inexistence, is necessary to salvation.

The Antecedent or Minor I thus prove. All that by faith in Christ are brought to the unfeigned Love of God above all, and special Love to his servants, and unfeigned willingness to obey him, are Members of the true Church as intrinsically informed. But such are all sincere Protestants: Therefore all sincere Protestants are Members of the true Church as intrinsically informed.

The Major is granted by the Papists, who affirm charity to be the form of Grace, and all that have it to be justified. And the promises of Scripture prove it to our Comfort.

The Minor 1. Is proved to others by our Professions: If this be in our Profession, then the sincere are such indeed. But this is in our Profession: Therefore, &c.

2. Its certainly known to our selves by the inward knowledge and sense of our souls. I know that I Love God and his servants, and am willing to obey him; Therefore all the Papists Sophisms shall never make me not know what I do know, and not feel what I do feel. They reason in vain with me, when they reason against the knowledge and experience of my soul. Your scope
scope is to prove me in a state of damnation. You confess that if I have charity I am in a state of salvation. I know and feel that I have charity: Therefore I know that your reasonings are deceit.

Arg. 2. The Church whose faith is contained in the holy Scriptures as its Rule in all points necessary to salvation, hath been visible ever since the days of Christ on earth.

But the Church whose faith is contained in the holy Scriptures as its Rule in all points necessary to salvation, is it of which he Protestants are Members.

Therefore the Church of which the Protestants are Members, hath been visible ever since the days of Christ on earth.

That the Catholick Church which hath been visible till now, hath received the Holy Scriptures which we receive, is confessed by all Papists that ever I heard or read making mention of it. And no wonder, for it cannot be denied.

That this Church hath taken these Scriptures for the Rule of faith in all points necessary to salvation (allowing Church-Governours to make Canons about the circumstantialls of Government and worship, which in the Universal Law are not determined,
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mined, but left to humane prudence to determine.) 1. I have proved in my third Dispute of the safe Religion already. 2. It is confessed by the Papists: the forecited passages of Bellarmine and Costerus are sufficient. But in the great Council at Basil, Orat. Ragus. Bin. p. 299. it is most plainly and with fuller authority asserted. [The holy Scripture in the Literal sense, soundly and well understood, is the infallible and Most sufficient Rule of faith.] See my vindication of this Testimony in my Catholic Key: and the like from Card. Richlien.

Gerson faith, de exam. doctr. p. 2. cont. 1. Nihil audendum dicere de divinis, nisi que nobis a sacra Scriptura tradita sunt.

Durandus in his Preface is wholly for the excellency and sufficiency of the Scriptures. Three ways, he faith, God revealeth himself and other things to man: The lowest way is by the book of the creatures (so heathens may know him.) The highest is by manifest Vision (as in heaven): and the middle way is in the Book of holy Scripture, without which there is no coming to the highest way.] And going on to extoll the Scripture, he citeth Jeromes words ad Paulinum, [Let us learn on earth the knowledge of those things, which will abide with
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us in heaven: ] But this is only (faith he) in the holy Scripture. ] And after ex Hierom. ad Marcell. [ If Reason be brought against the authority of the Scriptures, how acute soever it is, it cannot be true: ] And after [ We must speak of the mysterie of Christ, and universally of those things that nearly concern faith, conformably to what he holy Scripture delivereth: So Christ, John 5. Search the Scriptures, It is they that estifie of me. If any observe not this, he speaks not of the mysterie of Christ, and of ther things directly touching faith as he ought, but falls into that of the Apostle, Cor. 8. If any man think he knoweth anything, he yet knoweth nothing as he ought to now. For the measure is not to exceed the measure of faith: of which the Apostle bids us, Rom. 12. Not to be wiser then we ought to be, but to be wise to sobriety, and as God hath divided to every man the measure of faith. Which Measure consisteth in two things; to wit, that we subtract not from faith that which is of faith, nor (N.B.) attribute that to faith which is not of faith: or by either of these wayes, the measure of faith is exceeded, and men deviate from the continence of the sacred Scripture, which expresseth the measure of faith.]
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(That is, from the full sufficiency of the Scripture measure: ) [ And this measure, by
Gods affistance, we will hold, that we may
write or teach nothing difsonant to the ho-
ly Scripture. But if by ignorance or inad-
vertency, we should write any thing disso-
nant, let it be taken ipso facto as not written.]
This is a confession of the Religion of the
Protestants. And though he adjoyn a sub-
mission to the Roman Church, because he
was bred in it, it is only as to an interpreter
of doubtfull Texts of Scripture: So that the
sufficiency of our Rule and measure of faith
is granted by him, and zealously asserted;
and that without Bellarmine and Coftertns
limitation, to points necessary to the salva-
tion of all; he extendeth it to all the
faith.

Aquin. 22. g.1.a.10. ad 1. faith, [ That
in the Doctrine of Chrift and his Apostles,
the truth of the faith is sufficiently expli-
cated: ] even when he is pleading for the
Popes power to make new Creeds to obviare
errors.

And in his sum. de Verit. disp. de fide q.10.
ad ii. be faith , [ That all the means by
which the faith cometh to us are free from
fuspicion. The Prophets and Apostles we
believe, for this reafon, because God bore
them
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them witness by working Miracles: as Mar. 6, confirming their speech with following signs: But their successors we believe not, but so far as they declare to us those things which they have left us in the Scripture.]

This is the Religion of the Protestants.

Scotus in Prolog. insent. 1, makes it his second Question, Whether supernatural knowledge necessary to us in the Way, be sufficiently delivered in the holy Scripture, which he proveth (having first given ten arguments to prove the Truth of Scripture.) And first he shews, it containeth the Doctrine of the End; and 2. of the things necessary to that end, and the sufficiency of them; summarily in the Decalogue, explained in the other Scriptures, as to matter of faith, hope, and practice; and so concludes, that the holy Scripture sufficiently containeth the doctrine necessary viatoris, to us in the way: And he answereth the objection, of Difficulties in it, (without flying to the Church) that no science explaineth all things to be known, but those things from which the rest may conveniently be gathered: and so many needful truths are not expressed in Scripture; though they are virtually there contained, as conclusions in the Principles, about the in-
vestigation whereof the labour of Expositors and Doctors hath been profitable.] This is his doctrine out of Origen.

Gregor. Ariminenfis in Prol. q. 1. art. 2. Resp. ad art. fol. 3. & 4. faith [ A discourse properly Theologicall, is that which consisteth of words or propositions contained in the holy Scripture; or of those that are deduced from them; or at least from one of these: This is proved 1. by the foarealledged authority of Dionys. For he will have it, that there can be no leading of that man to Theologicall science, that assenteth not to the sayings of the holy Scripture.—It follows therefore that no discourse that proceedeth not from the words of holy Scripture, or of that which is deduced from them, is Theologicall.]—[ 2. The same is proved from the common conception of all men: For all men judge that then only is any thing proved Theologically, when they prove it from the words of the holy Scripture.]

This is more then the former say: For to extend the sufficiency and necessity of Scripture to all that's Theologicall, is more then to extend it to matter of faith. No Protestant goeth higher then this that I know of. And note, that he makes this the very
very common conception and judgement of all men. See then where our Religion and Church was before Luther! even among all Christians.

Yet more fully he proceeds (ibid.) Hence it further appeareth, that Principles of Theology thus taken, that is, which is acquired by Theological discourse, are the very Truths themselves of the holy Canon, because the ultimate Resolution of all Theological discourse doth stand (or belong) to them; and all Theological conclusions are deduced first from them. But distinguishing the Conclusions Theological from the Principles, I say that all truths are not in themselves formally contained in the holy Scripture: but of necessity following from those that are contained in them: and this whether they are Articles of faith, or not (NB); and whether they are knowable or known by another science, or not: and whether they are determined by the Church or not. But of other Truths, to wit, not following from the words of the holy Scripture, I say there is no Theological conclusion: This is proved, &c.

When I read over the Schoolmen and Divines of all sorts, that wrote before the Reformers fell so closely upon the Pope, and
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[find how generally even the Papists themselves maintained the sufficiency of the holy Scripture, just as the Protestants now do, I am convinced 1. of the succession of the Protestants Religion in the Universal Visible Church; and 2. that it was the Reformers Arguments from Scripture, that forced the Papists to oppose this holy Rule, as to its sufficiency, and to invent the new doctrine of supplementall Tradition; (for conservative, Ministeriall Tradition of the holy Scriptures we are for as much, at least, as they.)

The words of Guil. Parisensis, too large to be recited, in extolling the fulness and perfection of the Scripture, even for all sorts of men, you may read, de Legibus, cap. 16. pag. 46.

Bellarmine de Verbo Dei, lib. 3. cap. 10. ad Arg. 15. faith [We must know that a proposition of faith is concluded in such a syllogism: Whatsoever God hath revealed in Scripture is true: But this God hath revealed in Scripture: Therefore it is true.] (Though he require another word of God by the Pope, or Council, to prove that this is revealed in Scripture.) But if so, then Scripture containeth all that's true in points of faith.

2. And
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2. And that all things that are revealed, and which we ought to believe, are not Essential to the Christian faith, and therefore that all are of the Church that hold these Essentials, and that such a distinction must be maintained, the Papists have still confessed, till lately, that disputing hath increased their novelties and errors. Bellarmines and Costerus confession, I recited even now.

Guliel. Parisiensis in Operum pag. 9, 10, 11, 12. de fide, industriously proveth the necessity of distinguishing the fundamentals or essentials, from the rest of the points of faith: and it is they that constitute the Catholic faith, which he faith is therefore called Catholic or Universal, because it is the common faith, or the common foundation of Religion; And he proves that hence it is that the Catholic faith is but One, and found in all Catholicks, these fundamentals being found in all.] By many arguments he proveth this.

And that there are some points, even these common Articles necessary to be known of all, necessitati medi, the Schoolmen commonly grant: as Aquin. 22. q. 2. a. 5. c. Baines in 22. q. 2. a. 8. &c. Of these faith Espencaus (in 2. Ti. c. 3. dig. 17.) which
The objects of faith per se, are not the secondary objects, the adult must have an explicite faith, and the Collier faith at this time decantate by the Catholicks, will not serve the turn.]

And we have both the Scripture sufficiency to all points of faith, even the lowest and also the foresaid distinction given us together, by Tho. Aquinas 22. q. art. 5 c. [We must say, that the object of faith per se, is that by which man is made blessed: But by accident and secondarily, all things are the object of faith which are contained in the holy Scripture.]

See the judgement of Occham, Canus, Tolet, and many more cited by Dr. Potter and yet more for the sufficiency of the Symbolle or Creed, as the test of Christianity, pag. 89, 90, 91, 92, 93. Where you have the sense of the Ancients upon the point, and p. 102, 103.

I conclude therefore with the Jesuite Azorius, par. i. lib. 8, c. 6. [The substance of the Article in which we believe One, holy, Catholick Church, is, that no man can be saved out of the Congregation of men professing the reception of the faith and Religion of Christ, and that salvation may be obtained within this same Congregation of godly and faithful men.

And
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And as to the Essence of the Christian faith and Church, we say with Tertullian of the Symbole \[ Fides in Regula posita est: habes legem, & salutem ex observatione legis: exercitatio autem in curiositate consistit, habens gloriun solam ex peritiae studio: Cedat curiositas fidei: Cedat gloria salutis. Certe aut non obstrepant, aut quiescant adversus regulam: Nihil ultra scire, est omnia scire. \] That is, \[ Faith lieth in the Rule: Here you have the Law, and salvation in the observation of that Law; but it is exercise that consisteth in curiosity, having only (a name or) glory by the study of skill; Let curiosity give place to faith: Let glory give place to salvation. Let them not prate, or let them be quiet, against the Rule. To know nothing further, is to know all things. \] De Praescription. cap. 13, 14.

So cap. 8. 
\[ Nobis curiositate opus non est post Christum Jesum, nec inquisitione post Evangelium. Cum credimus, nihil desideramus ultra credere; hoc enim prins credimus, non esse quod ultra credere debeamus. \] That is, \[ As for us we need not curiosity after Jesus Christ, nor inquisition after the Gospel: When we believe, we need to believe no further: For we first believe this, that there is nothing further that we ought to believe. \] And
And here (on the by) for the right understanding of Tertullian's Book de Pra
script. note, 1. That the Rule of Essentials extracted from the whole Scripture, is
the Churches ancient Creed. 2. That the compleat Rule of all points of faith is the
whole Scripture. And that Tertullian had to
do with Hereticks that denied the Essentials,
and desired the whole Scripture to dispute
their case from both, because they had questi-
oned or rejected much of it; and because it
was a larger field to exercise their wits in,
and whence they might gather more matter
of dispute to puzzle the weak: And there-
fore Tertullian adviseth the ordinary Chri-
stians of his time, instead of long puzzling
disputes with them out of Scripture, to hold
them to the Churches prescription, of the
simple doctrine of the Creed. But now come
in the Papists; and 3. will neither be con-
tent with Creed nor Scripture, but must
have a Church or faith partly made up of
supplemental Traditions, of more then is in
all the Scripture, and so run further from
Tertullian and the ancient simplicity, then
these Hereticks, and yet are not ashamed to
glory in this Book of Tertullian as for
them.

Of the Fathers judgement of the Scrip-
ture
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ture sufficiency, see the third part of my [safe Religion] where I have produced Testimonies enough to prove the Antiquity of the Protestants Religion, and the Novelty of Popery. But nothing can be so plain and full, which pre-engaged men dare not deny. Let me instance but in one or two passages of Augustine, so plain as might put an end to the whole Controversie.

Aug. de Doctr. Christian. lib. 2. c. 9. [In bis omnibus libris timentes Deum & pietate mansueti, quanrant voluntatem Dei. Cujus operis & laboris prima observatio est, ut diximus, nosse istos libros, & si nondum ad intellectum legendo tamen vel mandare memoriae, (He was not against the Vulgars reading Scripture) vel omnino incognitos non habere. Deinde ulla que in eis aperte posita sunt, vel precepta vivendi vel regula credendi solertiis diligentiusque investiganda sunt: Qua tanto quisque plura inventit, quanto est intelligens capacior: In his enim qua apertè in Scriptura posita sunt, inveniantur illa omnia qua continent solum moresque vivendi, (N. B.) spem scilicet atque charitatem, de quibus libro superiore tractavimus. Tum vero facta quadam familiaritate cum ipsa lingua divinarum Scripturarum, in ea qua obscura sunt aperienda, & discutienda pergendum est, ut
ad obscuriores locutiones illustrandas de manifestationibus sumantur exempla, & quaedan certarum sententiarum testimonia, dubitationem de incertis auferant. ] You see here that the Scripture, as sufficient to faith and manners, to be read by all that fear God, and can read; and the harder places to be expounded by the plainer, was the ancient Rule of faith and Religion: And this is the Religion of Protestants.

Aug. lib. 3. c. 6. contra lit. Petilian, pag. 127. [ Prœinde, sive de Christo sive de ejus Ecclesia, sive de quacunque alia re qua pertinet ad fidem vitamque nostram; non dicam Nos, nequaquam comparandi ei qui dixit[Li- cet si nos ] sed omnino quod secutus adjecit, si Angelus de coelo vobis annunciaverit praterquam quod in Scripturis & Evangelicis accipiis, Anathema sit. ] I must needs English this short passage, to the utter confusion of Popery. [ And therefore whether it be of Christ, or whether it be of the Church, or whether it be of any other matter that pertaineth to our Faith or Life, I will not say [ if we ] as being not worthy to be compared with him that said [ Though we ] but ( I will say) plainly what he added following: [ If an Angel from heaven shall declare to you any thing besides that which you have received
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received in the Legall and Evangelicall Scriptures, let him be Anathema, or accursed."

Was not the Church then purely Protestant in their Religion?

The Minor needs no proof but our own profession. My profession is the best evidence of my own Religion to another: And profess this to be my Religion; which is contained in the holy Scripture, as the Text, Law, or Rule. And let no man contradict me, that knoweth not my Religion better than I do: The Articles of the Church of England profess this also to be the Religion of the Composers. And the Protestants commonly upon do profess it. It is the great difference between us and the Papists. The whole Universal Law of God that we know of, and own, is contained in Nature and Scripture conjunct. But the Papists take somewhat else to be another art. We allow by-Laws about mutable undetermined things (as aforesaid) to Governors: But we know no Universal Law of faith and holiness, but Nature and Scripture: This is our Religion: And this Religion contained in Nature and Scriptures hath been still received.

Obj. We confess Scripture is sufficient to them that have no further light: All that is necessary
224

The successive Visibility of the Church necessary to the salvation of all, is in the
erespiciuously, as Costerus, Bellarmine, and
others say: but more is necessary to salva-
tion to some.

Ans. 1. Then at least it containeth a
the Essentials of Christianity, which suffi-
ceth to our present end. 2. And what
maketh more Necessary to me, or other
here in England, if it be not necessary to
all? Is it because that more is Revealed to
us? But how and by whom; and with what
Evidence? We are willing to see it, and
can see no such thing: But if this be it, (i
I may speak so plainly without offence) it
seems it concerneth us to keep out Friar:
and Jesuites from the Land, as much (if we
knew how) as to keep out the Devil. For
they tell us, 1. That we must believe the
Popes Soveraignty, against the Tradition
and judgement of most of the Catholic
Church. 2. And we must believe our selves
to be void of Charity (because no Papists)
contrary to our internall sense and know-
ledge. 3. And we must believe that bread
is not bread, and wine is not wine, contrary
to the common senses of all found men: and
if we will not thus renounce the Churches
Vote, Tradition, our Certain knowledge,
Reason, and all our Senses, we must be
damned:
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...where as before this doctrine was taught us, we might have been saved, as saving in the Scriptures all things necessary to the salvation of all.

But the Papists must needs have us shew them where our Church was, and name the persons. *Answ. 1. If it were not the Catholike Church, if it were confined to any place that is but a part of the Christian territories. 2. Nor were it the Catholike Church if we could name half or a considerable part of the members: As *sub* in oft tells the Donatists, it is the Church which begun at Jerusalem, and thence is spread throughout the world. Part of it may be in one Nation one year, which may forfeit and lose it before the next. God hath not tied it to any place. 3. To tell you where the Catholike Church hath been in every age, and who were the Members or the Leaders, requireth much knowledge in History and Cosmography, which God hath not made necessary to salvation. 4. There are no known Histories that deliver us the Catalogues of the Christians in every age of the world. Had any been so foolish as to write them, they would have been too chargeable to keep, and too long to read: yea were it but of the Pastors.

5. God
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5. God hath nowhere commanded the Church to keep such Catalogues or Histories, nor promised when they are written that Papists shall not purposely corrupt and destroy them; nor Turks (as at Buda) take the Christian Libraries, and burn them.

6. Papists cannot prove the successive extent and habitations of the Catholike Church any more than we; and we can do it as well as they: for we have the same means. If they can tell us where it hath been in every age, they need not ask us. If they cannot, they have as much need to learn as we, and much more. They think it not necessary to their Laity, to the proving of their faith, to be able to prove the habitations or names of the Members of the Catholike Church in all ages: and why is it more necessary to us then them?

7. But yet, to men acquainted with history, what can be more easy, then to tell you where great multitudes of Christians in all ages have inhabited, and where many parts of the Church have been, though no man can give you a Catalogue of the Church any more than of the world?

Would you know then where our Church, that is, the Catholike Church hath been, in all ages? why it hath been in Asia, Africa,
Africa and Europe. Is that too general? It hath been in Syria, in Mesopotamia, Parthia, Media, Armenia, India, Persia, in Egypt, Hadassia, Georgia, Cilicia, Circassia, Mengrelia, Natolia, Isauria, Thrace, and more other Countries; then I have any need to name to you, (to say nothing of Europe, and Brittain by name, as a thing most known). But no man well in his wits will deny a succession of the Christian church which I have defined, from the first plantation of it until now. If Christianity and ever ceased in the world, how came it be new planted, and revived?

That this before described is the only catholike Church that hath been owned by the ancient Doctors, appeareth by their instant witnesses. To cite a few, and yet enough.

August. in Psalm. 21. Ubicunque timetur ens & laudatur, ibi est Ecclesia.

Id. Epist. 50. In Sanctis Libris ubi manifestatur Dominus Christus, ibi & ejus Ecclesiam declaratur (and therefore there it shall be sought). Isti autem mirabili cæcitate, cum ipsam Christum prater Scripturas scient, ejus tamen Ecclesiam non divinarum, but in humanarum alumniarum vanitate confingunt. Christ
The successive visibility of the Church is to be known in the Scripture, and therefore so is the Church.

Ibid. In causa Cæcilianæ—se ab Ecclesia Catholica, hoc est, ab unitate omnium gentium divisent. Its not the Catholic Church because Roman, but because extended to all Nations. Sed tamen Ecclesiæm, quæ non litigiosis opinionibus finguur, sed Divinis attestationibus comprobatur, propter quemlibet hominem relinquare non debe- mus.

Id. In Psal. 56. Corpus ejus est Ecclesia: non autem ista aut illa, sed toto Orbis diffusa: Nec ea quæ nunc est in hominibus qui præsentem vitam agunt, sed ad eam pertinentibus, etiam his qui fuerunt ante nos, & his qui futuri sunt post nos, usque in finem seculi. Tota enim Ecclesia constans ex omnibus fidelibus, quia fideles omnes membra sunt Christi, habet illud Caput postum in coelestibus quod gubernat corpus suum, et si separatum est à visione, sed annéditur charitate.

Id. Enchirid. ad Laurent. c. 56. Ecclesia tanquam habitatorit domus sua, & Deo templo suum, & conditori civitas suæ: quæ tota hic accipienda est, non solœm ex parte quæ perigrinatur in terris, a solis ortu usque ad occasum laudans nomen domini.

Id: contr. Petilian. cap. 2. Purposely opening
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of the true nature of the Catholic Church for the stating of the Case; faith,

Quaestio certè inter nos versatur, ubi sit Ecclesia? utrum apud nos, an apud illos?

Qua utique Una est, quam majores nostri catholicam nominabant, ut ex ipso nomine denderent, quia per totum est.— Hac autem Ecclesia Corpus Christi est: sicut Apol- lus dicit, [pro corpore ejus, quæ est Eccle-

p.] Unde utique manifestum est, eum qui in membris Christi, Christianam sa-

tem habere non possè. Membra vero Christi unitatis charitatem sibi copulantur, &

reandem capiti suo adhaerent quod est Christus Jesu. — Quaestio est, ubi sit hoc corpus, ubi sit Ecclesia? Quid ergo facturi sumus? in Verbis nostris eam quasi situri? an in

verbis capitis suis Domini nostri Jesu Christi? uto quod in illius potius verbis eam quærere bemos, qui veritas est, & optime novit cor-

its suum.—After he calls the Church over and over, Universum Orbem Christianum—cap. 3. Quia nolo humanis docu-

mentis, sed divinis oraculis sanctam Ecclesiam demonstrae. Si sancta Scriptura in Afri-

solâ, &c.—Si autem Christi Ecclesia canonicaerum Scripturarum Divinis & cer-

simis testimoniiis in omnibus gentibus desig-

nata est, quicquid attulerint (N. B.) & an-

decun-
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dicunque recitaverint, qui dicas, [Ecce hic
Christus, ecce illic] audiamus potius, stoves
ejus sumus, vocem pastoris nostri dici sitis [No-
lite credere.] — Cap. 4. Totus Christus
Caput & Corpus est: Caput unigenitus Dei
filius, & Corpus ejus Ecclesia, sponsus &
sponsa; duo in carne una: Quicunque de ipso
capite ab Scripturis sanatis dissentient, etiam se
in omnibus locis inveniantur in quibus Eccle-
sia designata est, non sunt in Ecclesia: &
rursus quicunque de ipso capite Scripturis
Sanatis consentient, & Unitati Ecclesia non
communicant, (or as after) ab ejus corpore
quod est Ecclesia ita dissentient, ut eorum
communio non sit cum toto quacunque diffun-
ditur, sed in aliqua parte separata inveniatur,
manifestum est eos non esse in Catholicca Ec-
clesia.] (A sad conclusion to the Papists.)

It would be tedious to recite half that
Austin there hath to this purpose. Through
all his exquisite disputes with the Donatists
he still describeth the Church, 1. As being
the Body of Christ, its Head: 2. As disper-
seed through the world, and containing at
the Members of Christ. 3. And that which
begun at Jerusalem. 4. And is to be known
by the word of God: Never mentioning
the Headship of the Pope, nor the Mi-
strif-ship of Rome: of which more anon.
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So Optatus lib. 2. adverf. Parmen. *Ubi ergo erit proprietas Catholicorum nominis, cum inde dicta sit Catholicica, quod sit rationabilis & ubique diffusa, &c.*] And before (p. 46.)

_Ergo Ecclesia una est, cujus sanctitas de sacramentis colligitur; non de superbia personarum ponderatur:_ He glorieth indeed in the chair of Peter, and the Roman Church and succession, as being on the Catholicks side; but never maketh them an Essential part of the Catholicck Church, nor talks of a Unity caused by subjection to them, but _Charity to all:_ And therefore calls the Schismaticks, _lib. 3. p. 72._ Charitatis desertores, not subjectionis desertores: Adding, _gaudet totus Orbis de Unitate Catholicia;_ but never de subjectione Romae. Yea he faith more of the leven Asian Churches, _lib. 2. p. 50._ _Extra septem Ecclesias quicquid foris est, alienum est._ Never more (if to much) can be found to be said of Rome: and now Rome it self is _extra septem Ecclesias._ So he supposeth God praising the Catholick, _p. 77._

(lib. 4. _Dissentio & schisma tibi displicit; Concordas fti cum fratre tuo, & cum una Ecclesia, quae est in toto orbe terrarum: Communicasti septem Ecclesiis & memoris Apostolorum; amplexus es unitatem._ So _lib. 6. p. 95._ he thus describeth the Catholick
Communion. [An quia voluntatem & jussi-
onem Deis secuti sumus amando pacem, com-
municando toti orbi terrarum; societati Orien-
talibus, ubi secundum hominem sum natus
est Christus; ubi ejus sancta sunt impressa
vestigia; ubi ambulaverunt adorandi pedes;
ubi ab ipso facta sunt tot & tanta virtutes;
ubi eum sunt tot Apostoli comitati; ubi est
septiformis Ecclesia; à qua vos concisos
esse, &c.]

Tertullian dealing with Heretics indeed,
that denied the Fundamentals, thought it
but a tiresome way to dispute with them
out of Scripture, who wrested so many
things in it to their destruction, but would
have them convinced by Prescription: be-
cause they lived near the Churches that
were planted by the Apostles, and near their
daies: And what doth he? appeal to Rome,
as the Judge, or Church that the rest are
subjected to? No: but 1. It is the common
Creed or Symbole of the Church, that he
would have made use of in stead of long
disputes (and not any other doctrine.)
2. And it is all the Churches planted by the
Apostles, that he will have to be the first
witnesses. 3. And the present Churches,
the immediate witnesses that they received
this Creed (not any supernumeraries)
from them, as the Apostles doctrine. So de
prescript. c. 13. he reciteth the Symbole it
self, and so cap. 20. he mentioneth the
fending of the twelve to teach this faith,
and plant Churches, which he describeth
thus [Statim igitur Apostoli—primo per
judaam contestata fide in Jesum Christum, &
Ecclesis institutis, debinc in orbem profecti,
emand doctrinam ejusdem fidei nationibus
promulgaverunt, & proinde Ecclesias apud
unamquamque civitatem condiderunt, a qui-
bus traducem fidei & semina doctrina catena
exinde Ecclesia mutuata sunt, & quotidie
mutuantur ut Ecclesia siant. Ac per hoc &
ipsa Apostolicae deputantur ut soboles Aposto-
licarum Ecclesiaram. Omne genus ad Orig-
nem suam censeatur, necesse est. Itaque tot ac-
tantae Ecclesia una est illa ab Apostolis prima,
ex qua omnes. ( Are not those too gros
dceivers that would perswade us that he
here meaneth the Church of Rome by the
[una illa], when he plainly speaks of the
Catholick Church of the Apostolick age
from which all the rest did spring? If of a
particular Churche, it must be that of Jeru-
salem. Did all the rest arise from Rome?
Can they say [ex hac omnes?] Sic omnes
prima, & omnes Apostolicae, dum unam omnes
probant unitatem. Communicatio pacis, &
appellatio
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appellatio fraternitatis, & contessratio hospitaitatis, qua jura non alia ratio regit, quam ejusdem sacramento una traditio.

Note here 1. That no Original Church is mentioned but those of Judea, with the rest of the Apostles planting. And 2. That the Churches planted by the Apostles themselves, (without any mentioned difference of superiority) are that one Church which all the rest must try their faith by, as the witnesses.

3. That they are equally made traductes fidei, and mother Churches to others propagated by them. 4. That per hoc, by this propagation (without subjection to the Church or Pope of Rome) all the rest are Apostolical.

5. And the sufficient proof to any Church then that it was prima & Apostolica, was (not subjection to Rome but) that unam omnes probant unitatem. That is, of the Apostolick faith, received from that one Apostolick Church.

6. Yea when he reciteth the external Characters of the Church, it is not subjection to Rome, that is any one of them, but, Communicatio pacis, appellatio fraternitatis, contessratio hospitaitatis.

7. Yea utterly to exclude the Roman subjection, he adds [qua jura non alia ratio regit, quam ejusdem sacramento una traditio.]

Se
of which we are Members, proved.

So he proceeds. *Sì hæc ita sunt, constat pro-
inde omnem doctrinam, quæ cum illis Ecclesiæ
Apostolicis matricibus & originalibus fidei
conspiret, veritati deputandum id sine dubia
tenentem, quod Ecclesiæ ab Apostolis, Apostoli
da Christo, Christus à Deo suscepit; reliquam
verò omnem doctrinam de mendacio præjudi-
candam, quá sapiat contra veritatem Eccle-
siarum, & Apostolorum, & Christi, & Dei. 
Superest ergo ut demonstremus, an hæc nostra
doctrina (the Creed; not the Popes additi-
ons) cujus regulam supra edidimus, de Aposto-
lorum traditione censeatur, & ex hoc ipso, an
catera (that contradict the Creed) de men-
dacio veniant. Communicamus cum Ecclesiæ
Apostolicis (Rome is not made the standard)
quod nulla doctrina diversa, hoc est testimo-
um veritatis.

And cap. 28. he doth not send us to the
Roman Church as Head or Judge, but cal-
ling the Holy Ghost only, *Vicarius Christi,
Christ's Vicar, makes it incredible that he
should so far neglect his office, as to let
(not Rome, but) all the Churches to lose
the Apostles doctrine; proving the certain
succession of it, by the Unity, and not by
Rome's authority [* Ecquid verisimile est, ut
tot ac tanta in unam fidem erraverint? Nullus
inter multos eventus est unus exitus: Vari-
asse*
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affe debuerat error doctrina Ecclesiatarum. Caterum quod apud multos unum inventur, non est erratum, sed traditum. Audet ergo aliquid dicere, illos errasse qui tradiderunt?

So c. 32. when he calls them to the Apostolical Church, it is no more to Rome, hen another. Ædant ergo origines Ecclesiatarum rarum — ut primus ille Episcopus aliquid ex Apostolis vel Apostolicis viris, qui tamen cum Apostolis perseveraverint, habuerit autorem, & antecessorem. Hoc enim modo Ecclesia Apostolica census suos deferunt: sicut Smyrnæorum Ecclesia habens Polycarpum ab Iohanne Collocatum refert; sicut Romanorum Clementem à Petro ordinatum edit: proinde utique & cetera exibent.] Here you see he puts Smyrna before Rome, and John before Peter, and refers them to Rome, but only as one of the Churches planted by the Apostles; and this is but to know their doctrine, delivered in that first age, which we appeal to.

And after he expressly faith [Ad hanc itaque formam, provocabuntur ab illis Ecclesiis, quae licet nullum ex Apostolis, vel Apostolicis autorem suum proferant, ut multo posteriores, qua denique quotidie institutum; tamen in eadem fidem conspirantes, non minus Aposto-
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Apostolica deputatur pro consanguinitate doctrine: ] The Apostles doctrine will prove an Apostolical Church, when ever planted.

And e. 38. he draws them from disputing from the Scripture, because they owned not the true Scripture, but corrupted it, and charged the Catholikes with corruption

[Sic ut illis non potuit succedere corrupta doctrine sine corrupta instrumentorum ejus:
Ita & nobis integritas doctrine non competisset, sine integritate eorum (not by real tradition alone) per quae doctrine tractatur:
Etenim quid contrarium nobis in nostris? quid de proprio intulimus, ut aliquid contrarium ei & in Scripturis deprehensum, detractione vel adjestatione vel transmutatione remediaremus? Quod sumus, hoc sunt. Ab initio suoe ex illis sumus; antequam nihil aliter fuit, quam sumus.]

And cap. 36. He sends them by name to the particular Apostolical Churches, and begins with Corinth; then to Philippi, Thessalonica, Ephesus, and then to Rome, of whole Sovereignty he never speaks a syllable.

So more plainly l. 4. contr. Marcion. c. 5. because Marcion denied the true Scriptures, he sends them to the Apostolike Churches
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Churches for the true Scriptures, first to the Corinthians, then to the Galatians, then to the Philippians, Thessalonians, Ephesians, and last of all to Rome.

But it would be tedious to cite the rest of the Ancients, that commonly describe the Church as we; and such as we all own as members of it.

Arg. 3. If the Roman Church (as Christian, though not as Papal) hath been visible ever since the days of the Apostles, then the Church of which the Protestants are members, hath been visible ever since the days of the Apostles: But the Antecedent is their own; therefore they may not deny the consequent.

The consequence also is past denial. 1. Because the Roman as Christian, is part of the universal Christian Church: 2. Because they profess to believe the same holy Scriptures and Creed as we do. So that though they add more, and so make a new form to their Church, yet do they not deny our Church, which is the Christian Church as such, nor our Test and Rule of faith, nor any Article that we account Essential to our Religion. So that themselves are our sufficient witnesses.

Well! but this will not suffice the Papists,
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pists, unless we shew a succession of our Church as Protestant.

1. This we need not, any more then a sound man lately cured of the Plague, doth need to prove, that he hath ever been, not only sanus but sanatus, a cured man (before he was sick.) How could there be a Church professing against an universal Vicar of Christ, before any claimed that Vicarship?

2. And when the Vicarship was usurped, those millions, abroad, and even within the Roman territories, that let the pretended Vicar talk, and followed their own business, and never consented to his usurpation, were of the very same Religion with those that openly protested against him: And so were those that never heard of his usurpation.

Object. But at least, (say they) you must prove a Church that hath been without the universal Vicar negatively, though not against him positively.

Answer. 1. In all reason, he that affirmeth must prove: It is not incumbent on us to prove the negative, that the Church had not such a Roman head; but they must prove that it had.

Object. But they have possession, and therefore you that would dispossess them, must disprove their title.

Answer.
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Ans. 1. This is nothing to most of the Catholike Church where they have no possession: therefore with them they confess themselves obliged to the proof.

2. This is a meer fallacious diversion: for we are not now upon the question of their Title, but the matter of fact and history: we make good the negative, that they have no Title from the Laws of Christ himself: and so will not dispossess them without disproving their pretended Title. But when the question is de facto, whether they have ever had that possession from the Apostles daies, they that affirm must prove, when we have disabled their title from the Law.

2. But what must we prove? that all the Church hath been guiltles of the Papal usurpation, or only some in every age? of all its no more necessary to us, then to prove that there have been no Hereftes since the Apostles. If a piece of the Church may turn Hereticks, or but Schismaticks, as the Novatians, and African Donatists, why may not another piece turn Papists?

3. What will you say to a man that knoweth not a Protestant, nor a Papist, or believeth only Christianity itself, and meddleth not with the Pope, any further then to say, I believe not in him, Jesus I know: and
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and the Apostles, and Scripture, and Christianity I know, but the Pope I know not: and suppose he never subscribed to the Augustane, English, or any such confession, but only to the Scripture, and the Apostles, and Nicene, and other ancient Creeds; By what shew of Justice can you require this man to prove that there hath been no Pope in every age?

4. The foundation of all our controversy is doctrinal: whether the Papal Sovereignty be Essential to the Church? or necessary to our membership? we deny it, you affirm it. If it be not Essential, it is enough to us, to prove that which is Essential: we be not bound in order to the proof of our Church it self, to prove the succession of every thing that maketh but to its better being.

Yet professing, that we do it not as necessary to our main cause, we shall ex abundanti prove the negative, that the Catholike Church hath not always owned the Papal Sovereignty, and so that there have been men that were not only Christians, but as we, Christians without Popery, and against it: and so shall both prove our Thesis, and overthrow theirs.

Arg. 4. If there have been since the R daies
daies of Christ, a Christian Church that was not subject to the Roman Pope, as the Vicar of Christ and universal Head and Governor of the Church; then the Church of which the Protestants are members, hath been visible both in its being, and its freedom from Popery. But the Antecedent is true: therefore so is the consequent.

I shall prove the Antecedent, and therein the visibility of our Church, and the non-existence in those times of the Papacy.

Arg. 1. My first Argument shall be from the general Council of Chalcedon.

If the privileges of the Roman Sea were given to it by the Bishops consequently because of the Empire of that City, and therefore equal privileges after given to Constantinople on the same account; then had not Rome those privileges from the Apostles (and consequently the whole Catholike Church was without them). But the Antecedent is affirmed by that fourth great approved Council: In Act. 16. Bin. p. 134. [We everywhere following the definitions of the holy Fathers, and the Canon, and the things that have been now read, of the hundred and fifty Bishops most beloved to God, that were congregate under the Emperour Theodosius the great of
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Pious memory, in the Royal City of Constantinople, new Rome, we also knowing them, have defined the same things concerning the privileges of the same most holy Church of Constantinople, new Rome: For the seat of old Rome, because of the Empire of that City, the Fathers consequently gave the privileges. And the hundred and fifty Bishops, most beloved of God, being moved with the same intention, have given equal privileges to the most holy seat of new Rome: reasonably judging, that the City adorned with the Empire and Senate, shall enjoy equal privileges with old Regal Rome.

Here we have the Testimony of one of the greatest general Councils, of the humane original of Rome's privileges. Bellarmin hath nothing to say, but that they spoke falsely, and that this clause was not confirmed by the Pope (which are fully answered by me elsewhere.) But this is nothing to our present business: It is a matter of fact that I use their Testimony for. And all the Bishops in two of the most approved general Councils, (called the Representative Catholike Church) were not competent witnesses in such a case, to tell us what was done, and what was not done.
The successiv[e V]isibility of the Church in those times, then we have none. The Papists can pretend to no higher testimony on their part. The Church itself therefore hath here decided the controversy.

And yet note, that even these privileges of Rome were none of his pretended universal Government.

It is in vain to talk of the Testimonies of particular Doctors, if the most renowned general Councils cannot be believed. Yet I will add an Argument from them as conjunct.

Arg. 2. Had the Roman universal Sovereignty, as essential to the Catholike Church, been known in the daies of Tertullian, Cyprian, Athanasius, Nazianzen Nyssen, Basil, Optatus, Augustine, and the other Doctors that confounded the Heresies or Schisms of those times (e. g. the Novatians, Donatists, Arrians, &c.) the said Doctors would have plainly and frequently insisted on it for the conviction of those Hereticks and Schismaticks: But they do not: therefore it was not known in those times.

The consequence of the Major is evident hence: The Doctors of the Church were at least of common wit and prudence.
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the matters which they did debate: therefore they would have insisted on this argument if then it had been known. The reason of the consequence is, because it had been most obvious, easie, and potent to dispatch their controversies. 1. When the Arrians and many other Hereticks denied Christ's eternal Godhead, had it not been the shortest expeditious course, to have cited them to the barr of the Judge of controversies, the infallible Soveraign Head of the Church; and convinced them that they were to stand to his judgement? 2. Had not this Argument been at hand, to have confounded all Heresies at once, [That which agreeth not with the Belief of the Roman Pope and Church is false: But such is your opinion: therefore]

2. So for the Donatists; when they disputed for so many years against the Catholikes, which was the true Church, had it not been Augustins shortest, surest way to have argued thus: That only is the true Church that is subject to the Pope of Rome, and adhereth to him: But so do not you: therefore.

Either the Arrians, Donatists and such others did believe the Papal Soveraignty and Vicarship, or not: If they did, 1. How
is it possible they should actually reject both the Doctrine and Communion of the Pope and Roman Church? 2. And why did not the Fathers rebuke them for sinning against conscience, and their own profession herein?

But if they did not believe the Papal Sovereignty, then 2. How came it to pass that the Fathers did labour no more to convince them of that (now supposed) fundamental Error? when 1. It is supposed as damnable a sin as many of the rest. 2. And was the maintainer of the rest. Had they but first demonstrated to them, that the Pope was their Governor and Judge, and that his Headship being essential to the Church, it must needs be of his faith, all Heresies might have been confuted, the people satisfied, and the controversies dispatched in a few words.

3. Either Arrians, Donatists, Novatians, and such like, were before their defection acquainted with the Roman Sovereignty, or not. If they were not, then it is a sign it was not commonly then received in the Church, and that there were multitudes of Christians that were no Papists: If they were, then why did not the Fathers, 1. Urge them with this as a granted truth, till they had
had renounced it? 2. And then why did they not charge this defection from the Pope upon them, among their hainous crimes? why did they not tell them, that they were subject to him as soon as they were made Christians; and therefore they should not perfidiously revolt from him? How is it that we find not this point disputed by them on both sides, yea and as copiously as the rest, when it would have ended all?

And for the Minor, that the Fathers have not thus dealt with Hereticks, the whole books of Tertullian, Nazianzen, Nyffen, Basil, Optatus, Hierom, Augustine, and others are open certain witnesses. They use no such Argument, but fill their Books with others; most imprudently and vainly, if they had known of this, and had believed it. Otherwise the Papists would never have been put to gather up a few impertinent craps to make a shew with.

We see by experience here among us, that this point is Voluminously debated; and if we differ in other matters, the Papists call us to the Roman bar, and bring in this as the principall difference. And why would it not have been so then between the Fathers, and the Donatists, Arrians, and such like, if the Fathers had believed this? It is clear hence
hence that the Papal Vicarship was then unknown to the Church of Christ.

Arg. 3. The Tradition witnessed by the greater part of the Universal Church faith, that the Papal Vicarship or Soverainty is an innovation and usurpation, and that the Catholic Church was many hundred years without it: Therefore there was then no such Papal Church.

This is not a single testimony, nor of ten thousand, or ten millions, but of the Major Vote of the whole Church; and in Councils the Major Vote stands for the whole. If this witness therefore be refused, we cannot expect that the words of a few Doctors should be credited; Nor may they expect that we credit any witness of theirs, that is not more credible.

And that the Antecedent is true, is known to the world, as we know that the Turks believe in Mahomet, by the common consent of history and travellers. Part of the Churches anathematize the Romans, and part more modestly disown them, and the generality that subject not themselves do profess that Popery is an usurpation, and that in the ancient Church it was not so; and this they have by Tradition from generation to generation. And if the Roman pretended
pretended Tradition be with them of value, the Tradition of the far greater part of the Church is with us to be of more. We must despair of satisfying them with witness, if most of the Christian world be rejected, and the Tradition of the greatest part of the Church be taken to be false in a matter of publick notorious fact.

Arg. 4. Many Churches without the verge of the Roman Empire, never subjected themselves to Rome, (and many not of many hundred years after Christ:) therefore there were visible Christian Churches from the beginning, to this day, that were not for the Roman Vicarship.

That abundance of Churches were planted by the Apostles, without the reach of the Roman Empire, is plentifully testified by the ancients, and the Papists commonly confess it. That these were under the Papal Government, all the Papists in the world cannot prove. The contrary is confessed by them, and proved by us. 1. They came not so much as to Generall Councils. 2. They had no Bishops ordained by the Pope, or any impowred by him. 3. They never appealed to him. 4. They never had any caules judged by him. 5. They performed no obedience to him, nor lived un-
der his Laws; nor scarce had any communion with him, more then the common communion that is held in Charity, and common faith and ordinances with all. Such were the Indians, the Persians, the further Armenia and Parthia, the Habassines and many more. And of long time the English and the Scots, that refused so much as to eat and drink in the same Inn with the Roman Legates: much less would obey him, so much as in the change of Easter day; we challenge them to shew us any appearance of subjection to the Pope in the generality of the Churches without the Empire.

But you say, that the Habassines were under the Patriarch of Alexandria, and he under the Pope.

Ans. 1. If that were true, yet what is that to all the rest? 2. Give us your proof that the Abassines were under the Patriarch of Alexandria, before that Patriarch broke off his communion with Rome. The Canons of Pisanus, of yesterdays invention, we regard not: Surely the true Canons of Nice (Can. 6.) measure out no more to the Patriarch of Alexandria, but Egypt, Lybia, and Pentapolis. There's no mention of Ethiopia: And its not like that the greatest part of his Province would have
have been left out. 3. If it had been so, we utterly deny that ever the Pope had the Government of the Alexandrian Patriarch: Only for a little while he had a pre- edency in honorary Title, and in Councils; s the City of London is preferred before York, but doth not Govern it at all.

Here therefore (without the Roman Em- ple) you may see those Churches that have successively been visible, and yet no Pa- lists. This your Raynerius confesseth contr. Waldens. Catalog. in Bibliothec. Patr. Tom. 4. pag. 773. saying [Armeniorum Eccle- sia, & Æthiopum, & Indorum, & cetera quae Apostoli converterunt, non subsunt Romana Ecclesia.] See Godignus de Rebus Abass- porum, of their Antiquity.

Arg. 5. The Eastern Churches within the Empire were never subjects of the Pope: therefore there have been and are Churches Visible, that neither were nor are his sub- jects.

The Antecedent I have proved in my Key for Catholicks, from the Council of Car- thage's Letters to Pope Celestine, after their reluctance of Zosimus, and divers testimo- nies from Basil and others. And they can give us themselves no plausible appearance of a proof of that subjection which they assert:
assert: no more then the younger Justice on the Bench are subject to the elder, or the Jury to the foreman, or a Master of Arts in a Colledge to a Batchelor in Divinity, or then the Mayor of Bristol is to the Mayor of York.

1. The Pope never chose the Patriarch of Alexandria, Antioch, &c. 2. It did not belong to him to ordain them: nor did he authorize any other to do it, nor did they receive or hold their power from him. 3. They receive no Laws of his to Rule by. 4. They were not commanded or Judged by him. 5. The Patriarch of Constantinople had equall Priviledges with him. So that here is nothing like to Sovereignty and Subjection, nor any acknowledgement of an universal Vicar of Christ. Communion indeed they held with Rome, as they did with one another, till pride divided them; but Communion is one thing, and Subjection is another. The Greek Church never gave them this.

Arg. 6. My next Argument to prove the Novelty of their Church as Papal, and consequently that the Universal Church was void of Popery, and therefore of the same Religion with Protestants, shall be from the testimony of their own most magnified Bishops.
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1. Here he affirmeth that the Title of Universal was never used by any of his predecessors nor received. 2. That it is a prophane Title. 3. That it is an injury to other Patriarchs. 4. That its unbeseeming a Christian mind to assume it. 5. That its undue.
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undue. 6. He persuaded the Bishops of Alexandria and Antioch to give it to no man whosoever.

Obj. But he faith that the Council of Chalcedon offered it him. Anf. 1. If he renounce it as undue and prophane, and say that de facto none of his predecessors took it, this is as much as we desire. 2. That at the Council of Chalcedon, near 150 years before this, two Deacons (that they say have no Votes) call'd Theodorus and Iphichirion, did superscribe their Libels, to Leo Universal Archbishop, I find; but no more: And this is it that Gregory here brags of: And what's two Deacons to the Council?

Obj. But it is only the Name and not the Thing that he disclaims, and that is in modesty. Anf. 1. How then could he censure the name as undue, injurious, prophane, and blasphemous, if he owned the Thing? seeing aperta sunt verba rebus: words are to be fitted to Things. 2. But I shall confute this fully from his following words.

[Ita ut Universalis sibi tentet ascribere, & omnia quae soli unicapiti coherent, videlicet Christo, per elationem pomputici sermonis, ejusdem Christi sibi studet membra subjungere.]

Here it is plain 1. That it is the Thing as well
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well as the Name that Gregory wrote against. 2. And that it is also a palpable fiction of the Papists (for want of a better) that Gregory opposeth only such an Universal Episcopacy as taketh away all Episcopacy from others. Ridiculous! They would make us believe, that John of Constantinople would have had no Bishop in the world but himself; and that the Council that gave him the Title, intended all to debase themselves; and that there were no Bishops under him ever after; when other Councils confirmed his Title. On the contrary, you here see 1. That there is but one Head, even Christ. 2. And that John's sin in arrogating the Title [Universal] was, that he would subjugate, or subject all Christ's Members to himself. And is not this now the very form of Popery, which Gregory makes so great a sin? even to subject all Christ's Members to one, as an Universal Patriarch or Bishop? Yea much higher Titles do they arrogate, even to be [the Vicar of Christ, and God, and in stead of Christ and God; and to be the Vice-Christ.] He proceeds [Nec mirum quod illetentator, qui initium omnium peccati sit esse superbia, &c.] Making the Devil the author of this Title.
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He adds a weighty reason [si enim hoc dici licenter permittitur, honor Patriarcharum omnium negatur. Et cum fortasse is in errore perit qui Universalis dicitur, nullum jam Episcopus remansisse in statu veritatis inventur] or as more plainly before c. 76 [fol. 180. in the Epist. to the Emperor] Maurice [si igitur illud nomen in ea Ecclesia siti quisquam arripuit, quod apud honosorum omnium judicium fuit: Universalis ergo Ecclesia, quod abit, a statu suo corruit quando is qui appellatur Universalis cadit].

The reason is plain, because the Head of every political society is essential to it and therefore if the Head of the Universal Church fall away to Herefie or Infidelity the Church falls: as Bellarmine knew when he told us, that if the Pope should err in determining, the Church would be bound to take evil for good, and vice versa.

He proceeds in the same Epist. ad Mau Imperat. [Sed absit à Cordibus Christianorum nomen istud blasphemia, &c.] [Far be this name of blasphemy from the hearts of Christians, &c.]

And after again faith [Sed nullus eorum unquam hoc singularitatis vocabulum assumpsit, nec mi consensit] That none o
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the Roman Bishops did ever assume this name of singularity, nor consent to use it.

And therefore he concludes to the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, c. 80. [Oportet ergo ut constanter ac sine prejudicio servetis scint accepistis Ecclesiæ, & nihil sibi in nobis hac tentatio diabolica usurpationis ascribat. State fortæs, state securi; Scriptum Universalis nominis falsitate, nec dare unquam, nec recipere presumatis] He chargeth them never to give or take writing with the falsity of this name [Universal] as being from the Devils tentation.

And in Ep. 38. c. 82. to John Const. himself he calls it [Nefandum elationis vocabulum] and the cause [Nefandum & prophanum tumorem] and after he calls it [the usurping of a proud and foolish word.]

To all this Bellarmine miserably answereth de Pontif. Rom. I. 2. c. 31. that the title [Universal] as it signifieth a sole Bishop to whom all other are but Vicars, is indeed profane, sacrilegious and Antichristian, and is it that Gregory speaks against, but not as it excludeth not particular Bishops.] To which I answer, 1. To be the Vicarius of a Superior, is not an exclusion. The Pope faith he is the Vicar of Christ the chief Pastour
Pastours and Bishop of souls: and all Pastours are to Preach the Word of reconciliation in his name and head, 1 Cor. 5. 19. and yet they are not thereby excluded from being Pastours. If to be Christ's servants, may consist with Episcopacy; much more to be his Vicarii over their particular flocks. Rather this is too high an honour for us to assume. I do not think that all the Clergy under the Pope, do think themselves honoured so much as they should be if they were his Vicars. 2. Hath not that man told his conscience to his cause, that will perswade the world that the Patriarch of Constantinople was about to unbishop all the Bishops in the world except himself? Let any man shew us by tolerable proof, that John of Constantinople did claim any higher a power over all others, or would bring other Bishops by his Universality to be lower, then the Pope of Rome doth by his Universality, and then I will confess that Papists only have eyes and reason, and all the world besides are blind, and mad, or beasts. Their cause is at a fair pass, when they must fly to such palpable falshoods, as makes them the wonder of their sober readers. 3. I proved before from the express words of Gregory, that it is Superiority of
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of Government, and making all other Bishops subject to him, that he condemned in the Patriarch of Constantinople. And no doubt he made not the least of his arrogancy: Nor do I believe that it can be proved that John, or the Council that gave him the Title, did ever intend so much as a Universal Government, which the Pope now usurpeth; but only a Primacy before all, which Popes were then striving for. For the Greeks to this day disclaim it, and they never strove to exercise it.

I will give you more of Gregory's words to put the question past doubt, Cap. 82. Ep. 38. to John, faith [Humilitatem ergo frater charissime totis visceribus dilige, per quam cunctorum fratrum concordia & sancta Universalis Ecclesia unitas valeat custodiri: Certe Paulus Apostolus cum audiret quosdam dicere, Ego sum Pauli, ego Apollo, ego vero Cepha, hanc dilacerationem corporis Dominici, per quam membra ejus aliis quodammodo se capitibus sociabant, vehementissime perhorrescens exclamavit, dicens: Null quid Paulus pro vobis crucifixus est: aut in nomine Pauli baptizati estis? Sic ergo ille membra Dominici corporis certis extra Christum quasi capitibus, & ipsis quidem Apostolis subjici particulariter evitavit: Tu quid

S 2 Christo
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Christo Universalis scilicet Ecclesia capiti, in extremi judicii es dicturus examine, qui cuncta ejus membra tibimet conaris Universalis appellatio ne supponere!

Here you see 1. That the unity and concord of the Church is not maintained by universal Headship, but by fraternal communion and humility. 2. That it wounded Paul, and should do us, to see the Church make men as it were their heads, though they were Apostles, and though Peter was one of them: and that extra Christum, beside Christ, none, no not Peter should be as a Head to Christ's members. 3. Much more abominable is it for any man to pretend to be the universal Bishop or Head to all Christ's members.

4. That the sin of this usurpation was against Christ the Churches Head, and that before him in Judgement the usurper of universal Episcopacy will be confounded for this very thing. 5. And that the crime of this title of universal Bishop was, that it endeavoured to put all Christ's members under him that used it (tibimet supponere:) not to exclude all other Bishops, but to put under him all Christ's members. These are the words of Gregory: and if men can make what their list of words so full and plain
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and oft repeated in many Epistles, what hope have they that their Judge of Controversies should do any more to end their Controversies then Scripture hath done, which they cannot understand without such an unintelligible Judge?

He proceeds (ibid.) [Quis ergo in hoc tam perverso vocabulo, nisi ille ad imitandum proponitur, qui despectis Angelorum legionibus, secum socialiter constitutis, ad culmen conatus est singularitatis erumpere, ut & nulli subesse, & solus omnibus præsse videtur.] He maketh him the imitator of the Devil, that aspiring above the rest of the Angels, fell by pride.

But Bellarmine hath three Reasons to prove yet that Gregory after all this meant not the universal Headship or Episcopacy indeed. 1. Because the holy Council of Chalcedon offered it him. Ans. 1. A fair offer! because two or three Deacons inscribed their Libels to him with the name of universal Archbishop: And we must believe that the Council approved of this, though we cannot prove it. Or if they called him the Head, as the City of London is the Head City in England, and the Earle of Arundel the Head Earle, or the Lord Chancelour the Head Judge, that yet have no
no Government of the rest, what advantage were this to the Roman Vicarship? 
2. It Gregory judge the name so blasphemous, when it signifieth an universal Governor of the Church, surely he believed that the Council offered it not to him in that fence, but as he was the Episcopus prima sedis. 3. But again, I say the matter of fact is it that I am enquiring of: And I have the testimony of this Roman Bishop that none of his Predecessors would receive that name. 

2. But faith Bellarmine, he faith that the care of the whole Church was committed to Peter, which is all one.] Ans. 1. But so it was committed also to the rest of the Apostles: Paul had on him the care of all the Churches, that claimed no Headship. 
2. He expressly excluseth Peters Headship, both in the words before recited, and after, saying [Certe Petrus Apostolus primum membrum (or rather as Dr. James Corrupt. of the Fathers Part. 2. p. 60 faith he found it in seven written Copies, [Apostolorum primus membrum] Sancta & Universalis Ecclesiae est: Paulus, Andreas, Johannes, quid claud quam singularum sunt plebium capita? Et tamen sub uno capitone membra sunt Ecclesiae] that is [Peter the first of
of the Apostles, is a member of the holy and universal Church: Paul, Andrew, John, what are they but the Heads of the singular flocks of the people? And yet all are members of the Church under one Head] (that is, Christ) so that Christ is the only Head: Peter is but a member, as the other Apostles are; but not a Head.

3. But faith Bellarmine, Gregory could not but know that the title of Episcopus Universalis Ecclesia, which is all one, had been oft assumed by the Popes.]

Ans. 1. Whether was Bellarmine or Gregory the wiser man? at least the fitter interpreter of those words: would Gregory have made them so blasphemous, foolish, profane, and devilish, if he had thought them of the same importance with those which his Predecessors used? Or was he so silly as not to know that this might have been retorted on him? What a silly for, what a wicked dissembling hypocrite, doth Bellarmine feign Pope Gregory to have been? 2. But verily did the Learned Jesuite believe himself that [Universalis Episcopus Ecclesia] & Episcopus Ecclesia Universalis] are of the same signification? Every Bishop in the world, that adhered to the common Communion of Christians and
and was a Catholike, was wont to be called [a Bishop of the Catholike Church,] and is indeed such; but he is not therefore [the universal Bishop of the Church.]

But Bellarmine will not charge Gregory of such horrid dissimulation without reason. His first reason is, [that Gregory did it for caution, to prevent abuse.]

Anf. What! charge it with blasphemy, prophaness, devilism, wronging all the Church, and also to excommunicate men for it, and all this to prevent abuse, when he held it lawful! Did hell ever hatch worse hypocrisy then this that he fathers on his holiest Pope?

But 2. His other reason is worse then this; forsooth [because the question was only whether John of Constantinople should have this title, and not whether the Bishop of Rome should have it: and therefore Gregory simply and absolutely pronounceth the name sacrilegious and prophan, that is, as given to John, (but not to himself) yet he refused it himself, though due to him, that he might the better repress the pride of the Bishop of Constantinople.] Anf. The sum is then, that Gregory did meerly lye and dissimble for his own end. He labours to prove that blasphemous, sacrilegious, &c. which
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which he desired; But we will not judge odiously of the Pope as Papists do. Doth he charge the other Patriarchs and Bishops to give it no man? doth he blame them after another Epistles that gave him that Title? and doth he profess that never any of his predecessors received it, and make so hainous matter of it, and yet all this while approve as for himself? Who will believe a Saint to be so diabolical, that calls it an imitation of the Devil? You see now what the Roman Cause is come to, and whether their Church as Papal, that is, their Universal Sovereignty, be not sprung up since Gregories layes.

Hear him a little further (ibid.) [Atque ut cuncta breviter singulo locutionis adstringam: sancti ante Legem, sancti sub Lege, sancti sub Gratia, omnes his perscientes Corpus Domini in membris sunt Ecclesia constitut, & nemo se unquam Universalum vocare voluit: Vesta autem sanctitas agnoscat quantum apud se tumeat, quod illo nomine vocari appetit, quo vocari nullus presumpsit, qui vera-citer sanctus fuit.] That is, [And to bind up all in the girdle of speech, the Saints before the Law, the Saints under the Law, the Saints under Grace, all these making up the Body of Christ, were placed among the Members
Members of the Church, yet never man would be called Universal. Let your Holi-
ess therefore consider how with your felt you swell, that desire to be called by that name, by which no man hath presumed to be called that was truly Holy.]

Well! if this be not as plain as Protestants speak against Popery, I will never hope to understand a Pope.

I only add, that Gregory makes this usurpation of the name of an Universal Bishop a forerunner of Antichrist: And that Pope Pelagius condemned it before him; which Gratian puts into their Decrees, or Canon Law.

And that he took the Churches authority to be greater then his own, when he tells John, [Sed quoad in mea correptione de spicior, restat ut Ecclesiam debeam adhibere.]

Lib. 7. Ep. 30. Dixi nec mihi vos, nec cui- quam alteri tale aliquid scribere debere: & ecce in prafatione epifola quam ad meipsum qui prohibui direxistis, s. perba appellationis verbum, Universalis me Papam dicentes, im- primere curastis. Quod peto dulcissima san- etitas vestra, ultra non faciat: quin vobis sub- trahitur, quod alteri plusquam ratio exigit, præbetur. ] See then whether it be not judged by him undue to himself as well as to others. And
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And what the weight of the matter emed to him, judge more by these words, p. 83. l. 4. ad Arrian. In isto scelesto voca-
do consentire, nihil est alius quam fidem
edere.] [To consent in that wicked word, nothing else but to lose (or destroy) the
sith. ] That is, apostasie.

And l. 6. c. 194. Mauric. Aug. Ego fi-
enter dico, quia quisquis se universalem sa-
erdotem vocat, vel vocare désiderat, in ela-
ione.sua Antichristum præcurrit; quia su-
erbiendo se cæteris præponit, nec dispar
sua superbia ad errorem ducitur.]

Arg. 7. The Papists themselves confess,
hat multitudes of Christians, if not most by
ar, have been the opposers of the Pope, or
one of his subjects : therefore by their
Testimony there have been visible Churches
of such.

Æneas Sylvius, after Pope Pius 2. faith,
small regard was had to the Church of Rome
before the Council of Nice. Bellarmine
faith, This is partly true, by reason of the
persecution of those ages, and partly false.
Ans. But, if true, we prove the matter of
fact, and leave Bellarmine better to prove his
Reason. If it be false, then their own Histori-
rians are not to be believed, though worthy
to be Popes. And then what historical Testi-
mony will they believe?
Voluminously do their Historians mention on the Opposition of the Greeks on one side, and of the Emperours and Kings, and Divines, that were under the Popes Patriarchal power; as *Mich. Goldastus* in abundance of Treatises hath manifested.

I gave before the testimony of *Reynerius* that the Churches planted by the Apostles were not under the Pope.

I shall once more recite the words of *Melch. Canus, Loc. Theol. lib. 6. cap. 7. fol. 201. [Not only the Greeks, but almost all (N. B.) the rest of the Bishops of the whole world, have vehemently fought to destroy the Privileedge of the Church of Rome: and indeed they had on their side, both the Arms of Emperours, and the greater Number of Churches; and yet they could never prevail to abrogate the Power of the One Pope of Rome. ] By the Papists confession then most of the Churches, and almost all the Bishops of the whole world, and the Emperours & their Armies, have vehemently fought to abrogate the Popes power, and destroy the Priviledges of Rome.

*Reynerius* his testimony concerning the Antiquity of the Waldenses, as from Pope *Sylvesters* dayes, if not the Apostles, hath been oft cited: Had they been but from *Gregories*
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Regories dayes, it had been enough, when
we have his own Testimony, that no Bishop
in Rome would own (to that time) that
vexed, profane, sacrilegious, foolish,
alphemous, dividing name of Universal
Triarch or Bishop, which who ever holds
up, destroys the faith.

Arg. 8. The next Argument should have
been from the Historical Testimony of the
Ancients, that the Papal Soveraignty was
then no part of the Churches faith, nor
owned by them. But here to produce the
testimonies of all ages, would be to write
a Volume in Folio, on this one Argument
alone: For how can the History of all Ages
be so particularly delivered out of such a
Multitude of Books, but in a multitude of
words?

And it is done already so fully, that I
provoke the Papists to answer the Cata-
logues and historical Evidence given in, if
they can. If you ask where, I will now only
tell you of, 1. Blondell against Perron de
Primatu in Ecclesia (in French) that shews
you the torrent of Antiquity against the
Papal Soveraignty. 2. Molinaus (in French)
de Novitate Papismi against the same Per-
ron. 3. Bishop Usher, de statu & succession
Ecclesiarum, and his Answer to the Jesuites
challenge.
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4. Dr. Field of the Church who \textit{lib. 5.} answereth Bellarmines allegations from all sort of Antiquity, which at their strength. I pass by many others, som of which I have named in the foresaid 3. Dispute of the \textit{safe Religion:} where also I have produced more of this evidence then the can answer. At least much more then you have returned me in your last Paper for the contrary, to which I desire your answer. For its in vain to write one thing so oft.

I shall only instance in the currant Testimony of their own Historians, of the Beginning of their Universal Headship. Sayt. Regino Chron. l. 1. An. 808. p. 13. [\textit{Bonifaci}us obtniuit apud Phocam Principem, ut \textit{sedes Romana Caput esset omnium Ecclesiarum: quia Ecclesia Constantinoplitana primum \textit{scrib}ebat.}


So Marianus Scotus in Phoc. [\textit{Bonifaci}us P 67. impetravit a Phoca Cæsare ut \textit{sedes Apostolica Romana Caput esset Ecclesia, quum antea Constantinopolis Primam omnium \textit{scriber}et.} The same hath \textit{Sigebertus Gem-}}

\textit{blac.}
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Beneventus de Rambaldis Lib. Augustali, in Phoca [Phocas occisor Man-

ii—qui Primus constituit, Quod Ec-

Cyprius Constantin. supremum se nominaret. ]

ark here the [Primus Constituit. ] So Be-

P. Diaconus, Anastasius, Pomponius La-

And of the Novelty of their worship, with Platina in Gregor. 1. [ What should I

y more of this holy man! whose whole

stitution of the Church office, specially

he old one, was invented and approved by

him? which Order I would we did follow:

en Learned men would not at this day ab-

or the reading of the Office ——— ] So

hat here is all invented new by Gregory

which was hardly received in Spain ) and

et that changed since.

Arg. 9. If the Generality of Christians

the first ages, and many (if not most) in

ater ages, have been free from the Es-

entials of the Papists faith, then their faith

th had no successive Visible Church pro-

ing it in all ages; but the Christians that

gainst it have been Visible: But the

ntecedent is true: as I prove in some in-

ances.

1. It
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1. It is an Article of their faith determined in a General Council at Lateran and Florence, that the Pope is above a Council. But that this hath not been successively received, the Council of Basel and Constance witness, making it a new Heresie.

2. It is an Article of their faith, that General Council is above the Pope: for is so determined at Basel and Constance: But that this hath had no successive duration, the Council of Lateran and Florence witness.

3. It is an Article of their faith, that the Pope may depose Princes for denying Transubstantiation and such like Heresies, and also such as will not exterminate such Hereticks from their dominions, and may give their dominions to others, and discharge their Subjects from their oaths and fidelity. For it is determined so in a Council at Lateran: But this hath not been so from the beginning: Not when the 13. Chapter of the Romans was written: Not till the day of Constantine: Not till the days of Gregory that spake in contrary language to Princes: And Goldastus his three Volumes of Antiquities shew you, that there had been many Churches still against it.

4. It is an Article of their faith, that the
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Body and Blood, together with the Soul and Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, is truly, really, and substantially in the Eucharist, and that there is a Change made of the whole substance of Bread into the body, and of the whole substance of Wine into the blood, which they call Transubstantiation. So the Council of Trent: But the Catholic Church hath been of a contrary judgement from age to age, as among many others, Edm. Albertinus de Eucharist. hath plainly evinced (though a quarreller hath denied it and little more): And its proved, in that successively they judged Sense and Reason by it a competent discernor of Bread and Wine.

5. It is now de fide that the true Sacrament is rightly taken under one kind (without the cup) as the Councils of Constance and Trent shew. But the Catholic Church hath practised, and the Apostles and the Church taught otherwise, as the Council of Constance, and their Writers ordinarily confess.

6. It is an Article of their faith (as appears in the Trent Oath) that we must never take and interpret Scripture, but according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers: But the Catholic Church
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Church before these Fathers could not be of that mind: and the Fathers themselves are of a contrary mind: and so are many learned Papists.

7. It is an Article of their faith, that there is a Purgatory, and that the souls there detained are holpen by the suffrages of the faithful. But the latter was strange to all the old Catholick Church (as Bishop Ufher and others have proved) and the very being of Purgatory, was but a new, doubtfull, indifferent opinion of some very few men about Augustines time.

8. It is now an Article of their faith, that the holy Catholick Church of Rome is the mother and mistris of all Churches. But have shewed here and elsewhere, that the Catholick Church judged otherwise, and doth for the most part to this day.

9. It is now an Article of their faith, that their Traditions are to be received with equall pious affection and reverence as the holy Scripture. But the Catholick Church did never so believe.

10. The Council of Basil made it de fide that the Virgin Mary was conceived without Original sin: But the Catholick Church never judged so.

11. Its determined by a Council now, that
the people may not read the Scripture in a known tongue without the Popes License: But the Catholic Church never so thought, as I have proved, Disp. 3 of the Safe Religion.

12. The Books of Maccabees and others are now taken into the Canon of faith, which the Catholic Church received not as such: as Dr. Cosin, and Dr. Reignolds have fully proved.

To this I might add the Novelty of their Worship and Discipline; but it would be too tedious: and I have said enough of these in other writings. See Dr. Challoner, pag. 88, 89.

In 16. points Dr. Challoner proveth your Novelty from your Confessions: Indeed his Book de Eccles. Cath. though small, is a full answer to your main Question.

Arg. 10. If Multitudes (yea the far greatest part) of Christians in all ages have been ignorant of Popery, but not of Christianity, then hath there been a succession of Visible Professors of Christianity that were no Papists: but the antecedent is true: therefore so is the consequent.

In this age it is an apparent thing, that the far greatest part are ignorant of formal Popery. 1. They confess themselves that the common people, and most of the nobi-
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lity of Habassia, Armenia, Greece, Russia, and most other Eastern Churches that are not Papists, are ignorant of the Controversie.

2. They use to tell us here among Protestants, that there is not one of many that know what a Papist is. 3. We know that of those that go under the name of Papists, there is not one of a multitude knoweth. We hear it from the mouths of those we speak with: I have not met with one of ten of the poorer sort of them, even here among us, that knoweth what a Papist or Popery is; but they are taught to follow their Priests, and to say that theirs is the true Church and old Religion, and to use their Ceremonious worship, and to forbear coming to our Churches, &c. and this is their Religion. And in Ireland they are yet far more ignorant: And its well known to be so in other parts: Their Priests they know, and the Pope they hear of, as some person of eminent Power in the Church: But whether he be the Universal Vicar of Christ, and be over all others as well as them, & whether this be of Gods institution, or by the grant of Emperours or Councils, &c. they know not. And no wonder, when the Papists think that the Council of Chalcedon spoke falsly of the humane Original of the
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The Primacy in the Imperial territories: And when the Councils of Basil and Constance knew not whether Pope or Council was the Head.

And that the people were as ignorant and much more in former ages, they testify themselves: And before Gregory's dayes they must needs be ignorant of that which was not then risen in the world.

Yea Dr. Field hath largely proved, *Append. lib. 3* that even the many particular points in which the Papists now differ from us, were but the opinions of a faction among them before Luther: and that the Western Church before Luther was Protestant, even in those particular Controversies; though this is a thing that we need not prove. And as Dr. Potter tells them, pag. 68. [The Roman Doctors do not fully and absolutely agree in any one point among themselves, but only in such points wherein they agree with us: In the other disputed between us, they differ one from another as much almost as they differ from us.] He appeals for this to Bellarmines Tomes. Though I cannot undertake to make this good in every point, yet that proper Popery was held but by a Faction in the Western Church, even at its height
The successive visibility of the Church height before Luther, is easily made good. 

He that readeth but the Writers before Luther, and in History noteth the desires of Emperours, Kings, and Universities, and Bishops, for Reformation of the things that we have reformed, may soon see this to be very true. It was Avitas Leges & consuetudines Anglia (as Reg. Hoveden and Matth. Paris in H. 2. shew) that the Pope here damned, and anathematized all that favoured and observed them (O tender Father, even to Kings! O enemy of Novelties!) The German History collected by Reuberus, Pistorus, Freherus and Goldastus, shews it as plain as day light, that a Papal Faction by fury and turbulency, kept under the far greater part of the Church by force, that indeed dissented from them, even from Hildebrands dayes till Luther's, or near. Saith the Apologia Henrici 4. Imperat. in M. Freheri Tom. i. p. 178. Behold Pope Hildebrands Bishops, when doubtless they are murderers of Souls and bodies—such as deservedly are called the Synagogue of Satan—yet they write, that on his and on their side (or party) is the holy Mother Church; When the Catholick, that is, the Universal Church, is not in the Schism of any side, (or parties) but in the Universality
And p. 179. [See how this Minister of the Devil is beside himself, and would draw us with him into the ditch of perdition, that writeth that Gods holy Priesthood is with only 13. or few more Bishops of Hildebrands: and that the Priesthood of all the rest through the world are separated from the Church of God: when certainly, not only the testimony of Gregory and Innocent, but the judgement of all the holy Fathers agree with that of Cyprian—that he is an Alien, prophane, an enemy; that he cannot have God for his Father, that holdeth not the Unity of the Church: which he after describeth to have one Priesthood.] Et p. 181. [But some that go out from us say and write, that they defend the party of their Gregory: not the Whole, which is Christ's, which is the Catholick Church of Christ.] And p. 180. [But our Adversaries (that went from us, not we from them) use thus to commend themselves—We are the Catholicks, we are in the Unity of the Church.] So the Writer calls them Catholicks, and us that hold the faith of the holy Fathers, that consent with all good men, that love peace and brotherhood,----us he calls
calls Schismaticks and Hereticks, and I communicate, because we resist not the King—— And p. 181. [Isidore faith, Ety. J. 8. The Church is called Catholick, because it is not as the conventicles of Heretics confined in certain countries, but diffuse through the whole world: therefore they have not the Catholick faith that are in part, and not in the Whole which Christ hath redeemed, and must reign with Christ.] They that confess in the Creed that they believe the holy Catholick Church and being divided into parties hold not the Unity of the Church: which Unity, believers being of one heart and one soul, properly belongs to the Catholick Church. ] Schol. this Apol.

One Objection I must here remove; which is all and nothing: viz. That the Armenians, Greeks, Georgians, Abassines, and many others here named, differ from Protestants in many points of faith; and therefore they cannot be of the same Church.

Ans. 1. They differ in nothing Essential to our Church or Religion, nor near the Essence. 2. Protestants differ in some lesser points, and yet you call them all Protestants your selves. 3. I prove undeniably from your own pens, that men differing in mat-
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ers of faith, are all taken to be of your Church, and so of one Church, (and therefore you contradict your selves in making all points of faith to be Essentials of the Christian Religion or Church.)

1. The Council of Basil and Constance differed de fide with the Pope and the Council of Lateran and Florence: They expressly affirm their doctrine to be de fide, that the Council is above the Pope, and may depose him, &c. and the contrary Heresie. And Pighius (Hierarch. Eccles. lib. 6.) faith, that these Councils went [against the undoubted faith and judgement of the Orthodox Church itself.]

2. Their Saint Tho. Aquinas, and most of their Doctors with him, differ from the second Council of Nice, in holding the Cross and Image of Christ to be worshipped with Latria, which that Council determined against:

See more Arguments in my Key for Cath. p. 127, 128. and after.

I will now add a Testimony sufficient to silence Papists in this point: and that is, The Determination of the Theological faculty of Paris under their great Seal, against one Joh. de Montesomo ordinis Praedic. as you may find it after the rest of the Errors rejected
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rejected by that University, in the end of Lombard, printed at Paris 1557. pag. 426.

Their 3. Conclusion is, that [Saint Thom. Aquin. doctrine is not so approved by the Church, as that we must believe that it is in no part of it erroneous de fide (in matter of faith) or hereticall. They prove it, because it hath many contradictions, even in matter of faith; and therefore they ought not to believe it not hereticall. Here fol. 426, 427. they give six examples of his contradictions; and therefore they conclude, that though he were no Heretick (because not pertinacious) yet they ought not to believe that his doctrine was in no part hereticall, or erroneous in the faith. They further argue thus [If we must believe his doctrine not hereticall, &c. this should be chiefly, because it is approved by the Church. But there is some doctrine much more approved by the Church then the doctrine of S. Thom. which yet is in some part of it hereticall or erroneous in the faith: therefore—— The Minor they prove by many examples. The first is of Peters doctrine, Gal. 2. (I own not this by citing it:) The second is of Cyprian. The third of Hierom, and they add, that the same may be said of Augustine, and many more approved Doctors. The
The fourth example is Lombard himself, who they say hath somewhat erroneous in the faith. The fifth is Gratian, who had he per-
tinaciously adhered to his doctrine, they say, had been a manifest Heretick: And (say they) some say the like of the Ordinary Glosses of the Bible, which yet seem of greater authority than Aquinas. The sixth example is of some not Canonized Saints, as Anselm. Cantuar. Hugo de Sancto Victore, and others, as authentick as S. Thomas. And (say they) his Canonization, hinders not, which some pretend as of great colour--To say that S. Tho. in some part of his doctrine erred in faith, derogates not from his Canonization, nor from the approbation of his Theological doctrine: even as to say this of other Saints and chief Doctors derogateth not from their Canonization or approbation. For as the Church by Canonizing one a Saint, doth not thereby approve all his Deeds, so in approving his doctrine, it doth not thereby approve all his sayings or writings, but only that which is not retracted by himself, or corrected by another, or deservedly to be corrected as contrary to truth.

And now when Fathers, even the chief, and your Saints and highest Doctors have this
this Testimony from the famous University of Paris, to have somewhat heretical or erroneous in the faith (and so who among you is free?) I leave it to modesty to judge, whether the Greeks, Armenians, &c. and we, are not of one Faith, Religion, and Catholic Church, for all our differences in some points! Have you had all these Nations man by man before your bar, and convinced them of pertinaciousness in heresie? If not, call them not Hereticks till you are willing to be called such your selves, and that by your selves.

And thus I have evinced, I. That the Church of which the Protestants are Members, hath been Visible since the dayes of Christ on earth. 2. And ex abundanti, that the Papal Church as Papal hath not been visible, and that Christian Churches without Papal Soveraignty have been Visible since Gregories dayes, and the whole Catholick Church was such before. And you see both in the Essentiaalls, and in the freedom from the Romish Vice-Christ, where our Church hath been before Luther; even since Christ.

Sir, I have performed this task on this supposed condition, that you will now do the
the like as to your own Church; and send me in solid Arguments your proof of this Thesis.

[The Church of which the Subjects of the Pope are Members, hath been Visible ever since the days of Christ on earth.]

Where note, that it is not the Visibility of your Church as Christian, United in Christ the Head, that is in Question: We grant, as Christians, all of you are of the true Christian Church that destroy not your Christianity: But it is your new Church form, as Papal, that we question, and renounce. Protestants are of no Church but the Christian united in Christ: The name Protestant signifieth not any essentiall of their Church, but their Rejection of your Church as Headed by the Pope: You are therefore to prove that your Catholick Church as Headed by the Pope hath been visible in all ages.

And here I must in Justice expect, that you give us such a Definition as you will stand to through the dispute, 1. Of [the Church] 2. Of [the Pope] and 3. [Of the Subjects of the Pope] or [Papists.] The term [Roman Catholicks] would but divert and elude: For it is not as [Romane] that we oppose you, that is, as inhabitants of
of Rome, or as subject to him as a Bishop of Rome: Nor is it as [Catholicks] is, as of the Universal Christian Church, but as [Papists] that is, [subjects of the Pope as universal Sovereign, or Bishop.]

Dispute of terms not agreed on, is of hour: Define first, or you do nothing find of your Writers, some by the Church mean [the Pope] as Greater Defender, cap. lib. 3. de Verbo Dei, pag. 1450, 1451. [the Church (faith he) we mean the Pope of Rome] and [per Ecclesiam Papam intertantur: Non abnno.] Some by [the Church mean [a Council] and what they mean [a Council] I know not well. And some mean [the Roman Clergy] i.e., of the Diocess: And some mean [all the Clergy under the Pope: ] And some mean [all people that are his subjects.] I have given you the Reason of my doubting of your meaning in these terms, in a Book come of the Press since your last to me, where have answered most of yours.

2. Let me desire of you such proofs in your own judgement are cogent. I suppose (as I have there told you, Key pag. 2 cap. 12.) that none of you will take either Sense, Reason, Scripture, the Tradition, judgement of most of the Church so
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Sufficient proof: but yet we will accept of them, when you argue but ad hominem: for we renounce them not. I think what ever you say, that is not the Determination of the Pope or a Council by him approved (which is all one) you will give us leave to judge that you are uncertain your selves whether you say true in it, if de fide. Saith Skul. Revisus Apol. pro Bellarm. c. 6. p. 255. The Popes Power is as the hinge, the foundation, and (that I may comprehend all in a word) the summ of the Christian faith.

Greg. Valentin. Anal. fidi. l. 8. c. 7. [ The Authority that resideth in the Pope alone, is called the Authority of the Church and Councils.

Bellar. de Rom. Pont. l. 4. c. 3. [ It is apparent that the whole firmness (or strength) of Councils is from the Pope; not partly of the Pope, and partly of the Council.

Binnius Vol. 2. p. 515. faith [ Every Council hath just so much strength and authority, as the Apostolike seat bestoweth on it.] But I leave you to give us your own judgement.

Your Testimonies from Fathers can seem of no great weight to us, while you so slight them your selves as commonly you do: with what lies, or Errors, or other in-

compe-
competency, you charge Justin Mart, Irenæus, Tertullian, Origen, Victorinus, Cyprian, Eusebius, Epiphanius, Prudentius, Hierom, Laëntius, Augustine,Procopius, Theodoret, Isidore, Euthymius, Sozomen, Oecumenius, Bernard, and all the Fathers, see Dr. James Corrupt. of Fath. Part. 4. p. 2, 3. Tell us therefore how far you credit them.

Sir if you refuse thus first to explain your terms, and then prove the Visibility of your Church, as Papal, successively, as I have proved the Visibility of the Church that I am of, I shall be forced to conclude, that you love not the light, but at once give up your cause, and the reputation of your impartial Love of truth.

Addenda Miscellanea.


Comment. in epist. Synodal. Basil. p. 31 & p. 40. Impress. Colon. 1613. faith that [The Provinces subject to the four great Patriarchs from the beginning of the Christian
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And if the Pope be a Patriarch, it is by the Church; if he be Head of all Churches, it is by the Church. And whereas we have said that it is expressed in the Council of Nice, that many Princes were subject to the Church of Rome by Ecclesiastical custom, and no other right; the Synod should do the greatest injury to the Bishop of Rome, if it should attribute those things to him only from custom, which were his due by Divine Right.] This Citation I take from Bishop Bromhall, having not seen the Book my self.

The Popish Bishop of Calcedon, Survey cap. 5. [To us it sufficeth that the Bishop of Rome is Saint Peter's Successour; and this all the Fathers testify, and all the Catholick Church believeth: but whether it be jure divino, or humano, is no point of Faith.] An ingenuous Confession destroying Popery.

See Aubert Miræus notitia Episcopat. where in the antient Notit. and Lenuclavins, record of Leo Philos. Impera. There are none of the Abaffine, or other extraimperial Nations under the old Patriarchs. Cajander Epist. 37. D. Ximenio (operum p. 1132.) faith of that learned pious Bishop
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shop of Valentinia Monlucius, (so highly commended by Thuanus and other learned men) that he said, *Si sibi permittatur in his tribus capitibus* [viz. forma publicarum precum, de ritibus Baptismi, de formâ Eucharistiae, sine Missâ] Christianam formam ad normam prisci Ecclesiae Institutam legi, confidere se quod ex quinquaginta mill. quos habet in sua Dioecesi à presenti disciplina Ecclesiae diversos, quadraginta millia ad Ecclesiasticam unionem sit reducturus] That is, If he had but leave in these three heads (the form of publick Prayers, of the rites of Baptism, and the form of the Eucharist or the Mass) to follow the Christian form Instituted according to the rule of the Antient Church, he was confident that of fifty thousand that he had in his Dioecesis that differed from the present discipline of the Church, he should reduce forty thousand to Ecclesiastical union. ] By this testimony it is plain that the Church of Rome hath forsaken the antient Discipline and Worship of the Church by Innovation; and that the Protestants desire the restitution of it, and would be satisfied therewith, but cannot obtain it at the Papists hands.

So Cassander himself, Epist. 42. p. 1138. [I would not despair of moderation, if they
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they that hold the Church possessons would remove some intolerable abuses, and would restore a tolerable form of the Church, according to the prescript of the Word of God, and of the antient Church, especially that which flourished for some ages after Constantine, when liberty was restored: which if they will not do, and that betime, there is danger they may in many places be cast out of their possessons.] Still you see Rome is the Innovator; and it is Restitution of the antient Church-form that would have quieted the Protestants, which could never be obtained.

So again more plainly, Epift. 45. p. 1144.
When I came to London, I enquired after Mr. Johnson, to know whether I might at all expect any Answer to the foregoing Papers, or not: And at last instead of an Answer, I received only these ensuing lines.

Pag. 5. part i. You say, I reply first, had not you despaired of making good your cause, you should have gone by argumentation, till you had forced me to contradict some common principle.

Now I have by Argumentation, forced you to this, if you will maintain what after you seem to assert in divers passages, (viz.) That Hereticks are true parts of Christ's Catholick Church; for thus you write p. 11. Some are called Hereticks for denying points essential to Christianity; those are no Christians, and so not in the Church; but many also are called Hereticks by you, and by the Fathers for lesser Errours consistent with Christianity; And these may be in the Church: And p. 12. you answer thus to your adversary: Whereas you say it is against all antiquity
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antiquity and Christianity to admit condemned Hereticks into the Church, I reply first, I hate their condemnation, rather then reverence it; where you saying nothing against their admittance into the Church, seem to grant it.

I therefore humbly entreat you to declare your opinion more fully in this question; Whether any professed Hereticks, properly so called, are true parts of the universal visible Church of Christ; so that they compose one universal Church with the other visible parts of it.

Functio 600.

William Johnson.

The Answer.

ANSWER. My words are plain, and distinctly answer your question, so that I know not what more is needful for the explication of my sense; Unless you would call us back from the Thing to the meer Name, by your [properly so called,] you are answered already. But I would speak as plainly as I can, and if it be possible for me
Whether Hereticks are in the Church.

to be understood by you, I shall do my part.

1. It is supposed that you and I are not agreed What the Universal visible Church it self is, while you take the Pope, or any meer humane Head to be an essential part; which is an assertion that with much abhorrence I deny. You think each member of that Church must necessarily ad esse, be a subject of the Pope; and I think it enough that he be a subject of Christ; and to his orderly and well-being; that he hold local Communion with the parts within the reach of his capacity; and be subject to the Pastors that are set over him; maintaining due association with and charity to the rest of the more distinct members, as he is capable of communion with them at that distance. So that when I have proved a person to be a member of the Catholick Church, it is not your Catholick Church that I mean: No sound Christian is a member of yours; it is Hereticks (in the foster sense) that are its matter. Its necessary therefore that we first agree of the Definition of the Catholick Church, before we dispute who is in it.

2. Your word [Properly so called] is ambiguous; referring either to the Etymologie, or to some definition in an authentick Canon;
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Canon; or to custom and common speech. Of the first, we have no reason now to enter controversie: For the second, I know no such established Definition that we are agreed on: For the third, custom is so variable here, not agreeing with itself, that what is to be denominated Proper or Improper from it, is not to be well conjectured. However all this is but denomine; and What is the proper, and What the improper use of the word Heretick, is no Article of Faith, nor necessary for our debate. Therefore again you must accept of my distinguishing, and give me leave to fly confusion.

1. The word [Heretick] is either spoken of one that corrupteth the Doctrine of Faith (as such), or of one that upon some difference of Opinion, or some personal quarrels, withdraweth from the Communion of those particular Churches that before he held communion with, and gathereth a separated party: such are most usually called Schismaticks; but of old, the name [Hereticks] was oft applied unto such.

2. The word [Heretick] in the first sense, is either spoken of one that (professing the rest) denyeth some one or more essential Articles of the Faith, or parts of Christianity; or one that only denyeth not
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what is necessary to the Being, but to the Integrality or sober and better-being of a Christian.

3. Heretics are either convict and convicted, or such as never were tried and judged.

4. Heretics condemned, are either condemned by their proper Pastors, or by others.

5. If by others, either by Usurpers, or by meer equal neighbour confociate Pastors.

6. They are condemned either justly clave non errante, or unjustly clave errante.

7. They are either judged to be materially, as to the quality of their errour, Heretics; or also formally as obstinate, impenitent and habitually stated Heretics.

Upon these necessary distinctions, I answer your Question in these Propositions.

Prop. 1. As the word [Heretics] signifieth Schismaticks as such, so Heretics with drawing from some parts of the universal Church only, may yet be parts of the whole (even with those parts from which they separate). If they say [You are no parts, and therefore we disown you, and will have no Communion with you] this maketh
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maketh neither cease to be parts] and while both own the Head and the Body as such, they have an union in tertio, and so a communion in the principal respects, while they peevishly disclaim it in other respects. Besides that the local or particular Communion, is it that is proper to members of a particular Church, and therefore the renouncing it only separates him from that Church. But it is the general Communion that belongs to us as members of the Church Universal, which may be still continued. But should any renounce the Body of Christ as such, and separate (not from this or that Church, but) from the whole, or from the Church Universal as such, this man would be no member of the Church.

Prop. 2. As the word [Heretick] is taken for one that denyeth any thing essential to Christianity; so an Heretick, if latent, is out of the Church Deo judice, as to the invisible part, or soul of the Church, (as Bellarmine calls it) as a latent Infidel is; but he may be (if latent) in the outward communion, or (as Bellarmine calls him) a dead member, that properly is none; as the straw and chaffe are in the cornfield.

Prop. 3. Such an Heretick convict and judged
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judged by the Pastors of that particular Church, of which he is a subject-member, is accordingly to be avoided; and infor
illius Ecclesia, is so far cast out of that Church, as the sentence importeth.

Prop. 4. Such an Heretick, if he be a Pastor of one Church, and be convict and condemned by the consociate co-equal Pastors of the neighbour Churches, is accordingly cast out from communion of all the Churches, of which they are Pastors.

Prop. 5. So far as any Christians through the world have sufficient proof or cognisance of the said conviction and condemnation, they are all bound accordingly to esteem the condemned Heretick, and avoid him.

Prop. 6. If [Heretie] be taken for the obstinate, impenitent resisting or rejecting of any point of Faith (that is, of Divine Revelation) which is made so plain to the person, that nothing but a wicked will could cause such resistance or rejection, such persons being justly convicted and condemned as aforesaid, are to be taken as persons condemned for obstinacy and impenitency in any other sin; and are out of the Church, as far as a man condemned for impenitency in drunkenness or fornication is:

Prop.
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Prop. 7. Heresiæ taken in this softer use (for the denial of a truth of Divine revelation, not essential to the Christian religion, or necessary to the Being of a Christian) excludeth no man from the church of itself, unless they are legally convict of wicked impenitency and obstinacy in defending it.

Prop. 8. A sentence passed in alieno foro, by an Usurper that hath no true Authority ereto, proveth no man an Heretick.

Prop. 9. A sentence passed by an Authorized Pastor, (or by many) if it be notoriously unjust, clave errante, proveth no an an Heretick, or out of the Universal Church.

Prop. 10. A sentence passed by one church, or many consociate, binds none to be the condemned person to be an Heretick, and out of the Universal Church, but those that have sufficient notice of the Authority of the Judges, and validity of the evidence, or a ground of violent pre-emption (as it is called) that the sentence is just.

Prop. 11. He that is sentenced an Heretick or Impenitent by the Pastors of some Churches, and acquitted by the equally-authorized Pastors of other Churches, is not
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Prop. 12. There is an actual excommunication pro medelâ and pro tempore, due an actual, willful defence of error, or other willful sin; which statedly puts no man out of the Church, as there is an communication à statu & Relatione, which due for stated habitual or obstinate pénitency in that or other great or known sin.

Having thus distinctly told you my judgment how far Hereticks are, or are not in or out of the universal Church, I add in order to the application: 1. That this whole debate is nothing to the great difference between you and us, it being not deside your own account, but a dogma theologica which you differ about among your selves. Bellarmine tells you Alphonsus a Cæsar maintaineth that Hereticks are in the Church (de Eccles. 1. 3. c. 4.) And he himself saith that heretici pertinent ad Ecclesiam ut ovile unde confugerunt, ibid. c. 4. so that they are oves stil, and if it be but ovile particular (veluti Romanum) that they from, and not the Universal, that proup them not out of the Universal Church.
Whether Hereticks are in the Church: Bellarmine faith of the Catechumen, & Ecommunicatis, that they are de anima, et si de corpore Ecclesia, ib. c. 2. and may be bed, cap. 6. And the anima Ecclesia is not incorporated in the world without: All ut have that soul, are of that Church rich Christ (that animateth his members) the head of. Which made Melchior Canus satente Bellarmino de Eccl. l. 3. c. 3.) cons- s the being of that which indeed is the true Catholike Church, saying of the Un- ptized Believers, that [sunt de Ecclesia ne comprehendit omnes fideles ab Abel usque l consummationem mundi.] 2. Many Popes have been condemned for hereticks, even by General Councils, as not only Honorius (by two or three) but En- nius by the Council of Basil, when yet he kept his place, and the rest come in as his cessors. And your writers frequently onfess that a Pope may be an Heretick (as ppe Adrian himself affirmeth.) Now if thefe are not of the Church, then they are ot Heads of the Church, and then being Tential parts of your Church, it followeth that your Church is heretical and unchurc- d with them. But if these Popes may be in the Church (and Heads of yours) while hereticks, then so may others.

3. Its
3. Its commonly said by others (yours) as well as Bellarmino, that the Councils were misinformed about Honorius, (the Popes that consented to those Councils) and so that he was not a Heretick nor of the Church: Also that a Pope may be in matter of fact, and unjustly excommunicate. If so, a Pope and Council may be about another, as well as about Honorius, other Popes; and therefore their sentence be no proof that such are out of the Church no more then that he and Eugenius were.

4. As the Pope and his Synods condemn the Greeks, so the Greeks condemn and excommunicate you; as formerly the Patriarch of Constantinople, and the Pope had excommunicated each other. I am therefore no more bound to take them for excommunicate persons, than you, they having much authority over you as you over them and their witness being to us as credible yours.

5. The Abassines, Armenians, Greeks, &c. are not proved to deny any essential point of the Christian Religion, or which is necessary to the Being of a Christian Church.

6. Nor are they proved to be willfully obstinate.
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Bstinate and impenitent in defending their errors, with a wicked mind; and so formally Hereticks in your own sense.

7. They are large Nations, and millions of souls, and their Pastours numerous, so that it is impossible they should be all legally convicted. They never spake for themselves, nor were witnesses heard against them. Noxa caput sequitur. Guilt of Heresie is to be proved of each individual whom you condemn. If a few Bishops were Hereticks, or a Prince were such, that proves not that the rest, and all the Pastors, or people, even to many millions are such. Or if half had been such in former ages, that proves not that half or any are such now. Christ never appointed the excommunicating of millions for the sakes of a few of their Rulers, nor of whole Nations unheard; but of single persons upon a just and equal tryal. If therefore your Pope, or any of his Councils, (which you falsely call General) do excommunicate or condemn Habaffia, Armenia, Georgia, Syria, and other Nations as Hereticks, it is so far from unchurching them, or proving them such, as that it is one of the greatest sins that can be committed by the sons of men, with inhumane injustice, cruelty, pride and arrogancy,
arrogancy, presuming to pass a damning sentence on so many millions of souls, whose faces you never saw, nor were ever called to a legal tryal.

8. Your own writers ordinarily acquit the Greeks from Heresie; and those of them that have travelled to other Countries, as Syria, &c. acquit most of them, as I have proved in former writings out of their own words (not needful therefore here to be recited, when you may see any writings.)

9. Your Pope (and Bishops) is none of their authorized Pastor, and therefore hath no power as such to judge them. And as neighbour Churches they have as much to do to judge you as you to judge them. Therefore they are never the more out of the Church for your judgement, any more than you for theirs.

10. There are as many and as great errors proved by them to be in your Church as is by you to be in theirs; so that (in sum) your cause being much worse, and your censure of them proving you guilty of such inhumane cruelty, injustice, arrogancy, usurpation, &c. by condemning them, you go much nearer to prove your selves no Christians and no Church than them.

11. And yet I think the far greatest part
of them (many thousands to one) are not actually excommunicated or condemned by any pretended sentence of your own, whatever your writers may say of them, and whatever one Council might say of some few in some one age.

12. Lastly, it can be no matter of certainty to you your self, or any of you, that these Nations or Churches are Hereticks, both because it is a thing that none of your approved Councils have determined of, as to any person now living, nor to any considerable number comparatively, in other ages; and also because you confess your Pope and Councils fallible in these cases, of fact and personal application. You cannot therefore build upon such acknowledged uncertainties.

But Sir, having thus answered your demand, I must ask you, what's all this to the Answer of my last Papers, which I have now near a year expected from you? I suspected some such tergiversation, when I took the boldness to urge you so hard to the tasks that you were reasonably engaged to perform, viz. 1. To prove by close Argumentation, the nullity of our Churches,
as you begun in your first Argument. 2. To answer my proofs of our successive visibility. 3. To prove your own successive visibility in all ages since Christ, as I have proved ours. I do therefore once more urge you speedily to do this, assuring you that else I must take it for an open deserting of your Cause.

But yet I must add, that if you will please to dispute the main cause in difference between us, upon equal terms; we have yet other Questions in which we differ, that are lower than these, and nearer the foundation. Besides the forementioned work therefore, I desire, that you will dispute the main Cause, in two distinct disputations, in one of which be you the Opponent, and bring your strongest Arguments against the Reformed Churches and Religion; and in the other I will be Opponent and argue against Popery; in the beginning agreeing upon the sense of those terms that we are like to have greatest use of through our disputation. If you will but let us meet, and state our sense of such terms, before I return into the Country, that we may the better manage it after at a distance, it will be worth our labour: And for verbal dispute, I shall a
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any fit time and place most cheerfully entertain it, if so many doubting persons may be present, as that it may be worth our labour. In the mean time I pray pardon it, if the roughness of any passages discover the frailty of

Your Servant,

June 7, 1660.

R. Baxter.
The Standard
Mr. Johnson's Explication of Some of the most used Terms: With Queries. Thereupon: And his Answer. And my Reply.

London, Printed, 1666
After the writing of the foregoing Paper, I again urged Mr. Johnson to the speedy answering my Papers: Of which when he gave me no hope, I committed them to the Press. But afterward, he seemed more inclinable both to that, and to a Verbal conference: And in order to both, (if we had opportunity) I desired him first that we might agree on the sense of those terms that are like to be most used in the substance of our Controversie; promising him that I will give him my sense of any term, when he shall desire it; and accordingly he explained his sense of many of them as followeth.

Queries
Queries of R. B. on these definitions, with Mr. Johnsons Answer, and my Reply.

Mr. J.

The Catholick Church of Christ.

The Catholick Church of Christ is all those visible Assemblies, Congregations, or Communities of Christians, who live in unity of true faith, and external communion one with another, and in dependance of their lawful Pastors.

R. B.

Of the Church.

Qu. 1. Whether you exclude not all those converted among Infidels, that never had external Communion with, nor were members of any particular visible Church, of which you make
make the Catholicick to be constituted?

Mr. J.

Answ. It is sufficient that such be subject to the supremum Pastor, and in vote, quantum in se eli, resolved to be of that particular Church actually, which shall, or may be assign'd for them by that Pastor, to be included in my definition.

R. B. Reply.

2. 1. Repl. ad 1st. 1. You see then that your Definitions signify nothing: no man can know your meaning by them. First you make the Catholicick Church to consist only of visible Assemblies: and after you allow such to be members of the Church that are of no visible Assemblies 2. You now mention subjection to the supremum Pastor as sufficient, which in your description or definition you did not. 3. If to be only in vote resolved to be of a particular Church will serve, then inexistence is not necessary. To be only in vote of the Catholicick Church, proves no man a member of the Catholicick Church, but proves the contrary, because it is Terminus diminuens. Seeing then by your own
own confession, inexistence in a particular Church is not of necessity to inexistence in the Catholike Church; why do you not only mention it in your definition, but confine the Church to such? will you say you meant in voto? who then can understand you, when you say they must be of visible Assemblies, and mean, they need not be of any, but only to wish, desire or purpose it? 4. But yet you say nothing to my case in its latitude. Many a one may be converted to Christ by a solitary Preacher, or by two or three, that never tell him that there is any supream Pastor in the world: How then can he be subject to that supposed Pastor, that never heard of him? The English and Dutch convert many Indians to the faith of Christ, that never hear of a supream Pastor. 5. If it be necessary that a particular Church must be assigned for such members by the supream Pastor, then they are yet little the better that never have any such assignation from him (as few have.)

R. B.

Qu. 2. What is that faith in unity whereof all members of the Catholike Church
The sense of the most used terms discussed.

Church do live? is it the belief of all that God hath revealed to be believed, or of part? and what part?

Mr. J.

Answ. Of all; either explicitly, or implicitly.

R. B. Reply.

Reply, Ad 2\textsuperscript{m}. Your second answer further proves that your definitions signify just nothing. They must live in unity of the faith: that is, either with faith or without it: with a belief of what God hath revealed to be believed, or without it. For to believe any point implicitly, in your ordinary sense, is not to believe it, but only to believe one of the premises, whence the conclusion must be inferred. But why do you not tell me what you mean by [an Implicite faith]? Faith is called Implicite in several senses. 1. When several truths are actually understood and believed in confusitu, or in gross, in some one proposition which containeth the substance of them all, but not with accurate distinct conceptions, nor such as are ripe for any fit expression: This indistinct, immature, imperfect...
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The kind of apprehension may be called 
implicite; and the distinct and more digest-
ial conceptions Explicit. 2. When a
general proposition is believed as the matter 
of our faith, but the particulars are not
understood or not believed: As to believe 
that omne animal vivit, not knowing whe-
ther you are Animal or Cadaver. Or to 
believe that [all that is in the Scripture is 
the Word of God and true,] but not to 
know [what is in the Scripture]. 3. When 
it is only the formal object of faith that is 
believed, without understanding the materi-
al object.

The first sort of these, I confess, is Actual 
Belief, though indistinct: But I suppose you 
mean not this. 1. Because it is not the or-
dinary sense of your party. 2. Because else 
you damn either all the world, or most of 
your own professed-party at least as no 
members of the Church: for few or none 
have an Actual understanding and belief of 
all that ever God revealed to them; be-
cause all men (or most at least) have been 
sinfully negligent in searching after, and re-
ceiving truth; and so are sinfully ignorant: 
No man knoweth all that God hath reveal-
ed, or that he ought to know. 3. Because 
by this rule it is impossible for you or any 
man
man to know who is indeed a member of your Church; for you cannot know me confused knowledge, or know that it extendeth to all revealed: For if you speak all revealed in general, or in Scripture, you still damn all, (or most in your own sense) for none, as I said, understand it all to word: But if you speak of all which the particular man hath had sufficient means to know, it is then impossible for you to make a judgement of any man's faith by this: For you can never discern all the means (internal or external) that ever he had; much less can you discern whether his faith be commensurate to the truth so far revealed. So that by this course you make your Church invisible. I pray tell me how you can avoid it?

2. The second sort of Implicit Belief, is no Belief of the particulars at all. An Animal may live, and yet it followeth not that you are alive or an animal. If this were your meaning, then either you mean [that it is enough if all be believed Implicitly besides that general proposition]; or you mean that some must be believed explicitly (that is actually) and some Implicitly, (that is, not at all). If the former be your sense, then Infidels or Heathens may be of your Church.
ch. For a man may believe in general
[the Bible is the Word of God and]
and yet not know a word that's in it;
So that he knows not that Christ is the Messiah,
that ever there was such a person. But
somewhat must be explicitly (that is, usually) believed, the question that you
would have answered was, [What is it?]
till that be known, no man can know
member of your Church by your de-

If you take [Implicit] in the third
sense, then Implicit faith is either Divine or
mane. Divine, when the Divine Vera-

is the formal Object. Humane, when

Veracity is the formal Object. Which
be Conjung where the Testimonies are
cunct, as that we are sure it is God
speaks by man; who is therefore credi-
because God infallibly guideth or inspir-
him: This is at once to believe a Hu-
me and Divine Veracity. If any of this
your meaning, the last questions remain
to be resolved by you. A man may be-
ve that [God is true,] and that [his Pro-
tas or inspired messengers are true] and yet
understand a word of the message: so
at still if this will serve, a man may be of
our Church, that knoweth not that ever
the e
there was such a person as Jesus Christ, that ever he died for our sins, or rose again or that we shall rise. And are Infidels your Church while you are arguing us out. But if there be some truths besides the veracity of God (and his Messengers) that must be believed, you must show what it or your Church-members cannot be known. Tell me therefore without tergiversation [what are the revealed truths that must actually be believed] or [what is the faith materially, in unity whereof all members the Catholike Church do live? ] I pray not, but plainly tell me.

And if again you fly to uncertain point because of the diversity of means of information, and say, [It must be so much every man as he had means to know] again answer you. 1. If a man had no means to know that there is a Christ, it seems that he is one of your Church. 2. You damn all your own, there being not a man that knoweth all that he had means to know because all have culpably neglected means. And so you have no Church. 3. Still make your Church invisible (if you may) For no man can tell, as I said, what knoweth in full proportion to his hand and means. Do you not see now
her your Implicit faith hath brought you?

**R. B.**

**Qu. 3.** Is it any lawful Pastors, or All, that must necessarily be depended on by every member? and who are these Pastors?

**Mr. J.**

*Answ. Of all, respectively to each subject; that is, that the authority of none of them, mediate or immediate, be rejected or contemned by him, that is a true member of the Church.*

**R.B. Reply.**

*Ad Qu. 3. R. Reply I. Here still you tell me that your descriptions signified nothing. You told me that the members must [live in dependance on their lawful Pastors.] And now you tell me that [their authority must not be rejected or contemned.] And indeed, is dependance and non-rejection all one? The millions of heathens that never heard of the Pope or any of your Pastors reject them not, nor contemn them.*
Are they therefore fit matter for your Church? 2. If you say, that you mean it of such only as have a sufficient Revelation of the Authority of these Pastors, I further reply. 1. It seems then it is not only the Pope, but every Priest respectively that is an essential member of your Church; or to whom each member must be subject necessarily ad esse. If so, then every man that by falling out or prejudice, doth culpably reject the authority of any one Pastor or Priest among a swarm, is damned, or none of the Church, though he believe in the Pope and in twenty thousand Priests besides.

2. And then have we not cause to pray God to bless us from the company of your Priests? or at least, that we may not have too many, when among a multitude we may be in danger of rejecting some one, and then we are cast out of the Church! What if a Gentleman should find some such as Watson or Montaltus describe in bed with his wife; or a Prince find a Garnet, a Champion, or a Parsons in a Treason, and by such a temptation should be so weak, as to conform, or reject the authority of that single Priest, while he honoureth all the rest? Is it certain, that such a man is none of the Catholike
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holike Church for that? How hard is it in France and Italy then to be a Catholike, where Priests are so numerous, that its ten to one, but among the crowd the authority of some one may be rejected!

3. But is it all the Priests that we never knew, or knew not to be Priests; that we must depend on, or is it only those whose authority is manifested to us by sufficient evidence? Doubtless you will confine our dependance to these only (or else no man could be a Christian:) And if so, you know we are never the nearer a resolution for your answer, till you yet tell us how we must know our Pastors to have authority indeed. What if they shew me the Bishops orders, and I know that many have had forged Orders? am I bound to believe in his authority? what if I be utterly ignorant whether he that ordained him, were himself ordained? or had intentionem ordinandi? how shall I then be sure of his authority that is ordained? And how can the people be acquainted with the passages in Election and Ordination that are necessary to the knowledge of their authority? especially of the Popes and prelates. And what if you tell me your own opinion, of the sufficient means by which I must be convinced of
of the Popes and Priests authority? how shall I know that you are not deceived; and that these are the sufficient means indeed, unless a General Council have defined them to be sufficient? And if they have, if it were not as an Article of faith, you'd say I am not bound of necessity to believe their definition. And what if I have sufficient means to know the authority of a thousand Priests, but am culpably ignorant of it in some few through my neglect? Doth it follow that therefore I am out of the Church? Is my obedience to each Priest as necessary, as my belief of every Article of my faith? If so, I know not whether your multiplying Articles, or multiplying Priests, doth fill hell faster, if men must be judged by your laws. But it is our Allegiance to our Soveraign, that is the character of a Subject in the Common-wealth, and not our Allegiance, or duty to every inferior Magistrate: the rejection of one of them may stand with subjection, though not with innocency: it is not treason to reject a Constable: why then should more be necessary to our Church-membership and salvation?

But still you make your Church invisible: For as no man can know that liveth in the remote parts of the world, whether your Popes
Popes themselves are truly Popes, as being duly qualified and elected, nor which is the true Pope, when you have oft had more than one at once; so you can never know concerning your members, whether their dependance on their Pastors be extensively proportionate to the means that discovered their authority? and whether their disobedience unchurch them or no? I earnestly crave your answer to the thirty uncertainties, which I have mentioned in my Safe Religion, p. 93, to 104. And tell us how all our Pastours may be known. And whether every particular sin unchurch men? and if not, why the contempt or rejection of a drunken Priest doth it, while all the rest are (perhaps too much) honoured?

R. B.

**Quest. 4.** Why exclude you the chief Pastors, that depend on none?

**Mr. J.**

Answ. I exclude them not, but include them, as those of whom all the rest depend; as St. Hierom does in his definition, Ecclesia est plebs Episcopo unita.
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Repl. ad Resp. ad Quest. 4. How unconstant are you among your selves in the use of terms? How frequent is it with you to appropriate the name of [the Church] to the Clergy? But remember hereafter, when you tell us of the Determinations, and Traditions of the Church, that it is the people that you mean, and not only the Pastors in Council; much less the Pope alone.

---------

Mr. J.

Heresie.

Is an intellectual obstinate opposition against divine authority revealing, when it is sufficiently propounded.

R. B.

Of Heresie.

Is the opposition and obstinacy that makes Heresie, in the Intellect or will?

---------

Mr. J.
Mr. J.

In the will, by an imperative act, restraining the understanding to that error.

R. B. Reply.

Of Heresie.

Qu. 1. Reply 1. Still your descriptions signify just nothing. You describe Heresie to be An Intellectual obstinate Opposition; and yet say that this is in the will. And yet again you contradict your self by saying that it is an Imperative act. No Imperative act is in the will, though it be from the will. It is voluntary, but not in voluntate. An Imperant act may be in the will, but not Imperate. All Imperate acts are in (or immediately by the commanded faculties.) The Intelligere, which is the Imperate act, is in the Intellect: though the Velle intelligere, which is an Elicite act, be in the will.

2. From hence its plain that you cannot prove me or any man to be an Heretic that is unfeignedly willing to know the truth, and is not obstinately willful in opposing it: which are things that you cannot ordinarily discern.
discern and prove by others, that are ready to be sworn that they would fain know the truth.

R. B.

Qn. 2. Must it needs be against the Formal object of Faith? is he no Heretick, that denieth the matter revealed, without opposing obstinately the Authority revealing?

Mr. J.

Answ. Yes. Nor is he a Formal, but only a Material Heretick, who opposes a revealed Truth, which is not sufficiently propounded to him to be a Divine revelation.

R. B. Reply.

Qn. 2. Reply 2. Every man that believeth that there is a God indeed, believeth that he is true: For if he be not True, he is not God. If therefore no man be Formally an Heretick, that doth not obstinately oppose the Veracity of God, which is the formal object, then as there are I hope but few Hereticks in the world, so those few cannot
cannot by ordinary means be known to you: unless they will say that they take God to be a lyar, so that you make none Hereticks indeed but Atheisfs.

What if a man deny that there is a Christ, a Heaven, a Hell, or a Resurrection? and also deny the Revelation it self, by which he should discern these truths? and yet deny not the Veracity of God, (no nor of the Church?) is this no Heretick? I would your party that have murdered so many thousands as Hereticks, had so judged: (if a falsehood may be wished, as a thing permitted, to have prevented such a mischief.) It is not Gods Veracity that is commonly denied by Hereticks, but the thing revealed, and the Revelation of that thing: And your Turnebul against Baronius hath told you, that the Revelation is no part of the Formal object of faith, but as it were the Copula, or a condition sine qua non. If he that obstinately refuseth to believe that the Godhead of Christ, or the Holy Ghost is any where by God revealed, and so denyeth it, be no Heretick, unless he also obstinately deny or resist the Veracity of God, then there are few that you can prove Hereticks. (For forma dat nomen; and he that is not a Heretick Formally, but materially only, is no Heretick at all.)

Lastly,
Lastly, many a truth is sinfully neglected by the members of the Church; that have a proposal sufficient, and yet not effectual through their own fault; and yet they are no Hereticks. Millions in your Church are ignorant of truths sufficiently proposed, and therefore their ignorance is their sin: but it followeth not that it is their Heresie. But if it be, then Hereticks constitute your Church; and then your Church is a thing unknown; because the Hereticks cannot be known, the sufficiency of each man's revelation being much unknown to others.

R. B.

Qu. 3. What mean you by a sufficient proposal?

Mr. I.

Answ. I mean such a proposal as is sufficient in humanis, to oblige one to take notice, that a King, or chief Magistrate, have enacted such, or such Laws, &c. that is, a publick Testimony, that such things are revealed by the infallible authority of those who are the highest Tribunal of Gods Church; or by
R. B. Reply.

Qn. 3. Reply 1. In humanis there lieth not so much at the stake as a man's salvation: and man is not so able as God to make a truly sufficient revelation of his will to all: and therefore the proportion holds not. 2. But if it did, either you think the sufficiency varieth according to the variety of advantages, opportunities, and capacities of the persons, or else that it consisteth only in the act of common publication, and so is the same to all the subjects. If the first be your sense (as I suppose it is,) then still you are uncertain who are Hereticks, as being uncertain of mens various capacities, and so of the sufficiency in question. Unless you will conclude (with me) that thus you make all Hereticks, as aforesaid, because all men living are culpably ignorant of some truths, which they had a revelation of that was thus far sufficient. If the second be your sense, then the same unhappy consequence will follow (that all are Hereticks;) and moreover, that some of obscure education are unavoidably Hereticks, because they had no opportunity to know those things,
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The things, which as to the Majority, are of publick testimony or universal Tradition. Is not the Bible, a publick Testimony and record, and being universally received, is an universal Tradition? And yet abundance of truths in the holy Bible are unknown, (and therefore not actually believed) by millions that are in your Church, and are not taken by your selves for Hereticks. Your befriending ignorance would else make very many Hereticks.

---

Mr. J.

Pope.

By Pope, I mean St. Peter, or any of his lawful Successors in the See of Rome, having authority by the Institution of Christ, to govern all particular Christian Churches, next under Christ.

R. B.

Of the Pope.

Qu. I. I am never the nearer knowing the
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Pope by this, till I know, how Peters successors may be known to me. What personal qualification is necessa-
ad esse?

Mr. J.

Answ. Such as is necessary ad esse for her Bishops; which I suppose you know.

R. B. Reply.

Of the Pope.

Qu. 1. Reply. If so, then all those were no Popes that were Hereticks, or denied essential points of faith (as Johan. 23.) and so were no Christians; and all those that wanted the necessary abilities to the essentials of their work. And so your Church hath oft been headless, and your succession interrupted, Councils having censured many Popes to be thus unqualified: And the disposition materia being of itself necessary to the reception of the form, it must needs follow, that such were no Popes, even before the Councils charged them with incapacity or Heresie: because they had it, before they were accused of it. And Simony then made many uncapable.

R. B.
Qu. 2. When and how must the institution of Christ be found?

Mr. J.

Answ. In the revealed Word of God, written or unwritten.

R. B. Reply.

Qu. 2. Reply 1. You never gave the world assurance, how they may truly know the measure of your unwritten Word, nowhere to find it, so as to know what it is.
2. Till you prove Christ's Institution (which you have never done,) you free us from believing in the Pope.

R. B.

Qu. 3. Will any ones election prove one to be Pope? or who must elect him ad esse?

Mr. J.

Answ. Such as by approved custom, are esteemed.
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Seemed, by those to whom it belongs, fit for at charge; and with whose election the church is satisfied.

R. B. Reply.

Qu. 3. Reply. Here you are fain to de your self instead of answering; and new indeed that a Pope (that's made an Tential part of the Church; subject to hom is made of necessity to salvation) is indeed but a meer name, or a thing un- known; and so can be certainly believed c acknowledged by none. For either election of him (by some body) is necessary, not. If not, then you or another man chosen may be Pope, for ought I know, or any man else. If yes, then it is either my bodies Election of him that will serve turn, or not. If it will, then you may be pope, if your Scholars choose you, and then you have had three true Popes at once; for many were Elected. But if it will not, then it must be known who hath the Power of Election, before it can be known who is deed the Pope: But you are forced here y your answer to intimate to us, that the power of Election cannot be known: and therefore the Pope cannot be known. For,
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1. Here are no determinate Electors mentioned; and therefore it seems none known to you: And no wonder: for if you confine it to the people, or to the Cardinals, or to the Emperours, or to Councils, you cut off all your Popes that were chosen by the other ways. 2. Nor do you determine any particular discernable note, by which the Electors, and power of election may be known to the Church: But all these patches make up your description. 1. It must be those that are esteemed fit for the charge. 2. And that by those to whom it belongs. 3. And that by custome. 4. And that approved. 5. And the Church must be satisfied with the election. O miserable body! then that hath been so oft headless, as Rom hath been! 1. Will esteeming them fit serve turn though they be unfit? then it is not the fitness that is necessary, but the estimation, (true or false.) 2. But why did you not tell us to whom it is that it belongs to esteem the Choosers fit? Here you were a straight. But is not this to say nothing, while you pretend to speak? and to hide what you pretend to open? 3. And who knows what custome, and of what continuance you mean? Primitive custom went on way; and afterward custom went another way.
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...way; and later custom hath varied from oth; and hath the power of Election hanged so oft? 4. And who is it that must approve this custom? and what approbation must there be? All these are meer iding, and not resolving of the doubt, and tell us that a Pope is a thing invisible or unknown. 5. And your last assureth us, that your succession was interrupted through many usurpations, yea indeed that you never had a Pope. For the Church was unsatisfied with the election of abundance of your Popes, when Whores, and Simony, and Murder, and power set them up: And most of the Church through the world is unsatisfied with them still to this day. And you have no way to know whether the greater part of the Church is satisfied or not; for non-resistance is no sign of satisfaction, where men have not opportunity or power to resist. And when one part of Europe was for one Pope, and another for another through so many Schisms, who knows which had the approbation of that which may be called the Church?

R. B.

Qu. 4. Is Consecration necessary? and by whom ad esse?  

Answer.
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Mr. J.

Answ. It is not absolutely necessary an
effe.

R. B. Reply.

Qu. 4. Reply. If consecration be not ne-
cessary to the Papacy, then it is not neces-
sary that this or that man consecrate him more
then another. And then it is not necessary
to a Bishop. And then the want of it makes
no interruption in succession, in any Church,
any more then in yours.

R. B.

Qu. 5. What notice, or proof is
necessary to your Subjects?

Mr. J.

Answ. So much as is necessary to oblige
them, to accept of other Elected Princes to be
their Sovereigns.

R. B. Reply.

Qu. 5. Reply. When you have answered
to the forementioned thing doubts, we
shall
The sense of the most used terms discussed shall know what that general signifies.

Mr. J.

Bishops.

I mean by Bishop, such a Christian Pastor as hath power, and jurisdiction, to govern the inferior Pastors, Clergy, and people within his Diocese, and to confer holy orders to such as are subject to him.

R. B.

Of Bishops.

Qu. I. Do you mean, that he must have this *jure divino*, or *humano*? and if *jure divino*, whether mediately or immediately?

Mr. J.

Anfw. The definition abstracts from particulars, and subsists without determining that question.
R. B. Reply.

Of Bishops.

Qu. 1. Repl. 1. You before seem to yield that the Papacy is but jure humano; (and therefore sure of no necessity to salvation:) For if man can change the power of election, and the foundation be humane, its like the relation is but humane. And therefore if Bishops must be jure divino, they are more excellent and necessary then the Pope.

2. How gross a subterfuge is this? either the Bishop in question is a divine creature or a humane: If a divine; as you may manifest it, or express it at least, so you ought; it being no indifferent thing to turn a divine office and Church into an humane: If he be not Divine, he is not of necessity to a divine Church, nor to salvation. And yet thus your R. Smith Bishop of Calcedon (ubi supra) confesseth it to be no point of your faith, that the Pope is St. Peters successor jure divino. And if you leave it indifferent to be believed, or not, that both your Pope and Bishops are jure divino, you confess you are but a humane policy or society, and therefore that no man need to fear the loss of his salvation by renouncing you.

Qu. 2
R. B.

Qn. 2. How shall we know who hath this power? what Election, or Consecration is necessary thereto? If I know not, who hath it, I am never the better.

Mr. J.

Answ. As you know, who hath Temporal Power, by an universal, or most common consent of the people: The Election is different according to different times, places, and other circumstances. Episcopal Consecration is not absolutely necessary.

R. B. Reply.

Qn. 2. Repl. 1. How now! Are all the mysteries of your succession and mission resolved into Popular Consent? Is no one way of Election necessary? Do you leave that to be varied as a thing indifferent? And is Episcopal Consecration also unnecessary? I pray you here again remember then, that none of our Churches are disabled from the plea of a continued succession,
cession, for want of Episcopal Consecration, or any way of Election; If our Pastors have had the peoples consent, they have been true Pastors, according to this reckoning: And if they have now their consent, they are true Pastors. But we have more.

2. By this rule we cannot know of one Bishop of an hundred whether he be a Bishop or no; for we cannot know that he hath the Common consent of the people: yea we know that abundance of your Bishops have no such consent: yea we know that your Pope hath none of the Consent of most of the Christians in the world; nor (for ought you or any man knows) of most in Europe. Its few of your own party that know who is Pope, (much less are called to Consent,) till after he is settled in possession.

3. According to this rule, your successions have been frequently interrupted, when against the will of general Councils, and of the far greatest part of Christians, your Popes have kept the seat by force.

4. In temporals your rule is not universally true: What if the people be engaged to one Prince, and afterward break their vow, and consent to a Usurper? Though in this case a particular person may be obliged to submit-
submission and obedience in judicial administrations; yet the usurper cannot thereby defend his Right, and justify his possession, nor the people justify their adhesion to him, while they lye under an obligation to disclaim him, because of their preengagement to another. Though some part of the truth be found in your assertion.

R. B.

Qu. 3. Will any Diocess serve at esse? what if it be but in particular Assemblies?

Mr. J.

Answ. It must be more then a Parish, or then one single Congregation, which hath not different inferior Pastors, and one, who is their Superior.

R. B. Reply.

Qu. 3. REPL. This is but your naked affirmation. I have proved the contrary from Scriptures, Fathers, and Councils in my disputation of Episcopacy, viz. that a Bishop may be (and of old ordinarily was) over the Presbyters only of one Parish, or
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single Congregation, or a people no more numerous then our Parishes. You must shew us some Scripture, or general Council for the contrary before we can be sure you here speak truth. Was Gregory Thaumaturgus no Bishop, because when he came first to Neocasarea, he had but seventeen souls in his charge? The like I may say of many more.

Mr. J.

Tradition.

I understand by Tradition, the visible delivery from hand to hand in all ages, of the revealed Word of God, either written, or unwritten.

R. B.

Of Tradition.

Qn. 1. But all the doubt is, by whom this Tradition that's valid, must be. By your Pastors, or people, or both? By Pope, or Councils, or Bishops disjunct? By the Major part of the
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...the Church, or Bishops (or Presbyters) or the Minor? and by how many?

Mr. J.

Answ. By such and so many proportionably, as suffice in a Kingdom to certify the people, which are the Ancient universally received customs in that Kingdom, which is to be morally considered.

R. B. Reply.

Of Tradition.

Qu. 1. REPL. I consent to this general. But then, 1, How certainly is Tradition against you, when most of the Christian world, yea all except an interested party, do deny your Soveraignty, and plead Tradition against it? And how lame is your Tradition, when its carried on your private affirmations, and is nothing but the unproved sayings of a Sect!

R. B.

Qu. 2. What proof, or notice of it, must satisfy me in particular, that it so past?

Mr. J.
Mr. J.

Answ. Such, as with proportion is a sufficient proof, or notice, of the Laws and customs of temporal Kingdoms.

R. B. Reply.

Qu. 2. REPL. But is it necessary for every Christian, to be able to weigh the credit of contradicting parties, when one half of the world faith one thing, and the other another thing? what opportunity have ordinary Christians to compare them, and discern the moral advantages on each side? As in the case of the Popes Soveraignty, when two or three parts of the Christian world is against it, and the rest for it, can private Christians try which party is the more credible? Or is it necessary to their salvation? If so, they are cast upon unavoidable despair. If not, must they all take the words of their present Teachers? Then most of the world must believe against you, because most of the Teachers are against you: And then it seems men's faith is resolved into the authority of the Parish-Priest or their Confessors. The Laws of a Kingdom may be easier known, then Christian
Christian doctrines can be known, (especially such as are controverted among us) by mere unwritten Tradition. Kingdoms are of narrower compass than the world: And, though the sense of Laws is oft in question, yet the being of them is seldom matter of controversy; because men conversing constantly and familiarly with each other, may plainly and fully reveal their minds; when God that condescendeth not to such a familiarity, hath delivered his mind by inspired persons long ago, with much less sensible advantages, because it is a life of faith that he directeth us to live.

Mr. J.

General Council.

A general Council, I take to be, an assembly of Bishops and other chief Prelates, called, convened, and confirmed, by those who have sufficient Spiritual authority to call, convene, and confirm.

R. B.
Mr. J.

Qu. 1. Who is it (ad esse) that must call, convene, confirm it? till I know that, I am never the nearer knowing, what a Council is; and which is one indeed.

Mr. J.

Answ. Definitions abstract from inferior subdivisions. For your satisfaction I affirm, it belongs to the Bishop of Rome.

R. B. Reply.

Qu. 1. REPL. 1. If it be necessary to the being or validity of a Council that it be called or confirmed by the Pope, then your definition signifieth nothing, if you abstract from that which is so necessary an ingredient, unless it were presupposed to be understood. 2. If it belong to the Bishop of Rome to call a Council as necessary to its being, then the first great General Council, and others following, were none; it being certain that they were not called by him. And
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and as certain that he hath never proved
my such authority to call them, or confirm
them.

R. B.

Qu 2. Must it not represent all the
Catholike Church? Doth not your
Definition agree to a Provincial, or
the smallest Council?

Mr. J.

Answ. Yes, my Definition speaks specifically of Bishops and chief Prelates, as con-tradistinct from inferior Pastors and Clergy, and thereby comprises all the Individuums contained in the Species; and consequently makes a distinction from National, or particular Councils, where some Bishops only are convened, not all; that being only some part, and not the whole species, or specifical Notio-n applied to Bishops of every age. And yet I said not all Bishops, but Bishops and chief Prelates; because though all are to be called, yet it is not necessary that all should come. Whence appears what I am to answer to the next two Questions.

R. B.
R. B. Reply.

Qu. 2. Repl. 1. Then you have had no General Councils; much less can have any more. For you have none to represent the greatest part of the Church, unless by a mock representation.

2. If all must be called, your Councils have not been General, that call'd not a great part of the Church.

3. If most are necessarily detained (as by distance, the prohibition of Princes, &c.) the call made it not their duty to be there, and so makes it not a General Council; which is so called from the generality of the meeting and representation, and not of the invitation: no more then a Call would make it a true Council if none came.

R. B.

Qu. 3. How many Bishops, and from what parts must (ad effer) make such a Council?

Mr. J.

Answ. The number is morally to be considered, more or fewer according to the difficulties
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ies of times, distances of place, and other circumstanes; as is also the parts, from whence they are to come.

R. B. Reply.

Qu. 3. Repl. This is a put-off for want of an Answer. Is it a Council if difficulties keep away all? If not, it can be no General Council, when difficulties keep away the most. Much less when such a petty confederacy as met at Trent, shall pretend to represent the Christian world. You thus leave us uncertain when a Council is General, and when not. How can the people tell, when you cannot tell yourself, when the Bishops are so many as make a Council General!

R. B.

Qu. 4. May none but Bishops and chief Prelates be members, as you intimate?

Mr. J.

Answ. No others; unless such inferiours as are sent to supply the places, and as Deputies of those Bishops or Prelates, are such members of
of the Council, as have Decisive votes in framing Decrees and Definitions.

R. B. Reply.

_Qu. 4. Repl._ This is but your private opinion. No Council hath defined it, unless they are contradictory. For I suppose you know that Basil and many Councils before it had Presbyters in them.

---

Mr. J.

Schism.

I understand by Schism, a willful separation, or division of one's self from the whole visible Church of Christ.

R. B.

Of Schism.

_Qu. 1._ Is it no Schism to separate from a particular Church, unless from the whole?

Mr. J.

Answ. No; it is no Schism, as Schism is take:
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R. B. Reply.

Of Schism.

Qu. 1. REPL. Though I take Schism more comprehensively, and I think, aptly myself, yet hence I observe your justification of the Protestants from the charge of Schism; seeing they separate not from the Catholike or whole Church: For they separate not from the Armenian, Ethiopian, Greek, &c. nor from you as Christians, but as scandalous offenders, whom we are commanded to avoid. We separate not from any, but as they separate from Christ.

R. B.

Qu. 2. Or is it no Schism, unless willfull?

Mr. J.

Answ. No; it is not Schism, unless the separation be willfull on his part who makes it.

R. B.
R. B. Reply.

Qu. 2. Repl. Again you further justifie us from Schism. If it be willfull, it must be against knowledge. But we are so far from separating willfully or knowingly from the whole Church, that we abhor the thought of such a thing, as impious and damnable.

R. B.

Qu. 3. Is it none, if you make a Division in the Church, and not from the Church?

Mr. J.

Answ. Not, as we here understand Schism, and as the Fathers treat it. For the Church of Christ being perfectly one, cannot admit of any proper Schism within it self: for that would divide it into two; which it cannot be.

R. B. Reply.

Qu. 3. Repl. Though I am sure Paul calls it Schism, when men make divisions in the Church, though not from it; not making it two Churches, but dislocating some members, and abating charity, and causing contentions
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tentions where there should be peace; yet I accept your continued justification of us, who if we should be tempted to be *dividers in the Church*, should yet hate to be dividers from it; as believing that he that is separated from the whole body, is also separated from the Head.

---

**Mr. J.**

_Sir,_

_The want of a Scribe hath forced me to fail a little in point of time; but I hope you will excuse him, who desires to serve you._

_W. J._

June 22: 1660.

---

**R. B.**

_Sir,_

_Urgent unavoidable business constrained me to delay my return to your solutions, or explications of your definitions, till this June 29. 1660._

_When you desire me to answer any such Questions, or explain any doubtful passages_
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of mine, I shall willingly do it. In the mean
time you may see, while your terms are still
unexplained, and your Explications or Defi-
nitions so insignificant, how unfit we are to
proceed any further in dispute, till we better
understand each other as to our terms and sub-
ject: which when you have done your part to,
I shall gladly, if God enable me, go on with you,
till we come (if it may be) to our desired issue.
But still I crave your performance of the
double task you are engaged in.

Richard Baxter.
Appendix.

The most that I here said against the successive Visibility of our Church, is reduced by them to the point of Ordination. They say, we can have no Church without Pastors: no Pastors without Ordination; and no Ordination but from the Church of Rome: therefore when we break off from the Church of Rome, we interrupted our succession, which cannot be repaired but by a return to them. This is the sum of most of their discourses, in what shape soever they appear. To which I answer.

1. As [a Church] is taken for a Community of Christians, which are really members of the Church universal, so it may ad esse be without Pastors. But the Catholike Church can never be without them: nor yet, any true Political, organized, particular Church.

2. It is contrary to the Pap. As own opinion that Ordination of their particular Pastors, is necessary to the being of a true particular Church. Bellarmine granteth (Lib. 3. de Eccles. c. 10.) that it is indeed
to us uncertain that our Pastors have potestatem ordinis & jurisdictionis; and that we have but a moral certainty that they are true Bishops: though we may know that they hold Christ's place, and that we owe them obedience; and that to know that they are Our Pastors, non requiritur nec fides, nec Character Ordinis, nec legitima electio; sed solum ut habeantur pro talibus ab Ecclesia. [i.e. It is not requisite, that they have faith, or the Character of Order, or lawful election; but only that they be taken for such by the Church.] And if it be enough that their Church repute their Pastors to be elected, ordained, and believers, though they are not so indeed; then can no more be necessary to ours. We repute ours as confidently to be lawfully elected and ordained as they do theirs.

3. It is contrary to the Papists own opinion, that any Consecration (much less Canonical) is necessary to the being of their Universal Head. I need not cite their Authors for this; as long as you have 1. The History of their Practices: And 2. The confession of this learned man that I dispute with, in the explication of the term [Pope] in these his last Papers. And that which is not necessary to their Pope, cannot
cannot by them be made necessary to our Bishops.

4. Nothing in Church History more certain, then that the Church of Rome hath had no continued succession of a truly elected, or ordained Pope according to their own Canons. 1. If Infidelity or Heresie judged by a Council (in the case of Honorius, §ob. 23. Eugenius, &c.) will not prove a nullity and intercifion. 2. If Simony, Murder, Adultery, &c. will not prove it. 3. If about forty years Schifme at once will not prove it: none knowing who was the true Pope, but by the prevalency of his secular power; and their writers confessing that it is known to none but God. 4. If intrusion without any just election will not prove it; Then there is no danger to those Churches that are lyable to no such accusations. But if any or all of these will prove it, the Roman intercifion is beyond dispute, as I shall further manifest on any just call, if it be denied.

5. The standing Law and Institution of Christ, is it that gives the Power (by imposing the duty) of Ministration: and Ordination only determineth of the person that shall receive it (together with election,) and solemnizeth it by Investiture: as Coronation.
tion to a King, that is a King before.

I have already proved that an uninterrupted succession of Regular Ordination is no more necessary to the being of a Church, then uninterrupted succession of Regular Coronation is to the being of a King or Kingdom: which I am ready to make good.

6. This whole case of Ordination I have already spoken to (so carefully and fully according to my measure) in my second Dispute of Church Government, that I shall suppose that man hath said nothing to me, requiring my reply, on this point, that doth not answer that. And to write the same thing here over again, cannot fairly be expected.

7. Voetius de desperata causa Papatus, hath copiously done the same against Jansenius, which they should answer satisfactorily before they call for more.

8. The Nullity which they suppose to make the Intercision, is either the Ordination we had from the Papist Bishops before our Reformation, or the Ordination that we received since. If the former be a nullity, then all the Papists Ordinations are null, and so they nullifie their Church and Ministry. That the latter is no nullity, we are ready to make good against any of them all.

Object.
Object. But if you own your Ordination as from the Church of Rome, you own their Church.

Answ. We consider them, 1. As Christian Pastors. 2. As Popish Pastors. As Christian Pastors in the Catholike Church, their Ordination is no more a nullity than their Baptizing, (which we count valid.) But as Popish, they have no authority for either. Object. But they gave both Baptism and Ordination as Papists, and it must be judged of by the intention of the giver, and receiver. Answ. It is the Baptism and Ordination of Christ's Institution, as such, which was pretended to be given and received. Could we prove that they Administred any other or otherwise, they say they would disown it: As such therefore we must take it, till we can prove that they destroy the very essence of it. If it be given and taken secondarily as Popish the scab of their corruption polluteth it, but not nullifieth it. So they profess themselves first Ministers of Christ, and but subordinately (as they think) of the Pope: so much therefore as belongs to them in their first and lawful relation may be valid; though so much as respecteth their usurped relation be sinful. Had I been baptized or ordained by one of their Priests,
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I would disown all the corruptions of them, but not the baptism and ordination itself.

9. There is no necessity to the being or well-being of a particular Church, that it hath continued from the Apostles' days, or that its particular Ministry have had no succession. If Germany were converted but lately to the Christian Faith, it may be nevertheless a true part of the Catholike Church. If Jerusalem had sometime a Church, and sometime none, it may have now a true Church nevertheless.

10. If our Ordination had failed by an intercession, it might as well be repaired from other Churches (that have had a continued succession) as from Rome. And much better, because without participation of their peculiar corruptions. Or if any Bishops that were of the Papal faction should repent of their Poperie, and not of their Ordination, they might Ordain us as Bishops, and repair our breach. And indeed that was the way of our continued Ordination. Many that repented that they were Popish Prelates, continued the office of Christian Bishops, and by such our Ancestors were Ordained. As Christianity and Episcopacy were before Poperie, and so are they still separable.
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Separa]ble from it, and may continue when it is renounced. Besides what I have more fully said in the foresaid dispute of Ordi-
nation, I see no need of adding any more, against this Objection, about successive Or-
dination and Ministerial Power.

As to their other Objection (which they make such a stir with, and take no notice of the Answer which we have so often given) viz. [When every Sect pretend that they have the true Church and Ministry, who shall judge?] I again Answer, There is a *judicium privatum*, and *publicum*: A private judgement of discerning belongs to every man: The publick judgement is either Civil or Ecclesiastical. The Civil judgement is [who shall be thus or thus esteemed of, in order to Civil encouragement or discouragement] (as by corporal punishments, or rewards:) This judgement belongeth only to the Civil Magistrate. The *Ecclesiastical judgement*, is in order to *Ecclesiastical Communion* or *Excommunication*. And so it belongs to those with whom the person is in Communi-
on, in their several capacities. The members of a particular Church, are to be judged Authoritatively by the Pastors of that Church, (and by the people, by a *Private judgement of Discerning.*) Pastors should associate
Associate for Communion of Churches: and so in order to that Communion of Association, it belongs to the several Associations to judge of the Members of the Society: which yet is not by a publick Governing judgment: For in Councils or Associations, the Major Vote are not properly the Governors of the lesser part: But those that are out of capacity of Communion, have nothing to do to judge of the Aptitude of Pastors or Churches in order to Communion or non-Communion. And for the Pope, he hath nothing to do with us at such a distance, whose persons and cases are wholly unknown to him; he being neither our Governor nor our Associate. But if we and our case were known to him, he may judge of us so far as we may judge of him. And other judgement (what ever men may say to deceive) there is none to decide our controversies, but the final judgement of the Universal Judge, who is at the door.
A

LETTER

Written to

Thomas Smith

A Papist, Concerning the Church of Rome.

LONDON, Printed, 1660.
Reverend Sir,

He noted sanctity, admirable integrity, and extraordinary charity so eminently appearing in your pious actions, (and as I have cause to think, the indelible characters of our sacred function) hath animated me to make choice of your self rather then any of our coat to this present address: hoping your andour and tenderness will bear with what may be (by others less sensible of the value of immortal souls slighted) interpreted according to the candid and true sense of your supplicant by you. It hath pleased the great and terrible judge of heaven and earth to put me upon some thoughts more seriously then ordinary of my eternal estate, and to be somewhat doubtful in the midst of external perturbations) of those internal grounds which I have formerly relied upon. And truly Sir with all cordialness, my desire is clearly to know the mind of my God; which were I truly satisfied in, I would soon wave all other interests to entertain: and assuring my self according to what I have seen and read, the Church of Rome, to which I have long cleaved and adhered, to be
the pillar and ground of truth, and that Catholike Church which the ancient Creed testifies, we are to believe in: My desire is to be as soon satisfied as may be of your thoughts, whether it ever were a true Church, which I suppose you will not deny, when you consider the first verse of the Epistle to the Romans; and if so, when it made its defection? The reason of my urging this is, because I think all other questions to be but going about the bush and the true Church being proved, all arguments else easily are answered. I have heard Protestants over the ancient maxime, viz. Extra Ecclesiam non est salus. Therefore suppose it the only thing pertinent to my purpose, and necessary to salvation to enquire after. My occasions will suddenly draw me from these parts, unless I hear from you speedily: and doubt not Sir, but I am one who freely will resign my self to hear truth impartially. Therefore I beseech you to send something to me by way of satisfaction the next Saturday, after which you shall be more particularly sensible who the person is that applies himself to you, and in the interim subscribe himself, Sir,

A thirsty troubled soul, and you

Feb. 11. 1656: to his power, Tho. Smith.

Dirt
Direct your Letter to me if you please to Mr. John Smith's house next door to the sign of the Crown in the broad street, Worcester.

Good Sir, be private for the present; otherwise it may be prejudicial to some temporal affairs agitating at this time.

Sir,

That you can have such charitable thoughts of one that is not of the Roman subscription, and of my function, being not received from the Pope, is so extraordinary, yea and contrary to the judgment of your writers, that I must needs entertain it with the more gratitude, and some admiration. And that you are so impartially willing to entertain the truth, (as you profess) though it be no more than the truth deserves of you, and your own wellfare doth require; yet is the more amiable in you, by how much the more rare in those of your Profession, so far as my acquaintance can inform me: for most of them that I have met with, understand not well their own Religion, nor think themselves much concerned to understand it, but refer me to others for a Reason of their hope. For my part, I do the more gladly entertain the occasion
caution of this intercourse with you (though unknown,) that I may learn what I know not, and may be true to my own conscience in the use of all means that may conduce to my better information. And therefore I shall plainly answer your Questions according to the measure of my understanding; most solemnly professing to you, that I will say nothing which comes not from my heart in plain simplicity, and that I will with exceeding gladness and a thousand thanks come over to your way, if I can finde by any thing that you shall make known to me, that it is the mind of God that I should so do. And therefore I am desirous, that if what I write to you shall seem unsound, you would not only afford me your own advice for the correction of it, but also the advice of the most learned of your mind, to whom you shall your self think meet to communicate it. But on these conditions. 1. That it be a person of a tender conscience, that dare speak nothing but what he verily believes. 2. That he will argue closly, and not fly abroad or dilate Rhetorically. And for any divulging of it to your danger or hurt, you need not fear it: For these two grounds of my following answers; I shall here promise, 1. That I am so far from persecuting bloody
bloody desires against those of your way, that their own bloody principles and practices where they have power (in Italy, Spain, &c.) hath done much to confirm me, that the cause is not of God that must be so upheld and carried on. 2. And I am so far from cruel uncharitable censures of any that unfeignedly love the Lord Jesus and his truth, that it is the greatest motive to me of all other to dislike your Profession, because it is so notoriously against Christian charity, restraining the Catholike Church to your selves, and outing and condemning the far greatest part of Christians in the world, and that because they believe not in the Pope, though they believe in God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and all that the Primitive Church believed. I am so Catholike, that (according to my present judgement) I cannot be of your Church, because it is so little Catholike. I am of the one universal Church, which containeth all the true Christians in the world: And you are of a Party which hath separated it self from most of the Christians in the world. I am of that one body that is centred in Christ the Head; you are of a piece of this body, that hath centred in a man, and oft a confessed heretical wicked man, whom you take
take while he lives to be the infallible Judge
and foundation of all your faith and hope; and when he is dead, perhaps pronounce him
to be in hell (as Bellarmine did Pope Sixtus,
and others commonly.) I know, as every
Sect hath a kind of unity among themselves,
however divided from all the rest of the
Church, so also hath yours: but nothing
will satisfy me but a Catholike Unity,
Church and Faith. So much being premised,
I answer your Questions.

Quest. 1. Whether the Church of Rome
was a true Church in the Apostles dayes?

Answ. The word [Church] signifies more
things then one. 1. Sometime it is used to
signifie the whole mystical body of Christ,
containing all and only those that are justi-
fied, whom Bellarmine calleth living mem-
bers. And in this sense the Church of Rome
in the Apostles dayes was not the Church,
but the justified members were part of the
Church. 2. Sometime it is used to signify
all that profess true Christianity in the
world: And thus the Church of Rome was
not the Church, but part of it. 3. It is oft
used by your writers to signify one Church,
that by Prerogative is the Head or Mistress of
all Christians in the world, to which they must all be subject, and from which they must receive their name, as the Kingdom of Mexico, of Tripolis, of Fez, &c. are so called from the chief Cities of the same name, and from which they receive their Faith and Laws, as the body hath life and motion from the head or heart. In this sense the Church of Rome was no Church in the Apostles days.

4. Sometime it is used to signify one particular Church, associated for personal Communion in Worship. And thus the Church of Rome was a true Church in the Apostles days.

5. Sometime it is used to signify a Collection or Conjunction of many particular Churches (though not all) under the Bishop of one Church, as their Patriarch or Metropolitan. And thus the Church of Rome was no Church in the Apostles days; but about two hundred years after Christ it was.

It is only the Church in the third of these senses, that is in controversy between the Roman and Reformed Churches. Now to your next Question.

---

**Quest. 2. When was it that the Church of Rome ceased to be a true Church?**

_Bb 2_ **Answ.**
Anf. In the first, second, and third fences it never ceased to be a true Church: for it never was one. In the first and second fence it never was one either in title or claim, (I hope.) In the third, it was never one in title, nor yet in claim for many hundred years after Christ: but now it is. Therefore the Question between us should not be, when it ceased, but when it begun to be such a Capital Ruling Church, Essential to the whole?

In the fifth fence it never ceased otherwise then as it is swallowed up in a higher Title. It begun to be a Patriarchal Church, about two or three hundred years after Christ: and it ceased to be meerly Patriarchal when it arrogated the Title of Universal or Mistress of all.

In the fourth fence, the Question is not so easie, and I shall thus answer it. 1. By speaking to the use of the Question. 2. By a direct answer to it.

1. It is of small concernment to my salvation or yours, to know whether the Church of Rome be a true particular Church or not: no more then to know whether the Church of Thessalonica, or Ephesus, or Antioch, be now a true Church. In charity to them I am bound to regard it, as I am bound to
to regard the life of my neighbour: But what doth it concern my own life, to know whether the Mayor and Aldermen of Worcester or Gloucester be dead or alive? So what doth it concern my Salvation to know whether the Church of Rome be now a true particular Church? If I lived at the Antipodes or in Ethiopia, and had never heard that there is such a place as Rome in the world (as many a thousand Christians doubtless never heard of it) this would not hinder my salvation, as long as I believed in the blessed Trinity, and were sanctified by the Spirit of Grace. So that, as I am none of their Judge, so I know not that it much concerneth me, to know whether they be a true particular Church, save for charity or communion.

2. Yet I answer it more directly. 1. If they do not by their errors so far overthrow the Christian faith which they profess, as that it cannot practically be believed by them, then are they a true particular Church, or part of the universal Church. 2. And I am apt to hope at least of most that they do not so hold their errors, but that they retain with them so much of the essentials of Religion as may denominate them a true professing Church. More plainly:
ly: Rome is considered first as Christian, secondly as Papal: As Christian, it is a true Church: As Papal, it is no true Church: For Popery is not the Church according to Christ's Institution, but a dangerous corruption in the Church. As a Leper is not the man, but the disease of the man. Yet he that is a Leper may be a man. And he that is a Papist may be a Christian: But 1. Not as he is a Papist. 2. And he is but a leprous or diseased Christian.

So much to your Questions.

By this much you may see that it no way concerneth me to prove when Rome ceased to be a true Church. For if you mean such a Church as Corinth, Philippi, Ephesus, &c. was, that is, but a part of the Catholike Church, so I stick not much, saving in point of Charity, whether it be true or false. But if you mean as your party doth, a Mistress Church to Rule the whole, and denominate the Catholike Church [Roman], so I say, its Usurpation is not ceased (that's the misery) and its just title never did begin: and its claim was not of many hundred years after Christ: so that your Question requireth no further Answer.
But what if you had put the Question, At what time it was that your Church began to claim this universal Dominion? I should give you these two answers. 1. When I understand that it is of any great moment to the decision of our controversy, I shall tell you my opinion of the man that first laid the claim, and the year when. 2. But it is sufficient for me to prove, that from the beginning it was not so. Little did the Bishops of Rome before Constantines dayes, dream of governing all the Christians in the world. But when the Emperours became Christians, their great favour and large endowments of the Church, and the greatness and advantage of the Imperial City did give opportunity to the Bishop of Rome (as having both riches, and the Emperours and Commanders ears) to do so many and great favours for most other Churches, in preserving and vindicating them, that it was very easy for the Bishop hereby to become the chief Patriarch (which he was more beholden to the Emperour for, then to any Title that he had from Christ or Peter.) And then the quarrel with John of Constantinople occasioned the thoughts of an universal Headship; which Gregory did disclaim and abominate, but Boniface after him, by the

grant
grant of a murdering trayterous Emperour, did obtain: But so as the See swelled before into a preparatory magnitude.

And if we could not tell you the time within two hundred years and more, it were no great matter, as long as we can prove that it was not so before. For who knows not that even some Kings in Europe have come from being limited Monarchs, to be absolute, and that by such degrees, that none can tell the certain time. Nay I may give you a stranger instance. The Parliaments of England have part in the legislative power: And yet I do not think that any Lawyer in England is able to prove the just time, yea or the age, (or within many ages) when they first obtained it: which yet in so narrow a spot of ground may be easilier done, then the time of the Popes usurpation over all the world. For it could not be all at once: for one Country yeilded to his (late) claim in one age, and another in another age, and many a bloody battle was fought before he could bring the Germane Emperours and Christian Princes to submit to him fully.

3. But let me tell you one thing more; Though as to an arrogant claim, the Pope is Head and Governour of all the Catholike Church,
Church, and Rome their Mistris, (as the Pope makes Patriarchs of Antioch, Alexandria, and Hierusalem, that never come near the place or people,) yet as to any possession or acknowledgement on the Churches part, he was never universal Head; nor Rome the Mistris to this day. For the greater half of the Christians did never subject themselves to him at all, nor come under his power. So that the Pope even now in his greatest height, is only the head of the universal Church by his own claim, and naming himself so, without any Title given by God, or acknowledged by men, and without having ever been possessed of what he claims. The King of France doth scarce believe that the King of England was King of France, for all that he put it into his title: nor do the Swedes take the Pole for their King, because he so calls himself. I am sure if the Turkish Emperor call himself the Emperor of the world, that doth not prove that he is so. Rainerius the Popes Inquisitor (in catal. post. lib. cont. Waldens.) faith plainly, That the Churches that were planted by the Apostles themselves (such as the Abaslines, &c.) are not subject to the Pope. Once he had the Government of no Church in the world, but Rome it self: After that he grew to have the
the government of the *Patriarchate of the West*: since that he hath got *some more*, and claimed all; but never got neer half the Churches into his hands to this day. Do I need then to say any more to disprove his universal Headship, and that *Rome* is not the Catholike Ruling Church?

But having gone thus far in opening my thoughts to you, I shall forbear the adjoyning the proof of my Assertions, till I hear again from you. If I understand it, The Question between you and me to be debated, must be this, *Whether the Roman Church was in the Apostles days, the Mother or Ruling Church, which all other Churches were bound to obey, and from it were to be called the Roman Catholike Church?* This I deny: and you must maintain, or else you must be no Papist. The motion that I make is, that by the next you will send me your Arguments to prove it (for it belongs to you to prove it, if you affirm it.) To which I will return you (if they change not my judgement) both my Answers and my Arguments for the Negative. And if you do indeed make good but this one Assertion, I do here promise you, that I will joyfully and resolvedly turn Papist: and if you cannot make it good, I may expect that you should
Should no longer adhere to Rome as the Ruling or Catholike Church, and the Pillar and Ground of Truth; though charity should allow it to be [a Catholike Church] that is a member of the Catholike Church, which is indeed the Pillar and Ground of Truth, wherein Rome may have a part as it is part of the Church: But I would it were not a most dangerously diseased part. I crave your reply with what speed you can, and remain,

An unfeigned lover of Truth and the friends of Truth.

Feb. 12. 1657.


The two following Letters, with the Narrative, are annexed only to shew the effect of the former.

Sir,

Though the business in agitation betwixt your self and me, be the one thing necessary, and so to be preferred to all obligations, and businesses of what concernment soever; yet a resolution formerly taken up, hath diverted me.
me somewhat from the present earnest prosecution thereof as it deserves. Temporal credit, though it should give way to things of eternal moment, yet it often sways the minds even of good men to neglect very important opportunities; which though I cannot excuse my self of, yet I desire it may be candidly interpreted, and that this may be accepted as a pledge to an answer of what you have inserted. And I desire your next may be directed to me to London, to one Mr. T. S. who is a kinsman of mine, and no small admirer of your self. My thanks in the interim I return for the pains you have taken, which I hope through the mercy of God will not prove unsuccessful for the future one way or other: the truth is, I have not divulged my self, or intentions as yet to any of my own way, which I know will be very troublesome; and I know I shall be beset with enemies from the ignorant, that way affected, as I doubt not of help from the learned. Yet as I told you in my former, without any carnal interest respecting, or outward troubles regarding, or inbred enemies combating, I resolve by the grace and assistance of God to be guided by truth impartially where I shall find it lye clearest: and shall make it my work to implore the throne of mercy, that my understanding may be so enlighten-
ned, as to discern truth from heresi. I desire Sir, if it may be no prejudice to your more earnest occasions, that I may have two or three lines from you by way of advice to meet me at London at the place aforesaid, and assure your self, however God shall direct the success, I shall rest, Sir,

A thirsty desirer of truth, and yours unsignedly,

Feb. 16. 1656.

Tho. Smith.

If what you write to me be first sent to Mr. John Smiths of Worcester as before, it will be safely sent to me. Good Sir, think not I slight a business of so eternal consequence by my neglect for the present; for none shall for the future be found more earnest to find out the mind of God, and he assisting, I hope, as cheerfully to close therewith.

Sir,

The speed of your former applications to me by way of answer, incites me to the confirmation of those thoughts of your worth which were at my first addresses to you harboured in my breast; but the substance of your discourse
discourse is a stronger motive. Although per-
adventure it may seem somewhat wonderful,
that I should so soon be brought over to the
serious apprehensions of the weight of what
you have written to me; yet when you consult
the divine providence, and the Almighty di-
rection which prompted me to the choice of your
self above others, upon grounds not altogether
insufficiently established, which will be further
made good when I shall have the happiness of a
personal entercourse of communion with you,
it will be certainly concluded upon by your
self and whosoever it shall be communicated
to, that the truth, which I have already seri-
ously pondered, was the full aim of my in-
tentions: which truth I shall impartially and
joyfully entertain wheresoever I find it, with-
out any thoughts at all of temporal or external
discouragements, of which I have already con-
tested with some, and expect (the Lord arm me
against them) far greater. It is no small
thing that I shall be lookt upon as an Apostate,
and so worthy of excommunication utterly; but
I conclude according to St. Augustine (I
guess) that it is no shame to turn to the better,
and withal I add (although I could insert
some small exceptions) I am to the main sa-
tisfied, but yet in some doubtful suspence,
wherein I expect full satisfaction by your
book,
book, which I received intimation from you is in the Press, and quickly to be published. If I might receive two or three lines from you in the interim, by way of establishment, it would be very gratefully accepted, in relation to the comfortable taking off those obstacles which I am certain to meet with in my change of judgement. I am very sorry that a person whom I know to be so tender of eternal souls in general, should be so continually taken off your important business daily by particulars. But being likewise sensible that you value a soul according to the worth of the same; I am encouraged to think, yea I verily believe, these rude things proceeding from a soul that is to rise or fall according to what is now determining between us, it will not be unacceptably received from, Sir,

The admirer of your worth,

March 24. 1656.

Tho. Smith.
A Narrative of the case of T. S. by his friend.

Reverend Sir,

Mr. Thomas Smith late of Martins Ludgate London was brought up in the Protestant Religion, and for some years accounted an affectionate professor thereof, by those who were acquainted with his diligence and pains in writing out at large the notes he took of (Mr. Calamies and others) pious Sermons: but afterwards (not living up to the knowledge he had) he grew more remiss in his practice, and in his company; and became a great affliction to his Father in his life-time by reason thereof, but a greater to his Mother after his Fæther's death: which I suppose Mr. Jacomb, Mr. Fauller and others of her acquaintance cannot forget. But when she understood the company he most frequented were Papists, who did at length take the boldness to refer to her house, she was very much perplexed, fearing that they had prevailed with her son to turn Papist, which she soon found, as she told me, to be so indeed. I was not willing to believe her report, but desired to
to satisfy my self by discoursing with himself, hoping that I should not have found his judgement determined that way, as I did to my great trouble find it to be, especially in his justification of the Jurisdiction and Authority of the Pope, and other tenets of the Church of Rome. By this time he had wafted his Patrimony, and had run himself into debt so far, that he durst not walk up and down the streets as he had done: he went a Voyage to the Barbadoes, but returned thence in a worse condition then he went, yet continued still in the opinion he had received, notwithstanding the great offence and trouble it was to those from whom he expected relief and maintenance, whose hearts and hands were in that particular somewhat shut up against him, in so much that he was reduced to manifold extremities here. Afterwards, hopeless of any livelihood here, he went over to Ireland where he had a kinismam; but meeting with disappointment there of what he expected, he returned again into England, and steered his course to Worcester, where he had another kinsman lived; during this Voyage I exchanged several letters with him, being desirous to make him sensible of the hand of God eminently out against him, hedging up his
his way with thorns everywhere, which I desired might be in order to his return to God, looking upon his condition to be manifestly desperate for ever, if he should refuse to return, and harden his heart against him. At Worcester he fell sick, which through God's blessing brought him to a more serious consideration of his everlasting state which he apprehended to approach near. And it wrought some kind of doubt in him, touching the truth of some of the chief of those things which he had entertained as true about the Church of Rome, as he informed me by his letter; whereunto for his conviction and better satisfaction, I did advise him to apply himself unto Mr. Baxter of Kidderminster (who I told him I did believe was a great lover of souls) which he by letter did as he told me, and that Mr. Baxter did return him an answer thereunto in writing, with liberty to shew it to any the most learned of his way; which when he came to London he shewed me, acknowledging himself much convinced by it: and the more taken, for that so large and full an answer with that liberty should be dispatch't to him with so much expedition, which as I remember he said he had the next day after he sent his. Yet was he confident, as he said, that it would
would be answered, and as he told me, he had left it with one that had undertaken it; He spake of its being shewn to Embassadors or an Embassador, and that within fourteen days he should have an answer to it; but enquiring after it, I could never see any answer, nor could he notwithstanding all his solicitations and provocations used, prevail to have an answer; which he seemed to be very much offended at; and at length, as he told me, those with whom he had to do about it, were much offended with him: in so much that he intimated himself to be apprehensive of danger from some of them: yet he seemed resolved to adventure whatsoever might befall him in that respect, rather then he would stifle those convictions, which by Mr. Baxter's letter had been begotten in him; This letter of Mr. Baxter, together with [The Safe Religion] a Book which he did refer him to, either then or near that time in the press, which he went for and had of the Stationer upon Mr. Baxter's account, (which I had almost forgot) gave him such resolution and satisfaction, that he thereupon altered his judgement and practice, and waited upon the Ordinances here in London in our Congregations for some time; I my self having seen
seen him at the morning exercise in London: what further effects it wrought upon him I know not; for that he left the City and went over into Flanders as his Mother hath informed me, and is since dead:

Sir,

Your affectionate friend
to serve you.

T. S.

For Mr. William Johnson.

Sir,

When I was invited to this Disputation with you, I entertained hopes, from your profest desires of close argumentation, that we should speedily bring it to such an issue, as might in some good measure answer our endeavours, in taking off the covering that Sophistry and carnal interest had cast upon the truth. When my necessary employments denied me the leisure of reading over your second Papers for some weeks; and when the loss of my Reply by the Carrier, and the difficulty of procuring another Copy, had caused a little longer delay; you urged so hard for a Reply, as put me in some further
Further hopes that you were resolved to go through with it your self. But after near a twelvemonths expectation of a Rejoinder, and of the Proof of your own succession from the Apostles, being here at London, I desired you to resolve me, whether I might expect any such Return and Performance from you, or not: And when you would not promise it, I took up the thoughts of publishing what had past between us: But upon further urging you, some moneths after, you renewed my hopes, which caused me to make some stay of my publication, and to desire you to give me your sense of the most used terms; (promising you that I shall do the like, when you require it; which I am ready to perform.) But yet I hear nothing to this day of your Answer to my Papers, or the Performance of what is incumbent on you for the justification of your Church: And therefore having waited and importuned you in vain so long, and finding by your last, that you cannot or will not so explicate your terms, as to be understood (without which there is no disputing;) and also perceiving, that my abode in London is like to be but little longer; my discretion and the ends of my writing have commanded me, to forbear no longer the publication of what hath past be-
tween us: For, though the work be not copious and elaborate, yet being on a subject, which your party do so much insist upon, I am assured it may be of common use. And I know that the publication is no breach of any promise on my part, nor do I perceive how it can be any way injurious to you; and therefore I see nothing to prohibit it: And I am not willing to be used as Mr. Gunning and Mr. Pierson were, by the partial unhansome publication of another.

If yet I may prevail with you, to justify your cause, as you are engaged, I must entreat you specially to try your strength for the proof of your own succession: for we are most confident that its a notorious impossibility which you undertake. Our Arguments against it are such as these.

1. That Church which since the time of Christ hath received a new essential part, hath not its being successively from the Apostles. But such is the Church of Rome: Ergo —

The Major is undeniable. The Minor is thus proved. A Vice-Christ, or Vice-head, or Governour of the Universal Church is an essential part of the now Church of Rome. But a Vice-Christ, or Vice-head, or Governour of the Universal Church is new, or a novelty, (or hath not been from the time of
of Christ on earth:) _Ergo_, the Church of Rome since the time of Christ, hath received a new essential part. The novelty I have here and elsewhere proved: And Blondel and Molinaeus against Perron have done it more at large.

2. That Church which hath had frequent and long intercessions in its head or essential part, hath not had a continued succession from the Apostles. But such is the Church of Rome: _Ergo——_

The Minor is here proved: and some hints of it are in the Appendix.

3. That Church which hath had many new essential Articles of Religion, hath not had a continued succession from the Apostles: (For if the essence be new, the Church is new.) But such is the Church of Rome. _Ergo——_

First it is commonly maintained by you that all Articles are Essential or Fundamental: and you deride the contrary doctrine from the Prostestants.

Secondly, that you have had many new Articles of Religion (of faith and points of worship) is proved by our writers, and your own confessions. See Molinaeus de Novit. Papismi. Prove a succession of all that is deicide determined in your Councils, or but of all
all in Pope Pius his Creed, and the Council of Trent alone; or of all that with you is de fide of those two and thirty points which I have named in my Key for Catholikes, p. 143, 144, 145. Chap. 25. Deett. 16. and I will yeild you all the cause: or I will profess my belief of every one of those points of which you prove such a succession, as held by the Catholike Church, as you now hold them. Read and answer my Deett. 21. Cap. 33. in my Key for Catholikes.

And how far you own Innovations, see what I have proved, ibid. cap. 35. and 36.

But these arguings being works of supererogation, I shall trouble you here with no more; but wait for such proof of all your essentials, as we give you of all ours. In the mean time, I shall endeavour so to defend the Truth, as not to lose or weaken Charity, but approve my self

An unfeigned lover of the Truth and you.

Sep. 1. 1660.

Richard Baxter.

FINIS.