

1603
D75

A
TREATISE CONCERNING ANTI-CHRIST, DIVIDED INTO TWO BOOKES, THE FORMER, PROVING THAT THE POPE IS AN ANTICHRIST;

THE LATTER, MAINTAINING the same assertion, against all the *objections* of Robert Bellarmine, Jesuit and Cardinall of the Church of Rome.

By GEORGE DOVNAME, Doctor of Divinitie, and lately reader of the Divinity Lecture in Paules.

Apo. 18, 4, 6.

Come out of Babylon my people, that you be not partakers with her in her sinnes, and that you receive not of her plagues, &c. Render unto her as she hath rewarded you, and repay her double according to her worke.



AT LONDON
Imprinted for Cuthbert Burbie. 1603.

1603
D75



**TO THE MOST HIGH
AND MIGHTIE, MOST
CHRISTIAN AND WORTHY KING,**

I A M B S., by the grace of God King of England,
Scotland, Fraunce and Ireland, defender of the
faith, &c. All prosperitie and true happinesse
in this life, and eternall felicitie in
the life to come.



H H blessed dispensation of Gods most graci-
ous providence towards this land; (for which
his holy name is alwayes to be praised in his
church) in bringing your Highnesse unto this
kingdome, in the beginning of this seven-
teenth century after Christ, seemeth to pre-
sage, that the happy reformation of the church,
restitution of the Gospell, consumption of Antichrist, decay of Ba-
bylon happily begun in the last centenary, shall in this age or cen-
tury receiue a notable confirmation and increase, if not a perfect
consummation. For howsoeuer whiles the darknesse of Popery
ouer spread the Christian world, not onely the inhabitants of the
earth were made drunke with the goulden cup of the whore of Ba-
bylons fornications, but the Kings also and Princes of the earth
hauidng drunke of the same cup, committed spirituall whoredome

Apoc. 17. 2.
& 18. 3.

Apoc. 17. 15

with her, and gave power to suppress the truth, and when as it
 should lead to enlighten the world with the bright beames of his
 glorious Gospel, then Antichrist began to consume, and Babylon
 to decay: the Preachers discovering Antichrist, the people com-
 ming out of Babylon, and the Princes which before had assisted
 Antichrist, setting themselves against him. This great worke of
 God in the full consumption of Antichrist and confusion of Baby-
 lon, the Ministers of God, that is to say, Princes and Preachers, are
 to accomplish and bring to passe. The Preachers, by preaching the
 everlasting Gospel; at the sound whereof Babylon falleth, as once
 the walles of Iericho at the noise of the Trumpets sounded by the
 Priests: and by the ministerie whereof as it were the spirit of the
 Lords mouth, Antichrist falleth into a consumption, as Dagon
 once did fall before the Arke. The Princes, partly by their good
 example going out and in before the people in the sincere profession
 of the truth, and detestation of popery; partly by their authoritie,
 providing faithfull Ministers, countenancing their Ministerie,
 oppugning Antichrist in his religion and in his members, berea-
 ving the whore of Babylon the Popes concubine of her meanes,
 and lastly sacking her and consuming her with fire. For which cause
 as I thought it my duty (being called to read a Lecture in divini-
 tie) when I perceived the Papists within these few yeares (I know
 not upon what other hopes then of raising their fortunes out of the
 ruines of this whole Island) growne more insolent then in former
 times, to make the best opposition I could against them, and to that
 end handled this maine controuersie concerning Antichrist (where-
 upon all Popery dependeth) both *καταναγκάζων* proving the affir-
 mative, viz. that the Pope is Antichrist, and also *ἀνταρραβάζων* dis-
 proving the negative against the objections of Bellarmine the
 Goliath of the Papists: so being now at the instance of many well
 disposed

disposed persons, to publish this treatise, I have thought good to de-
 dedicate the same to your Maiestie, as the chiefe patron and defender
 of the faith and Gospel of Christ (upon earth) against Antichrist
 and his adherents. For hereby not onely your royall courage may
 be stirred up, and your godly resolution in oppugning Antichrist
 (according to the prophecies of the scripture, foretelling the durie
 of Christian Princes in this behalfe) more and more confirmed:
 but also it may most evidently appeare to all men, that upon most
 iust and weighty considerations, you and your people renounce all
 communion with the Pope and church of Rome, and by all good
 meanes doe set our selues against them. For if the Pope be Anti-
 christ (which is proued in this Booke) & consequently the church
 of Rome, the whore of Babylon, and synagogue of Antichrist: the
 papists, (who call themselves Catholicks, and vs Heretiques) the
 limmes of Antichrist; the religion and doctrine of popery, the
 mystrie of iniquitie and meere Antichristianisme: it followeth
 necessarily, that Christian princes are not to tolerate either the re-
 ligion of papists or their persons within their dominions. The reli-
 gion of papistry being a Catholick Apostasie from God, consisting
 not onely in respect of the worship, of manifold superstition and most
 grosse idolatrie, but also in respect of the doctrine, of many hundred
 Antichristian errors and doctrines of diuels. The persons of Ca-
 tholick-papists, being Catholick heretiques and reuolters from God,
 members of Antichrist, palpable idolatours; many of them (espe-
 cially the Seminarie priests and Iesuites) perswaders of others to ido-
 latry and apostasie from God. Not to speake of the treason against
 Christian Princes which is enclosed in the bowels of popery, and
 bowels of papists. For they teach that all Christian Princes
 who acknowledge not the Pope for their supreme head and Lord,
 (as no true Christians doe) are Schismatics at the least, and conse-

THE EPISTLE

consequently that the Pope hath authoritie to depose them, and to absolue their subiects from their allegiance : and that the Pope when he proceedeth to the sentence of excommunication and deposition of them (as he did against your sister of blessed memorie Queene Elizabeth, and doth, so oft as he dares, against others) he doth not erre in his definitive sentence. And therefore (whatsoever they pretend to the contrarie) it is certaine, that they being the marked slaues of Antichrist, wholly deuoted to his will, are also willing and ready (when meanes and opportunitie faile not) to put in execution his Antichristian censures, and diuellish designements. In consideration whereof, Christian Princes and people, are not onely bound to come out of Babylon, and to renounce all communion with the Pope and Church of Rome, but also they are to rewarde the whore of Babylon, as she hath rewarded vs, yet to repay her double : and not onely to hate her, but also to make her desolate and naked, to eate her flesh and consume her with fire. And herof Christian Princes are to be assured, that as those which ioyne with the Pope in persecuting the faithfull, doe fight vnder the banner of Antichrist the beast, against Christ the Lambe : so they in oppugning the Pope and Church of Rome, doe fight the battailes of Christ against Antichrist. And consequently, are to promise to themselves vndoubted victorie : they fighting vnder the banner of the Lambe, who shall be sure to ouercome, seeing he is the Lord of Lords, and King of Kings: and those also that are with him, though esteemed of Antichrist and his adherents, as Schismaticks and Heretiques, yet are they called, elect, and faithfull. Encourage therefore your selfe most Christian King (as we doubt not but you doe) to maintaine for euer the truth of Christ, against the falshood of Antichrist. And doubts you not both of happy successe and victorie in this life, and of

Apoc. 18. 4.

Apoc. 18. 6.

Apoc. 17. 16.

Apoc. 17. 19

Apoc. 17. 14.

Qui monet
ut faciat,
quod iam
facit, ipse
monendo
laudat, &
hortatur
comprobat
assuescit.

DEDICATORIE.

an immortall crowne of glory in the life to come. The God of all mercy and power, who in his vnspokeable bountie towards vs, hath placed your Highnesse ouer vs in peace, make both you and vs truly thankfull to his maiestie for this inestimable benefit : and establish your Highnesse and your Royall posteritie in the throne of this Kingdome, to the glory of his great name, advancement of his Kingdome, propagation of the Gospell, confusion of Popery, consolation of all true Christians, and your owne euermlasting comfort.

Amen.

Your Maiesties

most humble

and

dutifull subiect

GEORGE DOVVNAME.

the Papists which be tractable may be reclaimed: Secondly, that those which bee obstinate among them may bee confounded: Thirdly, that Protestants and professours of the truth which be found & resolute, may be more & more confirmed: lastly & especially that those which be weak & waivering may be stayed, and perswaded from falling into that fearfull iudgement, which as the Lord hath threatened *2. Thess. 2.* against vnfound professours in these latter times, so hath it within these few years fallen vpon very many, who hauing by the great mercy of God beene deliuered out of the more then Egyptian bondage of Antichrist: and being set in the way toward the celestiall *Canaan* and land of promise, seemed with the vnthankfull *Israelites* to be wearie of the celestiall Manna the soode of their soules, and desired to be againe among the flesh-pots of *Egypt*. For seeing they had not receiued the loue of the truth that they might be saued, therefore God hath sent vpon them the efficacie of error that they should belieue lies (meaning the lies of Antichrist) that all they might be condemned, which believed not the truth, but delighted in vniustices, meaning the myserie of iniquitie wherof he had spoken *verse. 7.* that is to say, Antichristianisme or Popery.

2 And that we may proceed in order, we are first to set down the state of this controuersie, which in deed is the cheefe of all controuersies betwixt vs and the Papists, and of the greatest consequence. For if this were once thoroughly cleared, all others would easily be decided. Our assertion therefore in few words is this, *That the Pope of Rome, who is as it were the God of the Papistes, is that grand Antichrist, who according to the prophecies of the holy Ghost in the Scriptures, was to be reuealed in these latter times.* The Papists hold the contrary. And whereas we say and proue that their Lord God the Popes holiness is Antichrist, they affirme that our assertion is blasphemie, and our arguments dotages. But if it were no harder a matter to demonstrate the truth of our assertion, then to proue their conceipt concerning Antichrist and the proofes thereof to be mere dotages; I should very easily put this Question out of controuersie; that the Pope is Antichrist.

3 But first our assertion is to be expounded, and afterwards proued. As touching the name wee agree (saith *Bellarmin*) in this, that as the name *Christ* is taken two waies, to wit, commonly and properly, so also the name *Antichrist*. The name *Christ* commonly belongeth to all that are annointed of God; and that either to the speciall calling of a King, Prophet or Priest, or to the general calling of a Christian. And in this sence it is taken either more largely for the whole body of those that profess the name of Christ, whereof some are members of Christ in title and profession onely; or more strictly for the society of the elect citizens of heauen, who haue the marks of God, and are not only in shewe and profession, but also indeed and in truth members of the mysticall body of Christ. Peculiarly and *κατ' ιδίαν* the name Christ belongeth to Iesus the sonne of God, who was annointed with the oyle of gladnesse above all his fellows, and is the head, after a general maner, of all Christians, but more specially of the elect. In like sort the contrary name *Antichrist* belongeth commonly to all that be enemies to Christ; and those either open & professed enemies as the Iewes, Turkes, Infidels (in which sence the worde is not vsed in the Scripture) or else couert, professing themselves Christians, and vnder the name and profession of Christ, oppugning Christ and his truth. And so it is taken either more largely to signifie the whole bodie of Heretickes (as in the Epistles of *Iohn*) or more strictly the societie of them who hauing made an apostasie from Christ, haue receiued the marke of the beast. Properly or rather peculiarly & *κατ' ιδίαν* it belongeth to the man of sinne, the sonne of perdition: who after a more generall maner is the head of all Heretickes, and more specially of that societie, which hath the marke, the number and name of the beast. The societie or body of those who hauing made an apostasie fro Christ to Antichrist, & the Antichristian state which in the Scriptures is called the *whore of Babilon*, wee hold to be the apostatical church of Rome. The head of this Antichristian body & catholicke apostasie, we hold to be the Pope of Rome; and consequently that the Pope is that grand Antichrist, whom the holy Ghost in the Scriptures hath described vnto vs; And that he *κατ' ιδίαν* is called the Antichrist, not onely

2. Thess. 1. 10.
11. 12.

1. Thess. 2. 7.

Rhemist. in 2.
Thess. 2. Bellar-
min lib. 3. de
Pont. Rom. sive
de Antichristo
cap. 18.

Lib. 3. de pont.
Rom. 6. 2.

Psalm. 117.

1. Cor. 12. 13.

Apoc. 9. 4.

Psalm. 45. 7.

1. John. 2. 18.

2. Thess. 2. 3.

Apoc. 17. 17.

Apoc. 17.

because he is the head of the Antichristian body, but also because he being in profession the vicar of Christ, is in deed *Emulus Christi*, that is, an enemy opposed vnto Christ, in emulation of like honour, as if we should say, a counter-Christ, as the worde Antichrist doth also signifie.

4 But when we say that the Pope is Antichrist, wee meane not this or that Pope, howsoeuer some of them haue bene more notorious Antichrists then others: as for example *Siluester* the 2., *Gregory* the 7. alis *Hildebrand*, *Boniface* 8., *Iohn* 22., alis 24., *Alexander* 6. &c. but the whole rowe or rabble of them, from *Boniface* the 2. downward. For although the Antichrist be but one person, yet he is not one as Christ the head of the Christian body, is one. Christ because he liueth for ever hath no successors, and therefore is one in nature and number, as being one singular & definit person. The head of the Antichristian body, which is to continue to the end of the worlde, is continued not in one singular and definit person, but in a succession of many, who are mortall and momentany, which successiue haue bene, are, or shalbe the heads of the catholicke apostasie: of any where, of indefinitely, or of all commonly, the worde Antichrist is vnderstood. For euen as the Pope or vicar of Christ according to the Popish conceipt, is one person not in number and nature, but by lawe and institution, one at once ordinatly, but many successiue; so Antichrist is not one singular person, but a succession of Antichristian Popes, which we begin at *Boniface* the thirde. Because he with much adoe, about the yeare of our Lord 607. obtained from the Emperour *Phocas*, and all his successors since, haue challenged vnto them, the Antichristian title of the head of the catholicke or vniuersall Church, or *oecumenicall* & *vniuersall* Bishop. Which title of blasphemy, as *Gregory* calleth it, befitting him that resembleth Lucifer in pride, when as *Iohn* the Bishop of Constantinople had challenged not long before, to wit, about the yeare 600. in the time of *Mauritius*, whom *Phocas* cruelly murdered, *Gregory* the great then Pope of Rome assumed confidently (for so he saith, *Fidenter dico*) that therein he was the forerunner of Antichrist, who was now euen at hand, *Omnia enim qua predicta sunt, sunt. Rex superbia prop̄ est, & quod dei nefas*

nefas est, sacerdotum ei preparatur exercitus. For all things saith he which were foretold, do now come to passe. The king of pride (meaning Antichrist) is at hand: and that which is horrible to be spoken, an army of priests is prepared for him. Whereby he would also insinuate, that he should be the prince of priests. Now this is a principle in the church of Rome, that the Pope, (especially such a Pope as *Gregory* the great, speaking definitiue and confidently) can not erre. And if this be true (as they may not deny, the Pope being the foundation of all their truth) then must they needs confesse that Antichrist was come, almost a thousand yeers since, and that the Pope their prince of priests, who not only succeedeth *Iohn* of Constantinople in that Antichristian title, but also farre exceedeth him in all Antichristian pride, challenging a soveraigne and vniuersall authority not only aboue all other Bishops and priests, but also aboue all kings and Emperours, is that Antichrist.

5 To this testimony of *Gregory* I might adde diuerse other witnesses. But my purpose is not to draw mine arguments from the writings, and as it were the cisternes of men, who liued before the reuelation of Antichrist, and therefore except themselves had bene prophets, could not fully expound these prophecies: but from the pure fountaines of holy scriptures expounded by the history and euent, the best interpreters of prophecies. For as *Danell* saith of the like (or rather as the Papists say of the same prophecies concerning Antichrist) *The words are closed up, and sealed, untill the appointed tyme.* And accordingly was it said by *Augustine*, *prophetia citius impleti quam intelligi, that prophecies are fulfilled sooner then vnderstood, and by Irenaeus* whome *Bel-larmine* also alleadgeth to the same purpose, *omnes prophetia (saith he) priusquam habeant efficaciam, auzmata sunt & ambiguitas hominibus.* All prophecies before they haue their complement, are vnto men darke and doubtfull speeches. And therefore speaking of some part of the prophecies concerning Antichrist, hee saith, *Certum & sine periculo est sustinere adimpletionem prophetiae, quam suspicari, &c.* It is more sure and safe to wait for the fulfilling of the prophetic, then before hand to deliuer vncertaine guesses. Omitting therefore the vncertaine coniectures of men (for

Dan. 12. 9.

Lib. 4. aduers.
heres. l. 43.
Bell. de pont. A.
lib. 3. c. 10.

Apoc. 13.

Lib. 5. aduers.
heres. pag.
anteponit.

Lib. 3. de pont.
R. 6. 10.

such are diuerse opinions of the fathers concerning Antichrist, as Bellarmine confesseth of some, from the sacred scriptures, the vndoubted oracles of God, I frame this demonstration;

6 Vnto whome soeuer the prophecies of holy scripture describing Antichrist the head of the Antichristian body, doe wholly and onely agree, hee is that graund Antichrist who is foretold in the scriptures. Vnto the Pope of Rome the prophecies of holy scripture concerning Antichrist the head of the Antichristian body, doe wholly and onely agree: therefore the Pope of Rome is that graund Antichrist which is foretold in the scriptures. The proposition I take for graunted. For seeing the holy ghost hath of purpose in diuerse places of the scripture taken vpon him fully and sufficiently to describe Antichrist, and that to this end, that he might be knowne; we neede not doubt, but that this description of Antichrist is so perfect and so proper vnto him, as to whome that description agreeth not, he is not Antichrist: & contrarywise whom it wholly and onely fitteth, hee must be held and acknowledged to be that Antichrist. All the controuersie therefore is concerning the assumption, namely, whether the descriptions of Antichrist in the scriptures agree to the Pope or not. Antichrist is described by the holy ghost, especially in three places, viz. in the second chapter of the second epistle to the Thessalonians, in the thirteenth of the Reuelation from the eleuenth verse to the end, and in the seuenteenth chapter of the same booke. For I omitt those places in the prophetic of Daniel which vsually are alleged, (because they speake properly of Antiochus Epiphanes, who was but a type of Antichrist, as Bellarmine also confesseth,) and the ninth of the Apocalypse, because it is by some expounded of the Turks.

Chap. 7. & 8.
¶ 11. & 12.

Lib. 3. de pont.
R. 6. 18. & 21.

7 And that the description of Antichrist in the scriptures sely agreeth to the Pope, it appeareth by this induction. For whereas all the arguments and notes whereby Antichrist is described in the scriptures, may be reduced to these heads, to wit, the place or seat where we are to find him; the time, when we were to looke for him; his condition and qualities, that he is an aduersary opposed vnto Christ in emulation of like honour, a man of sinne in generall, and more particularly an horrible Idolatour: his actions

and

and passions, that is, such things as he shall either do or suffer: I will make it euident by the helpe of God (whose all-seeing spirit I humbly beseech to guide me into the truth) that all and euery one of them doe so fitly and properly agree to the Pope of Rome, that in the descriptions of Antichrist in the scripture, the Pope may behold himselfe as it were in a glasse.

Chap. 2.

Of the place or seat of Antichrist.

1.



And first as touching the place or seat of Antichrist, I reason thus, *Mysticall Babylon* (spoken of in the seuenteenth and eighteenth of the Apocalypse, is the seat of Antichrist:

Rome is *Mysticall Babylon*, spoken of in the seuenteenth and eighteenth of the Apocalypse. Therefore Rome is the seat of Antichrist.

As touching the proposition, you are to vnderstand that Babylon in the scriptures is taken sometimes literally, and sometimes mystically: literally, for Babylon either in Chaldaea, or in Egypt. Babylon in Chaldaea was the Metropolis or Imperiall city of the Babylonian and Assyrian Monarchy. Babylon in AEgypt is called Babylis and Cayrus, of which some vnderstand the Apostle Peter to speake 1. Epist. 5. 13. Babylon mysticall in the Apocalypse, is the seat or chiefe city of Antichrist, resembling the Assyrian Babylon in pride, idolatry, filthinesse, and especiallie in most cruell persecution of the church of God. And for the same causes Apoc. 11. 8. is called spiritually, Sodom and Egypt. Sodom, Ap. 11. 8. for pride and filthinesse: Egypt, for idolatry and for cruelty towards the Israel of God. And as the church of Christ in the Apocalypse is called Ierusalem mysticallie, or the holy city: so the church & especially the Metropolis or chiefe city of Antichrist, is mysticallie called Babylon. This as it is the receiued opinion of the faithfull, so may it euidently be gathered out of the seuenteenth and eighteenth of Apocalypse, which without all doubt

B 4

arc

Bellarmin. lib. 3.
de Pont. R. c. 2.
Sander, demon.
lib. 13. c. 18.

are prophecies concerning Antichrist, and the Antichristian city and seat, as the Papists themselves often confesse.

2 For that which the Papists sometimes object, That by Babylon is meant not any one city or company, but the vniuersall company of the reprobate, it is unworthy the answering. And the argument which our Rhemists bring to proue their assertion, is without fence, to wit in their annotation vpon Apoc. 18. 21. where the Angell throwing a great stone into the Sea, saith, with such violence shall that great city Babylon be throwne, and bee found no more. By this (say they) it seemeth cleere, that the Apostle meaneth not any one city, but the vniuersall company of the reprobate, which shall perish in the day of iudgement. But I answer, that the destruction of the vniuersall company of the reprobate in the day of iudgement, is described afterward chap. 20. 11. And this destruction, as appeareth plainly by the circumstances of the text, especially in the ninth verse, and those which follow vnto the eighteenth, shall be before the day of iudgement, and therefore is not the destruction of the vniuersall company of the wicked. For if the vniuersall destruction of the wicked were here signified, then none of the wicked should lument after this destruction to lament the same, as there shall, vers. 9. 10. 17. And that the vniuersall societie of the wicked is not meant by Babylon, evidently appeareth by the whole discourse, chapters 17. and 18, where the holy ghost speaketh of a city ruling ouer the princes of the earth, situated vpon seauen hilles, sitting vpon many waters, that is, ruling ouer many people, nations and languages, with whome all princes and inhabitants of the earth haue committed fornication, whose destruction is bewailed of all sorts of the wicked, none of which people or princes, or wicked ones that mourne for her, should be of the vniuersall company of the reprobate (as vndoubtedly they are) if Babylon signified the whole number of the wicked. And whereas they alleadge Jerem. 52, where onely the history of the Babylonian captivity is recorded, to proue that Babylon signifieth the whole number of Gods enemies: it argueth, that they haue not so much as any shewe of reason to object against the truth of this proposition, namely that mysticall Babylon is the seat, or as they speake, the See of Antichrist

christ, and therefore from henceforth vntill something further be objected, I will take it for graunted.

3. But let vs come to the assumption, viz, that Rome is mysticall Babylon: which I will proue by three arguments. First, because the description of Babylon, and of the whore of Babylon set downe by the holy Ghost, Apoc. 17. agreeth in all points to Rome and the Romane state. But most plainly in these two: First that the whore of Babylon is that great citie which in the Apostles time, had the kingdome ouer the Apoc. 17. 18. Kings of the earth. And secondly, that this citie is situated on 7. hilles: which two notes most properly describe Rome. Apoc. 17. 9. And so Propertius describeth it,

Septem vrbs alta iugis, tota quæ præfides orbi,
stet montibus 7. hilles, ouer-ruling the whole world. That Rome was the Imperiall citie of the world, and the Metropolis of the Romane Monarchy, it is out of Question, neither is there any of our aduersaries either so ignorant or so shameles as to deny it. Fro hence therefore I reason thus: That citie which in the apostles time had dominion ouer the Kings of the earth, is the whore of Babylon. Rome is that citie which in the apostles time, and since also vnder the Pope, had the dominion ouer the kings of the earth: therefore Rome is the whore of Babylon. And that Rome also was situated on 7. hills, it is most manifest. Of her Virgil saith, hne.

Scilicet & rerum facta est pulcherrima Roma,
Septem quæ una sibi muro circumdedit arces.

Varro speaking of a festiual day, which among the Romanes lib. 5. de ling. was called *Septimontium*, he saith it was so called, ab his 7. montibus in quibus vrbs sita est. that is, of the 7. hills whereon the citie was situated. And Plinarch vpon the same occasion calleth Rome *in idem, i. Septicollam*, that is *Seuen hilled*. Blondus Rome instans. lib. 1. eum. 63. saith, *Montes in vrbe septem numerantur*, The hills within the citie are seuen in number. and the names of these 7. hills are commonly knowne, & vually named in Romane authors, viz, *Palatinus, Capitolinus, Quirinalis, Cælius, Esquilinus, Viminalis, Auentinus*.

4. And but say our English Rhemists, The Angel himselfe In Apo. 17. 9. here describeth these 7. hills to be all one with the 7. heads, and

the 7. kings. And yet the hereticks take them literally for 7. hills: where is the number of 7. is mysticall, signifying vniuersally all of that sort. And they might marke, that the Prophets visions here are most by seven, whether he talke of heads, hornes (which notwithstanding are not 7. but 10.) candlesticks, churches, kings, hills. For answere whereunto, we must know that the beast wheron the whore of Babylon sitteth, is generally the Empire of Rome, but more specially *urbis Roma, the citie of Rome*, which was the imperiall, and is the papall seate. This beast is said to haue 7. heads: which the holy Ghost expoundeth two waies. 7. *capita urbis*, the 7. heads of the citie, are 7. hills: the 7. heads of the Empire or people subiect to Rome (which also are compared to waters whercon the whore sitteth) are 7. kings, that is seuen severall regiments, or heads of gouernment (for so the holy Ghost elswhere calleth them,) wherby the Empire or people of Rome hath at diuers times bene gouerned: to wit, Kings (which also were seuen.) Consuls, Decemvirs, Tribunes (not *tribuni plebis*, but *tribuni militum consulari potestate*), Dictators, Emperours, and Popes. Now the Apostle doth not say, the seuen heads are seuen hills, and the seuen hills are seuen Kings: but the 7. heads are seuen hills, and they (namely seuen heads) are (also) seuen kings, as Bellarmine also acknowledgeth. For this interpretation which they giue to the Angel; First, is inconuenient. For heads doe more fitly resemble kings which are the heads of the body politicke, then hills doe. And secondly false, for if the hills be kings, then the citie which is the woman *vers. 18.* sitteth vpon the seuen kings, for she sitteth on the hills, *vers. 9.* Neither is this interpretation of seuen heads, that they be seuen hills, any interpretation at all, except we vnderstand hills properly. Moreover both the hills and kings are said to be seuen, not because 7. is a mysticall number, signifying all the kingdomes of persecutors, but because they are 7. indeed. Which also may be said of the 7. candlesticks & 7. Churches. *Apoc. 1. & 2. & 3.* which they bring for an instance. Of the hills there is no question: and it is as true of the Kings, and therefore the Angell numb. eth them *vers. 10.* Five (saith he) are fallen, one is, and the other is

not yet come: which is verified of these 7. regiments wherof I spake. For the regiments of Kings, Consuls, Decemvirs, Tribunes, Dictators, were ceased in the Apostles time: One (that is of the Emperours) then was, and the seuenth, that is to say, of the Popes, was not yet come. And as touching the Romane Empire erected and reuiued by the Pope: it is the beast that was a flourishing imperiall state, but is not *Apoc. 17. 8.* Indeede and in truth the Empire of Rome, but rather an image of it. *Apoc. 13.* although it bee in name and title the Empire of Rome. This beast that was and is not, it is also the eight head or regiment, and is one of the seuen, namely of *Apoc. 17. 11.* Emperours.

5. Secondly that Rome is mysticall Babylon, it may be proued by the testimonies of very good Authours. *Ierome* saith, *Romanam urbem in Apocalypsi Iohannis & Epistola Petri Babylonem specialiter appellari*, that the citie of Rome is called Babylon specially, in the Revelation of Iohn, and epistle of Peter. *Augustine* calleth Rome the second Babylon, and Babylon of the West. To these we may adde *Tertullian*, *Primasina*, *Vittorinus* (who saith, the seuen heads are the seuen hills on which the woman, that is, the citie of Rome doth sit) *Prof. lib. 18. cap. 22.* per, and many others, *Sibylla* also oftentimes expressly calleth Rome Babylon. *lib. 18. cap. 22.*

6. Thirdly, by the confession of our aduersaries themselves. For first to proue that Peter was at Rome, they say, that by Babylon mentioned, *1. Pet. 5. 13.* is meant Rome: although there can no sufficient reason be giuen, why the Apostle if he had meant Rome, should not rather haue vsed the name of Rome, then of Babylon. Secondly, the Rhemists contended with cleareness of truth writing on the last verse of the 17. of the *Apocalypse* confesse, that if by Babylon is meant any one citie (which before we haue proued) it is most like to be old Rome. And on the 5. verse they doe confesse, that as the persecuting Emperours, which (as they say) were figures of Antichrist, did principally sit in Rome; so it may well be, that the great Antichrist shall haue his seate there. And againe on the 18. verse they alledge a reason for (say they) by the authorite of the

old *Roman Empire*, *Christ was put to death first*: applying the prophetic of the 11. *Chap. verse 8.* to Rome: thereby at vna-
wares confessing that Rome is that great citie, which as in the
17. of the *Apocalyps* is called *Babylon* mystically, so in that
place is termed spiritually *Sodom* and *Egypt*, where our Lord
was also crucified, Thirdly, the authour of the *Wardword*, not
knowing how to denie this so evident truth, is content thus
fate to agree with vs, that Rome is *Babylon*. For not onely *S.*
Iohn (saith he) in the *Apocalyps*, but *Peter* also in his Epistle
doth call Rome *Babylon*, and we doe not denie it. *Bellarmine*
also confesseth so much, *Per meretricem intelligi Romam, sicut*
by the whore of Babylon is to be understood Rome, and proueth
the same by the testimonie of *Tertullian* and *Hierome*, There-
fore seeing mysticall *Babylon* is the chiefe citie and See of An-
tichrist, as our aduersaries cannot denie with any shewe of rea-
son: and seeing Rome is mysticall *Babylon*, as hath bene pro-
ued not onely by reason & testimonies, but also by the confes-
sion of our aduersaries: the conclusion must necessarily be in-
ferred, that Rome therefore is the seat of Antichrist.

7 What then what ca the Papist answer to this syllogisme?

Mysticall *Babylon* is the seat of Antichrist,

Rome is mysticall *Babylon*,

Therefore Rome is the seat of Antichrist.

It may well be, by the *Rhemists*, that the great Antichrist shall
haue his seat there. And we doe not denie saith the authour
of the *Wardword*, but that Rome is *Babylon*. And *Bellarmino*
doth not onely say it, but proue it. How then? Forsooth we
must distinguish of Rome. For Rome is either *Heathenish* or
Christened. *Heathenish* Rome vnder the persecuting Empe-
rours was *Babylon*: But Rome *Christened* is the Apostolicke
See, and as it were the *Ierusalem* of the Christians. But this
evasion of theirs, howsoeuer they please themselves in it, is fri-
uolous and absurde, as shall appeare by these reasons. For
first, if Rome be *Babylon*, as now at the length they confesse,
and consequently the seat of Antichrist, as they cannot de-
nie with any shewe of reason: I would faine know of them,
whether vnder the heathenish Emperours Rome could be cal-
led.

led the seat of Antichrist, because Antichrist did then sitte in
Rome, or because he was to sitte there after the *Heathenish*
Emperours were remoued. If they say, because he fate there
then, their answer is ridiculous, and contrary to all that them-
selues hold concerning Antichrist. Therefore they must needs
confesse, that Rome is called *Babylon* and the seat of Anti-
christ; not because Antichrist fate there whiles it was heathe-
nisme, but because he was so fate there after the Emperours
were remoued.

8 And that the holy ghost by *Babylon* doth not meane
Heathenish Rome vnder the persecuting Emperours, either
onely or principally, but Rome christened vnder the Pope, it
may further appeare out of the whole discourse of *Saint Iohn*
in the seuenteenth and eighteenth of the *Apocalypse*. The
whore of *Babylon* is the great city, which in the Apostles
time, and since vnder the Popes, reigned ouer the kings of
the earth; called a whore, and the mother of fornications: not
onely because her selfe hath by spirituall fornications plaid
the trumpet, according to that which is sayd of *Ierusalem*: *Fide-
lis ciuitas facta est meretrix*, The faithfull city is become an
harlot: but also infected al kings and nations, subiect vnto her,
with her superstition & idolatry. But Rome heathenish, which
neither dealt by whorish sleights and allurements, but by mar-
tiall policy and power, neither had professed her selfe to bee
the Church and spouse of Christ, could not so fitly be called an
harlot, whereby is signified an adulterous and apostaticall
state. And besides, *Heathenish* Rome for the most part per-
mitted to euery countrey their owne religion: and was so far
from enforcing her religion vpon other nations subiect vnto
her, that as in her was erected the *Pantheon* in honour of all
the Gods (which *Boniface* the fourth hauing obtained of *Pho-
cas* consecrated to the virgin *Mary* and all the Saints) so since
admitted the idoles, religions, and superstitions almost of all
other countreies, excepting the religions of the Egyptians and
the Iewes, because they did not forsooth become the maiesty
of the Empire. But Popish Rome, of *Bethel* is become *Beth-
auen*, and of a faithfull city an harlot, exceeding all others in
whorish

Lib. 3. de pont.
R. c. 13.

2.

Esay. 1.

Marcellin. lib.
16. Rosin. lib. 2.
c. 9.

whorish entisements, coufenages, impudencies, cruelties, and all filthines; in so much that we may truly say with *Mantuan*, *Roma est iam tota lupanar*, Rome wholly is become a steepe: and with *Petrarch*, that there is *seclerum etque dedecorum omnium sentina*, The sink and seuer of all villanies and shamefull practises: and hath not onely plaid the harlot her selfe, but is become the mother of all fornications, that is, idolatry and superstitious, and the fountaine of all other abominations in the christian world. With which the cup of her fornications inebriateth (which more argueth the foulsness of the Romish religion) all kings and people that consent vnto her, and with fire & sword, obtrudeth her superstitions and Idolatrous religion, vnto all nations that they can make subiect to that See.

9. Again, if *Iohn* had spoken of old Rome, which then openly persecuted the saints, then had he not spoken of a mystic (as he doth) neither would he so greatly haue wondered to see the whore of Babels with her idolatry or cruelty, against the Saints (as he doth vers. 6.) if by the whore were meant old Rome, whose Idolatry and cruelty to *Iohn* was not strange.
4. And further that the holy ghost by Babylon meaneth Popish Rome, it may be proued out of the rest of the 17. chapter beginning at the 8. verse: where the Angell declareth vnto *Iohn* the mystic of the beast, whereon the woman sitteth, which hath the 7. heads and ten horns. For although this beast, as appeareth by conference with the thirteenth chapter, may signifie in generall the Romane state as it is opposed to Christ, which in respect of the regiment, hath been subiect to seauen heads of gouernement, in respect of the imperiall citie is seated on seauen hilles, and in respect of the Empire was diuided in the Apostles time, into ten provinces or kingdoms, as *Serabo* and others testifie: yet, here the Angell speaketh especially of the Romane state and Empire renewed, and as it were renewed by the Pope. To the which, as also to the Papacy (which is the second beast in the 13. of the Apocalypse) though they be cither of them but seuerall heads of the beast (vers. 10. & 11.) yet the holy ghost giueth the name of the beast, for this beast saith he, on which the woman sitteth, was & is not, and shall

shall arise out of the depth: and again, that it is the beast which was and is not, though it be. And vers. 11. hauing shewed that the 7. heads of this beast signifie both the imperiall seat standing on 7. hills, & also 7. kings, that is, 7. chiefe gouernments she saith, that this beast which was and is not, is the eighth (namely head of gouernment, or *Caesar*, for he speaketh in the masculine *et uirum* is he a man) and is one of the seauen, namely of Emperors. All which cannot be vnderstoode of the Romane Empire, as it was heathenish, but as it is Popish. For this head which had bene and after was not (for it lay void from the time of *Augustulus* vnto *Charlemagne*, the space of 325. yeers, viz, from the yeer 475. vnto the yeer 800) was after to arise (for so hee saith *resurrexerunt*) being reuined by the Pope, who was to put life into the image of the former beast. For this Empire erected by the Pope, although it hath the name of the beast ascribed vnto it, yet it is but the image of the former beast, & therefore is not, in truth & imperiall authority & dominion, the Empire of Rome, although in title it be. And further it is said, that this beast is the 8. head, & is one of the 7. which cannot be vnderstood of the heathenish Emperors but of the Popish. If therefore this beast wherupon the whore of Babylon sitteth, ruling & guiding the same, as the rider doth the beast on which he sitteth, be not the old Empire but the new, erected by the Pope: then the whore of Babylon is not old Rome vnder the heathenish Emperors, but Rome christened vnder the Pope. But the first is true, therefore the last.

10. And finally the ten hornes (saith the Angell) which thou sawest are ten kings, that is, the chiefe gouernors of the ten prouinces or kingdomes, who before the dissolution of the Empire in the west, had not as yet received the kingdomes; because they stil remained as *proconsuls* or *propreitors*, that is deputies & lieutenants vnder the Emperor. But after the Empire was dissolved in the west, they received power as kings about the same time with the beast. i. Antichrist the Pope (for so Antichrist both in the 13. chap. & in the 17. is considered, 1. as a head of the beast, & 2. as a beast by it selfe.) For albeit neither hee could raigne in Rome, nor they in the prouinces, by soveraign authority, while

the Empire stood in the west, and flourished; yet when it was once decayed, (but especially when the Emperour also of the east had by the Popes meanes lost his title in Italy and Rome, and was by him bereaved, as the authour of the booke called *fisculus temporum* saith, of the western Empire) then he seizeth on Rome, and a great part of Italie, and they on the severall provinces, And that these ten hornes are the heads of ten kingdomes, which together with the beast (meaning Antichrist) shall divide among them the Romane Empire, (for that is signified when it is saide that they receive power as kings, that is, souveraigne authoritie, the same houre with the beast) it is the received opinion of the best writers, Yea *Beffarmino* himselfe saith, *Latimes dicunt decem reges, qui sibi dividunt Rom. imperium, odios habuit nos purpuratam meretricem, i. Romam, et eam desolatam facturos*, *Iohn doth say that the ten kinges which shall divide among them the Romane Empire, shall hate the harlot arrayed with purple, that is (saith he) Rome, and shall make her desolate.* And therefore the holy ghost in that place speaketh not of Rome as it was vnder the Heathenish Emperours, nor of the Empire as it was Heathenish, for then it was not dissolved; and long before the dissolution, had Rome ceased to be Heathenish: but of the Empire erected and renewed by the Pope; which although it neither enjoyeth Rome it selfe the imperiall seate, nor yet the provinces which in times past belonged to the Empire, yet hath the name and title thereof. And consequently, he speaketh of Rome as she should bee, not onely after the dissolution of the old Empire in the west, but also after the erection of the new, that is to say of Rome Popish.

II Of these ten hornes it is further said, that they have all one minde, being all of the same Popish religion, all of them with one consent wholie devoted to the Pope, and sworne vnto him. To whome for a time they give over themselves, and their whole power to helpe and support the beast, thinking themselves bound (as hee hath perswaded them) to exercise their temporall sword, that is, their civill power, for the church, meaning himselfe, and at his beck and commandement.

ments And being ioyned to him & vnited one with another by holy leagues (as they call them) make holy warres, forsooth, against Christ the lambe in his true members. But when as Christ shall begin to consume Antichrist with the preaching of his worde, (as he is sure to overcome because he is the Lord of Lords) then these ten hornes which before had ioyned with Antichrist, and had committed spirituall fornication with the whore, shall begin to hate the whore and to leaue her desolate and naked. Which cannot be vnderstood of old Rome, but of that which now is, wherof this Prophecy already is in part fulfilled. For since the reuelatiō of Antichrist in these latter times, the Pope hath lost, as *Beffarmino* coplaineth, *magna Germania partem, Suetiam, Gothiam, Noruegiam, Daniā universam, bonā Angliā, Gallia, Heluetia, Polonia, Boemia ac Pannonia partem*, that is, a great part of Germany, all Suevia, Gothland, Norway, Denmarke, a good part of England, (but he might as well have said all England, and thereunto added, Scotland and Ireland) a good part of France, Heluetia, Polonia, Boemia, & Pannonie. So that diuerse of these 10. Kings have already forsaken the whore of *Babylon*, and haue bereaved her of a great part of her maintenance, and left her, as much as in themselves, naked, & the rest in Gods good time will accomplish his will.

12. Seventhly, It is apparāt that *Iohn* his treatise of Rome, extendeth vntill the destruction thereof. If therefore by *Babylon* is meant onely heathenish Rome vnder the persecuting Emperours; then the destruction which the holy Ghost denounceth against the whore of *Babylon*, did befall Rome, whiles it was heathenish. But it is absurde to say that this destruction befell heathenish Rome. For first this destruction is an vtter & final destruction. *Apocal. 18, 21, 22, 23.* And before this destruction the Empire was to be divided into ten kingdomes, which first should ioyne with Antichrist, and after ward oppose him. Which is vtterly false of Rome heathenish, but yet is begonne to bee fulfilled of Rome Popish, and will in due time be accomplished. And againe it is most plaine that *Iohn* intreateth of the state and condition of Rome, as it shalbe in the time of Antichrist. But Antichrist, as the Papists themselves confesse,

Apoc. 17. 13.

11.

Apoc. 17. 2.

Lib. 3. de pont.
R. cap. 21.

Apoc. 17. & 18.

8.

Lib. 3. de Pont.
R. cap. 13.

Apoc. 17. 13.

De morit. e.
uam fuit.

confesse, was not to come whiles Rome was heathenish, but after the dissolution of the Romane Empire. And lastly, *Hierome* and other of the fathers, in whose times Rome was not Heathenish, doe notwithstanding call it *Babylon*. Not that then it was, or had beene before, but because it should be according to the Prophecies of the holy Ghost, the seat of Antichrist, whose comming he and other of the fathers supposed not to be farre off: and therefore *Hierome* in his Epistle to *Marcella*, vseth this argument as the principall to perswade herto come from Rome (which then was not Heathenish) because it is *Babylon*.

13. These arguments might suffice to prove that not Rome Heathenish vnder the Emperours, but Rome Christened vnder the Popes, is mysticall *Babylon* the chiefe citie and See of Antichrist. But yet for better evidence of this truth, and for the clearer manifestation of Antichrist, I will further proue vnto you, that Rome Christened and professing her selfe to be the Church of Christ, is the seate of Antichrist. For if Antichrist shall sitte at all in Rome, then shall hee sitte in Rome Christened professing her selfe to be the Church of Christ. But he shall sitte in Rome (as hath beene proued in parte and shall further bee cleared) therefore in Rome christened, and professing her selfe to be the Church of God. The proposition is built vpon this foundation, that Antichrist shall sitte in the Church of God, and therefore if Antichrist shall sitte at Rome, he shall sitte in Rome professing her selfe the Church of God. Now then that Antichrist shall sitte in the Church of God, I proue by the testimonie of Saint *Paul*, affirming 2. *Thessal.* 2. 4. that Antichrist shall sitte in the temple of God. But because the Papistes labour by might and maine to extort this place from vs, as seruing rather to proue their conceipt, that Antichrist shall sitte in the temple of God at *Ierusalem*: I will therefore deliuer the place from their corruptions, and also make good our interpretation. For first, the temple at *Ierusalem*, and citie it selfe, as it was a type of the church of Christ: so when the church of Christ was once planted by the preaching of the gospell throughout the worlde,

it was

It was vterly and finally to be abolished, according to the Prophecie of our Saviour Christ, *Mat. 24. 14. And then shall be the end*, namely of the temple and citie of Ierusalem. For after the temple was once vterly destroyed by *Titus Vespasian*, as Christ *Mat. 24. 1.* had foretold, it is neuer to be reedified. For as *Daniel* saith, according to the vulgar translation, which with the Papists is the onely authentike Text of Scripture, *Chap. 9. 27. Et erit in templo abominatio desolationis, & usque ad consummationem & finem perseverabit desolatio, And there shall be in the temple the abomination of desolation, and vnto the consummation and end, the desolation shall continue*: or as *Hierome* speaketh more plainely, *Pss. ad consummationem & finem mundi perseverabit desolatio: The desolatio shall continue vnto the consummation and end of the world.* Our Saviour Christ also *Luc. 21. 22. 24.* foretold, that *Ierusalem* being destroyed by the Romanes, should be troden vnder foote by the Gentiles, vntill the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled, that is vntill the second coming of Christ, which in the next wordes is described. Wherefore when as *Iulian* the *Apostata* endeouored by the Iewes to reedifie the temple that hee might conuince the preaching of Christ of falshood, (*the Axiom in the next chapter is put* *Lib. 3. cap. 20.* *non cessant dicere, ut Theodorus speaketh*) which hee could not doe, vntesse Christ had taught that it should not be reedified. Our Saviour Christ by fire first from heauen, and after out of the earth, and by a fearful earthquake hindered this enterprise, thereby approving his godhead, and shewing that he was not pleased, as *Sozomen* saith, with the renewing of the temple. It seemeth also to haue bene the iudgement of *Cyrill* with many others in the primitive church, that the temple should neuer be reedified: and *Hierome* saith, that the opinion which is for the restoring of the temple, is a Iewish fable. Whereas therefore the *Socorani* teach, that Antichrist shall cause this temple to be built, and that he shall haue his seat there, which they know shall neuer be; what doe they else but make a mockery of all the prophecies of the holy Ghost concerning the coming of Antichrist, and with *Iulian* goe about to giue the lie to *Daniel* and our Saviour Christ.

14. Again, if the apostle had by temple meant such a temple as should be built by Antichrist, hee would not have called it the Temple of God, but rather of the Diuell. *Non enim templum alicuius idoli* (saith *Augustine*) *aut demonia, templum Dei Apostolus dixerit.* For the temple of some idol or Diuell, the Apostle would not call the temple of God. Neither are wee by the temple of God to vnderstand a materiall building, for such (as *Beilarmine* truly saith) are not called the temple of God in the newe Testament. And therefore the more grosse is he to vnderstande it of a materiall temple, and of a corporall siting. For first, materiall temples in the writings of the apostles are not called the temples of God; but the congregations of Gods people are the temple of God. See 1. Cor. 3. 16. 17. 2. Cor. 6. 16. Ephes. 2. 21. Apoc. 3. 12. And according to the Scriptures phrase speaketh *Lactantius*, *Sola* (saith hee) *catholica Ecclesia est, qua verum cultum retinet, hic est fons veritatis, hoc est domicilium fidei, hoc templum Dei.* It is the catholike Church alone which retaineth the true worship: this is the wellspring of truth, this is the house of faith, this is the temple of God. The temple of God therefore signifieth the congregation or companie of them which profess the name of Christ. In this temple Antichrist sitteth, that is, ruleth and raigeth. For wee are not to vnderstand it of the corporall gesture, as appeareth by that which followeth, he shal sitte in the temple of God as God, that is, he shal rule and raigne as if he were a God: for that is meant by Gods siting, who doth not sitte after a corporall maner. In the temple of God therefore, which is his Church, Antichrist sitteth, that is ruleth and governeth, challenging a soueraine and vniuersall dominion ouer all those that professe the name of Christ, as being the head, husband and Lord of the vniuersall church: which agreeth most fitly and properly to the Popes of Rome; Neither are we to omit the phrase of siting. For whereas princes are said to raigne so many yeares, the Popes are said to sitte, and the chiefe place of his dominion is called his *Sedes*: that is See or seat.

15 And this our interpretation is confirmed by the testimonies

monies of the ancient. The temple of God (saith *Theodoros*) he calleth the churches, wherein Antichrist shal challenge to himselfe the first seat, endenduring to shewe himselfe to be God. And againe, *Dei atheni templum vocat ecclesiam*; The temple of God he calleth the churches. *Hierome* also in *temple Dei* (saith he) vel *Ad Alagium Hierosolymis ut quidam putant, vel in ecclesia verius arbitramur.* And he shall sit in the temple of God, either at Ierusalem as some thinke, or in the churches, as we more truly suppose. *Chrysostome*, in *apostolus* in 2. Cor. 6. 16. *id est in ecclesia*, where it seemeth *id* is put corruptly for *in*, for so the greeke scholiast, whose vntually reported worde for worde, out of *Chrysostome* saith; *id est in ecclesia*, see Occumen. in 2. Thess. 2. *In the temple.* Hee saith not in the temple at Ierusalem; but in the churches of God. And likewise *Theophylact*; not in the temple which is at Ierusalem specially, but simply in the churches and in every temple of God. *Augustine* of these words saith, But in what temple of God he shall sit as God, it is vnderstande; whether in that same of the temple which king Salomon built, or else in the church. For the Apostle would not call the temple of an idol or idole, the temple of God, whereupon some (to whose iudgement not only *Augustine* in this place, but *Primasius* also subscribeth) some I say by Antichrist in this place will haue vnderstood not the prince himselfe, but his whole body after a sort; that is the multitude of gismes were men pertaining vnto him together with the prince himselfe. And they thinke it might better be read in the latine as it is in the greeke, not in *temple Dei*, sed in *templum dei* sedeat, tanquam ipse sit templum Dei quod est ecclesia. *Sicut diuinitas sedet in athenis*, i. velut athenis, &c. He sitteth not in the temple of God, but as the temple of God; as if he were the temple of God which is the church, even as we say sedet in athenis, that is, he sitteth as a friend. Which exposition most fitly agreeth to the Pope, and church of Rome who esteeme themselves alone to be the catholike church; and all others professing the name of Christ, to be heretikes and schismaticks. By this which hath bene said, it is plain that by the temple we are to vnderstand the church of God. And yet this doth no more proue the church of Rome

De ciuit. Dei
lib. 10. c. 19.

Instit. lib. 4.
cap. 30.

Psalm. 9. 5.

see Occumen.
in 2. Thess. 2.

De ciuit. Dei
lib. 20. c. 19.

cap. 13.

Of this see
more in the
booke, & 13.
chap. 5: 4-5.
& 6.

to be the true church of God, then they can proue the temple of Antichrist at Ierusalem, where they say he should sit, to be the temple of God. It is sufficient that the church where Antichrist sitteth, hath bene the true church, and still is in title and profession; although in truth it bee but an Apostaticall church. For Antichrist, as he was to sit in the church, so he was to be the head of the Apostasie, and of those that fall from God: who notwithstanding (according to that exposition in *Augustine*) shall sit in *templum Dei* as though they alone were the true church of God.

Apoc. 11. 8.

16 But the Papists confirme their exposition, viz. that the temple of God signifieth the temple at Ierusalem, out of the cleuening of the Apocalypse & eight verse. *Where Iohn sheweth (say they) That the bodies of Enoch and Elias being slaine by Antichrist, shall lie in the streets of Ierusalem.* Whereunto I answer, that *Iohn* in that place neither speaketh of *Enoch* and *Elias*, nor yet of Ierusalem. And whether he speake of the persecution of Antichrist, there may be some doubt; because he seemeth verse. 2. and 7. to speake of the same persecution of the holy city that is the church, ynder the heathen, & namely the persecuting Emperours, for 42. moneths, which is mentioned Apocalypse 13. 5. But supposing it to be vnderstood of Antichrist his persecution, let vs consider the force of their argument. *Where the two witnesses of God are slaine by Antichrist, there is (say they) the seat of Antichrist: At Ierusalem the two witnesses of God shall bee slaine, therefore at Ierusalem shall be the seat of Antichrist.* The proposition they take for graunted, the which notwithstanding is not generally true. For the two witnesses of God may bee slaine in that place by the authoritie and commaundement of Antichrist, where his proper seat is not. For as our Saviour Christ was put to death, by the authority of the Romane Empire, at Ierusalem, where notwithstanding was not the imperiall seat of the Emperour: So the witnesses of our Saviour Christ might be slaine by the authority and commaundement of the Antichrist of Rome, either at Ierusalem or else where, where notwithstanding is not the proper seat of Antichrist. This alone

alone is sufficient to ouerthrow their whole argument. For if their proposition be not generally true, then their whole argumentation from a particular proposition is mere sophistry.

17 Notwithstanding, their assumption is also to be denyed, because the holy ghost speaketh not of Ierusalem (as *Hierome* proueth) but of Rome, or rather of the Empire of Rome. *Yes but (say they) Christ also was crucified where the two witnesses should bee slaine: at Ierusalem Christ was crucified, and not at Rome, therefore at Ierusalem the two witnesses should bee slaine.* I answer to the assumption: Christ was crucified at Ierusalem, and in the great city also, that is to say, within the Romane Empire, wherein and by authoritie whereof our Saviour Christ was put to death. In which sence the *Rhemists* seeme to apply this prophecy to Rome. *If by the great city (say they) is meant any one city, it is most like to be old Rome, For by the authoritie of the old Romane Empire Christ was put to death first.* Whereunto I might adde, that euen in Rome it selfe Christ hath bene crucified in his members: and that within Ierusalem Christ was not crucified *Heb. 13. 12.* Now that Ierusalem is not here meant, but Rome, or rather, the Romane Empire, I proue; first, because it is called the great citie. By which title throughout the Apocalypse is meant Babylon or Rome, as appeareth by conference of these places. *Apoc. 14. 8. and 16. 19. & 18. 10. 16. 18. 19. 21.* but especially *Apoc. 17. 18.* where the woman, that is, the whore of Babylon is said to be the great city which reigneth ouer the kings of the earth. And of this great city, is Empire of Rome (which as it is called *Sodome*, which is the name of a city, so also *Egypt*, which is the name of a kingdom) the streets may fitly signifie the cities or townes of the severall provinces. Once only is this title given to Ierusalem, & then not to the earthly Ierusalem, but to the heavenly. *Ap. 21. 10.* And so *Augustine* expoundeth this place, *In pla Homil. 8. 21. it is civitas magna, i. in medio ecclesia, in the streets of the great city that is in the midst of the church.* Saving that by the name church, he must needs vnderstand an adulterous & apostaticall church (which elsewhere is called the whore of Babylon), because as it followeth in the text, it is called spiritually *Sod* or *Egypt*. For

For euen as in the middelt of the church euen at Ierusalē christ was crucified, so also the two witnesses of Christ were to bee slaine in the middelt of the church, & euen in that city which professeth her selfe to be as it were the Ierusalem of Christendome. Secondly, the great city whereof he speaketh, is called spirituallie Sodom or Egypt. Sodom, for her pride and vncleannes, Egypt for her idolatrie and crueltie towards the Israel of God, Which titles most fitly agree to Rome: which is not inferiour either to Sodom in pride and vncleannes, or to Egypt in grosse idolatry, and sauage cruelty towards the church of God. But they are not in this place ascribed to Ierusalem, which in the Apocalypse and elsewhere in the new testament, is called the holy city, euen then when it had crucified our Saviour Christ. And not to seeke further, euen in that eleventh chapter of the Apocalypse vers. 2. neither is the citie of Ierusalem in the Apocalypse in his Epistle to Marcella. None of the holy scripture (saith he) can be contrary to it selfe, and much lesse the same place of scripture. For about ten verses before, Ierusalem is called the holy city. Now if it be called the holy city euen after the passion of our Lord, how is it againe called spirituallie Sodom and Egypt? But Bellarmine answereth, that Hierome did not write this in good soothly which answereth it were easie to elude any testimony: as though Hierome made no conscience to write vnruthes, especially in so waightie a matter, although in the name of others. Thirdly, before the time of this reuelation which was in the latter end of Domitian's raigne, the temple and city of Ierusalem were vterly destroyed, and neuer so to be reedified as to become the seat of Antichrist, therefore this place cannot be vnderstood of Ierusalem. Wherefore these obiections notwithstanding, our assertion remaineth firme and stedfast, that Antichrist was to sit in Rome christened, and professing her selfe the church of God. Euen as the Bishops of Germanie in Auentinus applying both this prophesie of Paul, and that of Iohn Apocalypse 17, to the Antichrist of Rome, the Babylonians say they in templo Desideri he sitteth in Babylon in the temple of God.

18. Now let vs further consider what other euasions they vse to auoide this truth. First they say, that Babylon did not signifie any one citie, but the whole societie of the wicked. Secondly, if it signified any one citie, that then it was olde Rome. Now thirdly, if the whore of Babylon doe signifie Rome christened, that yet notwithstanding it is not (as Bellarmine is not ashamed to say) the seat of Antichrist. But if Rome christened or Church of Rome be the whore of Babylon (as wee haue proued though our aduersaries should not confesse it) then is it so called because shee is an adulterous and apostaticall church, which hath fallen from Christ to Antichrist, whom in steed of Christ she acknowledgeth to be her husband and head: then is she the mother both of all fornications, that is of all superstitious and idolatrous worshippe, and also of all abominations, as Atheisme, Machiavelisme, Sodomy and Antichristian heresies, with whom the Kings and inhabitants of the earth haue committed fornication, being made drunke and intoxicated with the golden cuppe of her fornications, that is, of her glorious idolatries and Antichristian heresies: who as she is cloathed with Scarlet, so is shee died red, and drunke with the blood of the Saints, and with the blood of the Martyrs of Iesu: as being that citie and church wherein the two witnesses of Christ are put to death. Apoc. 11. And can she then be the whore of Babylon, and not the Antichristian citie and state? especially considering these two things which the Papists themselves are forced to confesse, first, that the state of Rome is here figured as it shalbe in the time of Antichrist: secondly, that Antichrist shalbe one of the seuen heads, & namely the last head of the Romane beast, and consequently shall haue Rome for his principall seat. Let vs see then whether the Iesuit be able to bring so much as a shew of reason against this truth. For it may be you expect his prooffe, Antichrist, saith he, 1. lib. 3. de pont. making his collection out of Apoc. 17. 16. Shall hate Rome, and Rom. cap. 13. shall fight with her, and shall make her desolate, and burne her. Whereupon it followeth manifestly, that Rome shal not be the seat of Antichrist. But it should seeme the Iesuit was in a dreame when he framed this argument. For it is euident that not An-

Mat. 4. 4.
Mat. 27. 53.

Hierome ad
Marcell.

cap. 13.

Irenaeus.

lib. 5. lib. 8. Boc.

De Pont. Rom.
lib. 3. 4. 13.

Apoc. 17. 5.

Apoc. 17. 1. 4.

Apoc. 17. 4. 6.

1. lib. 3. de pont.
Rom. cap. 13.

De resurrex.
cap. 6. 25.

richrist, but the ten hornes, that is the ten Kings, shal hate the whore, that is, the Antichristian city & president thereof: & accordingly *Tertullian*, *Prostituta illa ciuitas, à decem regib. dignos exitus referet*, That city which hath prostituted her selfe to play the harlot, shall fro the ten Kings receive her deserved end. And so in another place himselfe being better awaked reasoneth from that place, *The ten kings* (saith he) *which shall diuide among them the Romane Empire, and in whose time Antichrist shall come, shall hate the purple harlot that is Rome and make her desolate, how then shall shee be the seat of Antichrist?* Whereunto I answer, that the very contrary is to be inferred vpon that place: where it is said that the 10. hornes, that is the 10. kings, which shall diuide among them the Romane Empire, shal in deed for a time ioyne with Antichrist, and giue their power vnto him. But when as Christ shall begin to waste and to weaken him with the spirit of his mouth, that then these 10. Kings shall oppose themselves against the Antichristian citie and the head thereof. Which, euent and experience in parte hath proued to bee true in some of these 10. Kings, as hath before bene shewed. From that place therefore wee may reason thus; The purple harlot which the 10. Kings shall assault is the city of Antichrist. Rome is that purple harlot, as the aduersarie himselfe confesseth, therefore Rome is the citie of Antichrist.

19. Their last refuge is this: that Rome Christian, where the Pope sitteth, doth not stande vpon 7. hilles, but is removed from the seven hilles into the plaine of *Campus Martius*: and that the Pope sitteth on the other side of the riuer vpon the mount *Vatican*. *Sauviers* therefore thought it to bee but a childish argument to proue from the 7. hilles that the seate of Antichrist is at Rome. But we would knowe of him whether it be the same Rome where they say *Peter* sat or not. If it be the same, then it standeth on seven hilles, if it bee not the same, how is it then the Apostolicke seate and chaire of *Peter*? True in deede it is, that in the time of the Emperours the *Pomacium* of the citie was enlarged, so that it enclosed a good parte of *Campus Martius*; and that since some more

auuncient

ancient partes of the citie being decayed, the greatest parte of priuate buildings stande in the plaine. Yet notwithstanding, euen to this day, the seven hilles are enclosed within the walles of the citie, and vpon them there doe yet remaine, besides some of the Popes palaces and courts, diuers churches and houses of religion and other buildings of note: as that learned diuine of blessed memory *D. Fulke* particularly sheweth in his answer to the *Rhenists*. Neither doth the enlarging of the citie in one parte, and the decaying of it in another, proue it not to be the same citie. And although the Pope doth liue in the *Vatican*, or in any other pallace of his whersoever: yet who knoweth not, that Rome is the Papal or as they call it the Apostolicke seate, appointed as they (a) say by Christ himself. (a) *Rad. Cupers de eccl'es. pag. 37. num. 3.* Neither can the Pope as (b) they teach chaunge his seate: or if he should, he should cease to be the successour of *Peter*. For (b) *Cupers de eccl'es. p. 226. num. 16.* whosoever is chosen Bishop of the citie of Rome, he (say they) is the successor of *S. Peter*, the vicar of Christ, and Bishop of the world. And as Rome in generall is the Popes seate, or See; so more specially the cathedrall church of *Laterane*, whereof more properly the Pope is Bishop, as the husband of one wife. In which respect they say, that as *S. Peter* and his successors bee the head of the whole church or vniuersitie of the faithfull, so the *Laterane* church being referred to other materiall churches, is the head of all churches of the world. Vnto this church was adioyned the chiefe pallace of the Pope, which was inhabited by them vntill the time of *Boniface* the 9, as *Onuphrius* testifieth, that is to say 1400. yeares almost after *De 7. urb. eccl'es.* Christ: howsoever since the time of *Leo* the 10. who lodged therein, it is within these last hundred yeares decayed. Now it is well known that the pallace and church of *Laterane* standeth on the mount *Caelius* in the most remote part of the citie, and furthest distant from the *Vatican*. So that all these shifts and euasions of the Papists notwithstanding, it is euident, that Rome, which we haue now proued to be the seate of the Pope, is by the former reasons alleaged, the seate of Antichrist.

Concerning the time of the Reuelation
of Antichrist.

1.



S from the place we gather the Pope to be Antichrist, because the seat of Antichrist is Rome christned, or professing her selfe the church of Christ: So the consideration of the time ioyned with that of the place, doth make this truth much more euident. Rome Christned

is the seat of Antichrist: but when doth Antichrist sitte, that is, raigne there? I answered that he could not exercise Antichristian dominion there, whiles the Emperours had their seat in Rome. But when the Emperours were removed and the Empire in the West dissolved: then did Antichrist succeed them in the seat, that is, in the gouernmēt of Rome. And this may

2. Theff. 2. 8.

be proued first, by the testimonie of S. Paule. 2. Theff. 2. 8. And then that outlaw, meaning Antichrist, shall be reuealed. And whē is that? When he that hindereth shall be taken out of the way. And who is that which hindereth the reuelation of Antichrist for

2. Theff. 2. 6. 7.

a time, that he might be reuealed in his due time? Who this was, the Apostle had told the Theffal. by word of mouth, and therefore forbore for iust causes to tell them by writing which they

2. Theff. 2. 5. 6.

knew already, to wit, that he might not incur the needlesse hatred of the Romanes. But that which he had told them, in all likelihood, was continued in the church. For although this place in it selfe be most difficult, yet generally it is understood of the Empire and Emperours of Rome by most of the auncient writers of the Church. Tertullian: who shall be take out of

Devesurrell. cain.

the way, but the Romane state whose departure being diuided among ten Kinges shall bring in Antichrist. Ambrose, After the decay of the Romane Empire, Paule saith that Antichrist

In 2. Theff. 2.

shall appeare. Chrysostome on these wordes, Onely hee that holdeth that is (as hee expoundeth) hindereth now: untill he

In 2. Theff. 2.

be taken out of the way: vñ is (saith hee) iñ qñ iñ pñ qñ, that is, the

the Empire of Rome, when it shall be taken out of the way, then he (meaning Antichrist) shall come, and worthily. For whiles men shall be in awe of the Empire, none will hastily be brought in subjection to Antichrist. But when the Empire shall be dissolved he shall seize upon the vacancie, and shall challenge to himselfe the Empire or rule both humane and diuine. Hierome speaking of these words, And now what hindereth you know, that he Ad Alcas. might be reuealed in his time: that is (saith he) what the cause is Quasi. 12. why Antichrist cometh not yet, you know very well. Neither could he plainely say that the Romane Empire is to be destroyed, which the Emperours thinke is eternall. Wherefore according to the Apocalypse of Iohn, there is written in the forehead of the harlot clothed with purple, a name of blasphemy, that is, Romæ æternæ, to Rome eternal. And afterwards these words onely he which holdeth now must hold untill hee be taken out of the way, and then that outlaw shall be reuealed, hee expoundeth thus, onely that the Romane Empire which now holdeth (that is, gouerneth) all nations, depart and be taken out of the way, and then Antichrist shall come. Cyrill, Antichrist shall come, when the times of the Romane Empire shall be fulfilled. Primasius, The kingdome of the Romanes shall be taken out of the way, before Antichrist be reuealed: Theophylact, when the Romane Empire shall be taken out of the way, then shall Antichrist come. The greeke scholiast on those wordes, that which holdeth &c. hee in 2. Theff. 2. 6. meaneth saith he vñ qñ iñ pñ qñ, that which letteth and hindereth. And what is that? Many understand the holy ghost, others the Romane Empire, whose iudgement is the better? For untill that be dissolved, Antichrist shall not come. And for this cause blessed Paul spake so obscurely, because he would not incur unreasonable enmitie with the Romans. For when they should heare that the Empire of the Romanes shall be dissolved, they would persecute him and all the faithfull, as being such as looked for the dissolution of the Empire. But if he had spoken of the holy ghost, what letteth him to haue said plainely, that the grace of the holy ghost did hinder him that he should not appeare? To which we may adde, that in the sixt verse the Apostle speaketh in the newter gender, and in the seauenth in the masculine: the

former whereof may signifie the Empire, the latter the Empe-
rour, of whom the holy ghost speaketh, as of one man (*sanctus*)
as he vseth to speak sometimes of Antichrist and wee of the
Pope; although both by the one and the other is signified not
one man, but a state or succession. *Augustine* in deede saith of
these words, *but he that hindereth shall hinder. I do confesse that*
I am utterly ignorant what he saith. Some think that this is spo-
ken of the Romane Empire, and that Paul the Apostle would not
therefore write it plainlie, least he should incur this slander that
he was an ill willer to the Romane Empire; which men hoped to be
eternall. Notwithstanding this seemeth to haue bin his iudge-
ment also, for afterwards he thinketh those words may thus be
expounded of the Empire of Rome, *sanctus qui modo imperat, im-*
peret &c. only he which reigneth must raigue (for so *regis* also
may signify, & to the same purpose *Primasius* expoundeth those
words, *sanctus ut qui tenet nunc, se imperit, only he which holdeth*
now, so will the Empire until he be done, that is taken, out of the
way; and then that outlaw shall be reuealed, whome no man doub-
teith to signifie Antichrist.

2 But what need I to be so diligent in gathering testimonies
for the confirmation of this truth, seeing it is not only confirmed
by the former assertioⁿ (for how could Antichrist raigⁿ in Rome
while the Roman Emperors remaind or raignd there) but also
is confessed by *Bellarmino* himself, namely that by this let, is to
be vnderstood the Empire of Rome. Rather let vs consider whe-
ther the Empire that hindered, be taken out of the way, or not.
Bellarmino vnderstandeth this taking away, of an ytter aboli-
shing of the Romane Empire, so that there should not remaine
so much as the name of the Emperour or King of the Romanes.
Fro^m whence he would proue that Antichrist is not yet come, be-
cause the Romane Empire is not yet abolished. Wee confesse
that the Romane Empire which hindered the reuelatioⁿ of An-
tichrist was to be dissolued, and also diuided among ten, that is
many kings (for so this number of ten is oft vsed indefinitely);
which is all that can be gathered either out of the scriptures or
fathers. But that there should be such an ytter abolishment of
the Romane Empire, as that there should not remain so much

as the name or title of the Emperour or King of the Romanes,
we do vterly deny. It is sufficient that the Emperour was so far
forth taken out of the way as it hindered the Reuelation or do-
minion of Antichrist, And so much the phrase of the Apostle
seemeth to import, *terre ples* *zanno* until hee be done out of the
way, (or as the *Rhemists* themselves do read, *until he be taken*
out of the way) as may appeare by conference of like places.
Let vs then consider, in what sence the Romane Empire did
hinder, and was to be taken away, and in what sence it hinde-
red not, and was to remaine: For the better vnderstanding
whereof we are to distinguish betwixt the old Empire and
the new. The old Empire, as it hindered the dominion of An-
tichrist, was to be taken out of the way, that it might bee no
more an hinderance thereunto. The new Empire in the west
erected by the Pope hindereth not the dominion of Antichrist,
but rather supporteth him, and therefore together with An-
tichrist was to remaine. Neither doth the Apostle speake of the
new Empire, but of the old, as shall appeare by these reasons;

1 First the Apostle speaketh of the Empire which hindered
or held then, & of that only: for so he saith, only he which now
letteth will let until he be taken out of the way. And *Hierome*
expoundeth those words, *and now what hindereth, you know,* after
this manner, *que causa sit vt Antichristus in presentia non ve-*
niat optime nostis, You know very well what the cause is that An-
tichrist cometh not now. But the old Empire hindered them and
not the new. And therefore the Apostle speaketh of the taking
away of the old Empire & not of the new. Again when he saith
the Empire hindered, he meaneth the imperial authority & do-
minioⁿ, & that at Rome, not the title or name thereof in Germa-
ny. For it is not the name or title of an Emperour in Germany,
that can hinder the dominion of Antichrist at Rome, & much
lesse at Ierusalem, where the Papiests say his seat shall be. Thirdly,
Antichrist appeared & shewed himselfe (and in that sence was
reuealed) before the erection of the new Empire. For the new
Empire is the image of the former beast: which Antichrist the
2. beast Ap. 13. causeth to be made. And whereas Antichrist is
(as the Papiests also confesse) the 7. head of the beast which hath

See 2. book.
chap. 5.

Mat. 13. 49.
Act. 17. 53. &
23. 10.
1. Cor. 5. 2.
2. Cor. 6. 17.

1.
Ad. Algas.
quest. 11.

2.

3.

De ciuit. Dei.
lib. 20. c. 19.

Cap. 5.

Num. 24. 22.
Job. 19. 3.
Nchem. 4. 12.

heads, the Empire renewed (which is the beast that was and is not though it be) is the 8. in order, though in name it is one of the 7. and in that sense is to bee referred to the sixth head, namely the Emperours. Fourthly the whore of Babylon, that is the Antichristian state, was to sitte vpon the beast which afterwards was to ascend, that is, the Empire renewed. Therefore with Antichrist there was to remaine an imperiall state, though much abased vnder him. Fifthly, the Empire renewed is the beast whereon the whore of Babylon sitteth. And therefore is so farre from hindring Antichrist, that it supporteth him, as the beast doth the rider. And to that end in deed was this Empire erected in the west, that it might support the church of Rome.

For when as the church of Rome was oppressed by the king of the Lombards, it sought aide of the Emperours of Constantinople; and when they would not defend the church, the Pope translated the Empire to the French king; and from him vpon the same occasion to the Germanes, and that to this end, *ut Rex Teutonicorum foret imperator & patronus sedis Apostolicae*, that the king of the Almaines might be Emperour, and patron of the See Apostolicke. And for the same cause the Emperour is called of them *procurator sine defensor Romanae Ecclesiae*, the protector or defender of the church of Rome. Sixtly, the Papists themselves doe hold that the Empire which now is, shall continue vnto the end of the world. For they say that in the second of Daniel (as many others also haue said) is described a succession of the chiefe kingdomes or Monarchies of the earth, which should continue vntill the end of the world; the last whereof is the Romane Empire. Seauenthy, the destruction of the Romane Empire (which the fathers say shall go before the reuelation of Antichrist) is the dissolution and diuision thereof among ten kings, which in deede long since happened to the old Empire, but cannot happen to the new: vnlesse we can imagine that ten mightie kings shall arise out of the bare name and title of an Emperour diuided among them. When as the Papists therefore teach vs not to expect Antichrist vntill the Empire that now is either be diuided into ten kingdomes, they are ridiculous; or vterly abolished which they

Joan de turre-
crem. lib. 2. c.
114.

Adrian. 4. in
epistol. ad ar-
chiep. German.
apud Aueniis.
lib. 4.
Dist. 96. c. 3. in
perator, in
glossa.

6.

they say shall continue to the end, they are absurd, and in both impious, making (as it may seeme) a scorn of the prophecies concerning Antichrist, which they make to imply impossibilities and contradictions.

4. By this which hath bene said it plainly appeareth, that howsoeuer the old Empire in the west, which hindered the dominion of Antichrist, was to be take out of the way before Antichrist should be reuealed; yet notwithstanding euen with, & vnder Antichrist there was to be an imperiall state in name & title, which is the beast whereon the whore of Babylon sitteth, & therefore is so far frō hindring Antichrist, as that it supporteth him. Let vs then consider how the Empire which hindered the reuelation of Antichrist was take out of the way, & how afterwards Antichrist was reuealed. Of the taking away of the Emperour, as also of the reuelation of Antichrist there are two degrees. The Romane Emperour was first take out of the way, when the imperiall seat was by *Constantine* the great translated from Rome to *Bizantium* or *Constantinople*, and that to this end, as they haue set downe in the forged donation of *Constantine*, that he might leaue rowme to the Pope. Because forthwith where the princehood of priests, and head of Christian religion was by the heavenly Emperour placed, there it is not iust that the earthly Emperour should haue power. Secondly, after the death of *Constantine* the great, and of *Flavius Valerius Constantinus* his son, the Romane Empire being diuided into 2. partes the Easterne & the Westerne, and by diuision being weakened, the Westerne was ouerthrowne in the yeare of our Lord 475. & Rome it selfe taken by the *Goths*. So that neither in Rome any Romane afterwards had his seate of authority, vntill the Pope tooke vpon him the souerainty: neither in the West was there any Romane Emperour vntill *Charles* the great, that is to say, from the yeare 475. vnto the end of the yeare 800. In the meane time *Italy* was gouerned first by the *Goths*, and afterwards a great part thereof by the *Lombards*. And howsoeuer the Emperours of the East had recovered Rome, and some part of *Italy*, which because they gouerned by exarches hauing their seat in *Rauenna*, was called the exarchat of *Rauenna*, the *Lombards*

Dist. 96. c. 3. *Constantinus, & de electione e. fundamentum, in sex.*

bards, enioying the rest: yet before the renewing of the Empire in the West, the Emperour of the East had lost all Italy and Rome, and that by the Popes means. For when as *Leo* the third called *Isaurus*, Emperour of Greece, had held a councel at Constantinople of 330. Bishops, wherein was decreed that all images within the Empire should be destroyed & burnt: and afterwards put the same decree in executiō: the Popes of Rome first *Gregory* the 2. and after *Gregory* the 3. excommunicate him, forbid tributes to be paid him out of Italy and Rome, absolue his subiects from their allegiance vnto him, and hauing stirred vp not onely the Italians, but Lombards also against him, the exarch of *Rauenna* is slaine, and the Emperour deprived of all his dominion & reuenues in Italy and Rome. So that howsoeuer the Empire in the East stood all this while: yet according to the prophetic of th'apostle, he which hindred the reuelation of Antichrist, that is to say, the Emperour of Rome, was taken out of the way; First, by removing that dominion and soueraintie whiles the Emperour had his seate there, which afterwards he did. Secondly, because the Empire of the west, which properly was the Empire of Rome, was dissolved, & the Emperour of the East lost his title & interest in Italy and Rome.

5. Of the reuelation of Antichrist there be also two degrees. The first, of his reigning and shewing himselfe in his colours: the second, of his acknowledged. Of his reigning there be 2. degrees also. The first, whē he challenged supreme authority ouer the vniuersal church of Christ. Which he did when he vsurped the title of vniuersal or oecumenicall Bishop or head of the vniuersal Church: which was done as we said about the yeare 607. About which time besides other prodigious signes there appeared a terrible comet, & thē we hold that Antichrist (to wit, the head of the Antichristia body) was borne. True it is that the seeds of Antichristianisme were sowe before his time: & euen frō th'apostles time the mystery of iniquity, that is, Antichristianisme, was working although more conertly, & preparation was made towards the birth of the great Antichrist, partly by heresies & some declinatiōs in the church of Rome in religion

Anno. 607.

religion from the purity of the primitive church, partly by the ambition of diuers of the Bishops of Rome, who aduancing themselves as *Socrates* saith, beyond the limit of priesthood into forraigne dominion, contended to haue the primacy aboue all other churches (and that is the chiefe scope of many of their Epistles decretall) and to the same end forged a Canon of the council of Nice, when their ambition was curbed by other generall counsels. And lastly by the indulgence of deuout Emperours and Princes, who haue by great deuotions and priuiledges aduanced that church. Notwithstanding wee hold that Antichrist was not reuealed, vntill he shewed himselfe by vsurping an vniuersall dominion ouer the church of God.

6. But notwithstanding this great title & authority, Antichrist was yet but in his nonage, and vnder the gouernmēt not onely of the Emperour, but also, for a time, of the Emperours Lieutenant in Italy the Eparch of *Rauenna*, by whom the electiō of the Pope (made by the Clergie and people of Rome) was of necessitie to bee ratified and confirmed, vntill *Benedict* the 2. obtained this priuiledge frō the Emperour *Constantine* the 4. called *Pogonatus*, that the electiō of the Pope by the clergy and people of Rome should be good without the confirmatiō of the Emperour. Vpō which priuiledge obtained, the Pope began to care little for the Emperour, holding himselfe hencefoorth to be *dominus* or rather as th'apostle speaketh *inquit* without law, & subiect to the iudgemēt of no mā, as they professe in diuers of their canons. Not lōg after they began to aduāce themselves both against & aboue the Emperour. *Constantine* the 1. suffereth the Emperour *Iustinian* to kisse his feet, about the yeare of our Lord 710. Within three yeares after the same *Constantine* seareth himselfe against the Emperour *Philippicus Bardanes* in defense of images, as did his two successours *Gregory* the 2. and third against *Leo Isaurus* in the same quarell. In whose threetimes, (that wee may know Rome to be the mother of spirituall fornications) were helde three Councils at Rome, wherein worshipping of images is approved and the oppugners thereof excommunicated. And we must note that about this time (saith the Author of the booke called *Fasciculus temporum*) the Popes began aboue their wont to oppose themselves

Lib. 7. c. 11.

Anno. 684.

2. Thess. 2. 8.

Anno. 710.

themselves euen in temporal matters against the Emperours because of their vnsoundnesse in the faith (for so he calleth their oppugning of images) and to translate the Empire from nation to nation, as time required. As for Gregory the 2. he was the first which auouched himself superior to the Emperour; who also excommunicated *Leo* the 3. because he sought to abolish the idolatry of his time, which they call worshipping of images. But his successor *Gregory* the 3. not onely excommunicated the said Emperour for the same cause, but also forbad any tributes or duties to be paid vnto him out of *Italy* & *Rome*, & absolved his subiects fro their allegiance vnto him. Whereupon *Rome* (being then a Duchy) with diuers other cities in *Italy*, reuolting from the Emperour, sware obediēce to the Pope, who by the defection of the Italians, and helpe of the Lombards, dispossesteth the Emperour of all his reuenues in *Italy*; & consequently (as the popish author of the booke called *Fasciculus temporum* saith) totum regnum occidentis ab eo abstulit, *Hee* took from him the whole kingdome of the West. But when as the Lombards held the exarchat of *Rauenna* which the Pope intended to himselfe, & sought to rule ouer all *Italy* as the *Goths* had done, not exempting *Rome* or those other cities which had reuolted to the Pope; first, *Gregory* the 3. when *Rome* was besieged by *Luiprandus*, vsed the friendship of *Carolus Martellus* to free him from the siege. Whereupon the Pope remoueth the tuition of the Church of *Rome* from the Emperour of *Greece* vnto *Carolus Martellus* the great Master of *Fraunce*, & to his sonne *Pipinus* after him. Whom that the Pope might bind vnto him, and finde a sufficient defence against his eni-
 mies, hee (namely *Zacharias*) hauing (as themselves testifie) deposed *Childerick* the King of *Fraunce* from his kingdome, and absolved his subiectes from their allegiance (because forsooth he was too simple to rule) maketh him (namely *Pipin*) King of *Fraunce*. Who afterwards when his helpe was intreated by the Pope *Steuē* the third, against *Aistulphus* the king of Lombards, enforced the said King to yeeld vp the exarchat of *Rauenna*, and *Pentapolis*, which hee gaue to the Pope. This donation his sonne *Charles* the great confirmed and enlarged with a pleinsfull addition (reseruing notwithstanding

ding to himselfe the royalties of those possessions) when he had at the intreaty of *Adrian* the Pope ouerthrowne the kingdome of the Lombards in *Italy*. For which cause, as also for that hee assisted the Pope *Leo* the third, against the insurrections of the people of *Rome*, punished his aduersaries, and caused the people of *Rome* to sweare allegiance to the Pope: The Pope (namely *Leo* the third) crowned him Emperour of *Rome*, translating that title from the Emperour of the East to him, and in him renewing the Empire of the west, which had bene void since the time of *Augustulus*. And as he made him Emperour; so to him was committed by *Adrian* and *Leo*, the confirmation of those which were elected to the Papacy. Which yoke as the Popes following oft struggled against: so at the last, they shooke it off. And whereas, in former times, the Pope was subiect to the Emperour, & being elected was confirmed by him, afterwards it came to passe that as the Empire was renewed in *Charlemaigne*, and after renewed in *Otto* the great; and that to this end that it might support the Papacy; so the Pope (namely *John* the 12. alias 13.) causeth the Emperour to sweare vnto him to that end, taketh order for the election of the Emperour, appointing 7. electors, reseruing the coronation of the Emperour and confirmation of the election vnto himselfe; and at the length subiecteth the Emperour vnto him as his vassall, challenging both sword and vsurping an vniuersal dominion and souerainty ouer all the christian world, not onely ouer ecclesiasticall persons, as Bishops and Priests, but also ciuill, as princes, Kings, Emperours, whome he esteemeth as his vassals, and maketh them kisse his feete, as we shall shew more fully when we come to speake of his Antichristian pride. Vnto this Monarchy (as they call it) not onely of spirituall but also of temporal power, they long aspired, but neuer fully attained, vntill the time of *Gregory* the seauenth, in whom Antichrist was come to his full growth, wherein hee flourished, vntill our Saviour Christ the king of kings and Lord of Lords began to waste and consume him with the breath of his mouth. This is that which *Auentine* saith, *Hildebrand* who also is called *Gregory the seauenth*, first established the Pontificall Empire.

which his successors for the space of 450. yeares (that is to Auentine and also Luthers time) so held in spite of the world, and manure the Emperours, that they haue brought all both in heauen & hel into bondage &c. at their pleasure they cast men headlong from heauen to hel, and again from hel aduance to heauen. The Emperours from henceforth is nothing but a bare title without body or shew.

7 But no sooner was Antichrist come to his full growth (whereby he plainly reuealed & discouered himself) but straightwaies he began to be acknowledged, which is the 2. part of his reuelation, whereof also there are degrees. For first hee was acknowledged particularly dy diuerse learned & godly men in the time of Gregory the 7. and in euery age since vntill the time of Luther. As for example, the Bishops of Germany affirme Gregory the 7. to be Antichrist. *Antichristus esse pradicat. Vnder the name & title of Christ (say they) he cotrinereth the businesse of Antichrist: he sitteth in Babylon in the temple of God: he extollet himselfe above all that is worshipped, as if he were a God, he boasteth that he cannot erre.* And afterward Auenin either in his owne name or in the persō of Sigebertus, speaking of the times of Gregory the 7. *All men almost (saith he) that were good, openhearted, iust, ingenuous, and simple hearted, haue left in wringing, that the Empire of Antichrist did then begin, because they saw those things which our Saviour Christ so many yeares before had prophesied vnto vs, to happen in that time.*

The Bishop of Florence, in the time of Paschalis the second, preached that Antichrist was come, meaning the Pope.

Honorius Augustinodensis applieth the prophecies in the Apocalypse concerning Antichrist, to the Pope and church of Rome. *Dialog. de lib. arb. & pradest.* Bernard in his time acknowledged a general apostasie, and complained of the state of the church as Antichristian.

Ioannes Sarisburiensis taught that the pope is Antichrist, and the city of Rome the whore of Babylon. About the same time Petrus Blesensis wrote, that Rome is that very Babylon whereof Iohn speaketh in the Apocalypse.

Gerbardus and Dulcinus Nauarrensis preach that the Pope is

is Antichrist, and that the cleargy and prelates of Rome were the very whore of Babylon prefigured in the Apocalypse.

In the time of Alexander the third, the Waldenses teach that the Pope is Antichrist, and Rome Babylon.

Ioachim the abbot, being demanded of Richard the first king of England, now going towards the holie land, concerning Antichrist, answered thus; Antichrist is already borne in the citie of Rome, and is aduanced in the See Apostolicke. And in certaine Germane verses also published at Francofurt, he affirmeth that the Pope and his priests are Antichrists.

Eberhardus archiepiscopus Iunacensis, *Hyldebrand* (saith he) about an hundred and 70. yeares ago did first, vnder the shewe of religion, lay the foundation of Antichrists kingdome. And straightwaies after, those priests of Babylon (saith he) come to reigne alone, they cannot endure an aqual. Neither will they crosse vntill they haue troden all vnder their feet, and do sitte in the temple of God, and be extolled above all that is worshipped. Their hunger after wealth, and thirst for honour, is insatiable &c. he that is the seruant of seruants desireth to bee the Lord of Lords, as if he were a God. And againe, hee wasteth and spoileth, he deceiveth and killeth, I meane that man of perdition whome they call Antichrist, in whose forehead a name of blasphemie is written, I am God, I cannot erre, he sitteth in the temple of God, he ruleth faue and wide.

Robert Grossthead, the worthie Bishoppe of Lincolne, on his deathbed complaining of the Pope, and bewailing the losse of soules which happened through the auarice of the Popes court, with sighs he said; Christ came into the world to gaine soules: therefore if any feare not to destroy soules, is not he worthily to be called Antichrist?

Gmilietinus de sancto amore, a master of Paris and chiefe ruler of that vniuersitie, called the monks and priests the subiects of Antichrist.

One Lawrence also an Englishman & master of Paris, proued the Pope to be Antichrist, & the synagogue of Rome the great Babylon. About the same time Manardus Tyrolinus in a publick

Ex J. Fox.

Anno. 1170.

Ex J. Fox & Catal. test. Roger Housden in Riccardi.

Balewin. 3. c. 35. in apped. Anno. 1189. Catalog. test.

Anno. 1211.

Auenin. annal. Boior. lib. 7.

Anno. 1193.

Mat. Paris. in Henr. 3.

Anno. 1260.

Anno. 1290.

J. Fox.

Annotin. an. u. b. i. l. 7. edict calleth the Popes effeminate Antichrists. And againe, if they be not Antichrists, I pray you what are they?

Anno. 1322. I. Fox. *Michael Cesarius* principall of the gray fryers, wrote against the pride, tyranny and primacy of the Pope, accusing him to be Antichrist, and the church of Rome the whore of Babylon drunken with the blood of Saints. *Hayabulus* a fryer in the time of *Clement* the sixt, preached (and that, as he saide, by commaundement from God) that the church of Rome is the whore of Babylon, and that the Pope with his Cardinales is the very Antichrist. *Wilhelmus Occomensis*, as *Auentine* calleth him, wrote a booke against *Charles* and *Clement* the sixte, wherein he calleth the Pope Antichrist.

Anno. 1370. I. Fox. *Briget*, whom the Papists worship as a canonized Saint, calleth the Pope a murderer of soules, more cruell then *Iudas*, more vniust then *Pharo*, worse then *Lucifer* himselfe. She propheticke that the See of Rome shall bee throwne downe into the deepe like a millstone, (according to the prophetic of Saint *Iohn*, Apocalypse. 18. 21) About the same yeere, *Matthias Parisensis*, a Bohemian, writing a booke of Antichrist, proueth that he is already come, and noateth him to be the Pope.

Anno. 1374. *Franciscus Petrarch*, in many places of his writings, calleth the court of Rome the whore of Babylon, the mother of the fornications and abominations of the earth.

Urbanus the sixte, and *Clement* the seauenth two Popes at once, call one the other Antichrist. As *Bernard* before had called *Antiochus*, against whom *Innocentius* the second was chosen as Antipope. That beast saith hee in the Apocalypse, to whom is giuen a mouth speaking blasphemies, & to war with the Saints (meaning Antichrist), occupieth the chaire of *Peter*, as a Lyon ready for the pray.

Anno. 1383. B. l. d. de vit. pontif. Anno 1378. Anno 1370. Epist. 125. But most effectually doth our godly and learned countryman *Iohn Wicleffe* discover the enormities and heresies of the Pope whom he pronounced to be Antichrist. Artic. 90.

Anno 1405. Rom. lib. 5. c. 1. His iudgement as in other things, so also in this, that worthy Martyr of Christ *Iohn Husse* followed. Who affirmeth in his booke *de ecclesia*, that hee was troubled because he preached Christ, and discovered Antichrist. That the Censures of the Romish

Romish church were Antichristian, and proceeding fro Antichrist: & (as *Gerson* & the *Parisians* objected against him *Art. 16*) that in those times & many ages before, there had bin no true Pope, nor true Romane church: but the Popes were Antichrists & the church of Rome the synagogue of Satan. Whose iudgement many in *Bohemia* followed, Sir *Iohn Oldenstell*, the Lord *Cobham*, that famous & noble martyr of Christ, professed to King *Henry* the 5. that by the Scriptures he knew the Pope to be the great Antichrist, the son of perdition &c. *Hieronymus Savanarola* taught that the Pope is Antichrist, because he did attribute more to his owne indulgences & pardons then to Christs merits.

About the yeare of our Lord 1517, *Luther* began to preach against the Popes indulgences, and afterwards against other errors and abominations of the Pope and church of Rome, discovering more plainly then any had done before him, that Rome is Babylon, and the Pope Antichrist. Since whose times this truth hath bene almost generally acknowledged by the true and reformed Churches of Christ.

Seeing therefore we haue proued, that Antichrist was to sitte in Rome professing her selfe the church of God, and that after the taking away of the Romane Emperour whom hee was to succeed in the gouernment of Rome, and there to be reuealed both by his owne shewing himself in his colours, & also by the acknowledgement of others: it cannot be auoided but that the Pope is Antichrist. For he and none but he siteth, that is reigned in Rome, professing her selfe the church of God, and that after the taking away of the Romane Emperour, (not onely by the removing of the imperiall seat, but also by the dissolution of the Empire in the West) whom hee succeedeth in the gouernment of Rome, where he hath bene reuealed not onely by his owne shewing himselfe in his colours, but also by the acknowledgement of others.

8. Vnto the former place of the Epistle to the *Thessal.* we will adde two other places out of the Apocalypse, from whence both the place and time of Antichrist may be iointly gathered. The former place is in the 13. of the Apocalypse, where two beasts are described, signifying two estates of the Romane gouernment as they are opposed vnto Christ: the former representeth the

the persecuting Emperours, the latter Antichrist. Of the former he saith thus, I saw a beast arising out of the sea (that is, of many & diuers peoples which it had vanquished.) Now the description of this beast containeth in it the resemblances of those 4. kingdoms which are described in *Daniel*, the Romane Empire fare surpassing the al. The first of the beasts in *Daniel*, signifying the kingdome of the *Babylonians*, is compared to a Lion: The 2. resembling the kingdome of the *Medes* and *Persians*, to a Beare: The 3. representing the monarchy of the *Macedonians*, to a Leopard: The 4. figuring the kingdome of the *Seleucide* and *Lagide*, to a beast with 10. hornes, resembling so many of their kings, who should tyrannize ouer Jewry. The Empire of Rome therefore, as if it were compounded of them all, is resembled to a beast hauing ten hornes with so many diademes vpon them, both in respect of the ten persecuting Emperours, answering the 10. *Seleucide* & *Lagide*; as also in regard of the 10. kingdoms or prouinces wherinto the Romane Empire in those times was diuided; being also like a Leopard, hauing the feet or pawes as it were of a Beare, & the rauening mouth of a Lion. And besides all this, is said to haue seuen heads, which afterwards (*chap. 17.*) are expounded to be 7. hills, & also 7. heads of gouernment &c. & to this beast was given authority or power, ouer euery tribe, language and nation &c. al which are proper to the Empire of Rome. The former beast therefore signifieth the Romane state, especially as it was vnder the persecuting Emperours, as *Bel-larmine* confesseth.

Verse. 7.

Lib. 3. de pont.
R. cap. 15.De pont. Rom.
lib. 3. c. 10. &
11.

Verse. 11.

The second beast, described *vers. 11.* and so forward to the end of the chapter, is (as *Bel-larmine* saith all men do confesse) Antichrist: who also is, by the confession of the said *Bel-larmine*, one of the heads of the former beast. By the description of this beast (that we may now note that which serueth for the present purpose, reseruing the residue vntil their due time & place) it is apparant, that there is one & the same principall seate of both the beasts, that in that seate the second beast succeedeth the former, practising al the power or authority of the former beast & that before him, that is to say, euen at Rome: and that his chiefe endeuors tēde to magnifie the beast, that is the Romane state, as in making me to worship it, in causing me to make an image

of &c. to the beast, wherunto he giueth spirit & speech, & enforcing men to worship the same: finally in compelling men to take vpon the the marke of the beast, his name, & nūber of his name. All which as they argue Antichrist to be a Romane, succeeding the Emperours in the gouernment of Rome: so also they fully & properly agree to the Pope, who succeedeth the Emperours in the gouernment of Rome, where he vsurpeth all & more then al the power of the Emperours, chalēging a more vniuersal & soueraigne, or rather diuine authority, then belonged to the; whose maine endeuors are to aduance the Romane state, which he calleth the See Apostolik, & which he maketh al me to worship: causing them also to make an image of the Empire (which was the head that had receiued the deadly wound) to &c. in behoofe of the Romane state; an image I say, partly in the Emperour of Almanie, resembling the title ornāmēts & shew of the former Emperours: partly in his owne courts not onely in Rome, but in all other countries representing the former imperial authority & tyrāny both in Rome it selfe, and in the prouinces thereunto belonging. This image both in the Empire & popish courts he animateth & authorizeth. For as there is no question to be made hereof in respect of his courts, so is it as true in respect of the Empire, if that be true which themselves professe. Namely, that what the Emperour hath, he hath it wholly frō the: that the Empire in the West was renewed by the Pope, who traslated the title of the Emperour of Rome frō the Emperour of the East, first to the Frēch, & after to the Germāns: that the Pope caused this new Emperour to be made, that he crowned & authorized him, that he appointed 7. Electors in Germany, reseruing the cōfirmation of the electiō & coronatiō of the Emperour to himselfe: of which points we shal hereafter speake more at large. Further, he causeth al me to worship the image by him erected, & cōpellet all men to receiue the marke of the beast, as also the name of the beast (which cā be no other but either Romane or Latine,) & the nūber of his name, i. to liue insubiection to the See of Rome, & to professe the selues to be Romanes & Latines in respect of their religiō, as hereafter shal be shewed.

Chap. 7.

Chap. 8.

9. The same is proued out of the 17. chap. of th'apocalyps, where be reckened 7. heads, that is 7. kinds of principall rulers

3.

as it were heads of government, whereby Rome hath bene gouerned, every one succeeding another. The sixt head being the Emperours, the seuenth Antichrist which is the Pope. For Antichrist is one of the 7. heads of the beast which hath 7. heads & 10. hornes. And this beast signifieth the Romane state, therefore Antichrist is a head of the Romane state. All which *Bellarmino* after a sort cōfesseth. Now it is most certaine that Antichrist is none of the first 5. heads, for they were past in the apostles time: neither is he the sixt head which was of the Emperours, that then way, for that was to be done out of the way, as the Papists themselves do teach, before the reuelatiō of Antichrist. It remaineth therefore that the seuenth head which is the Pope is Antichrist. The eight head, which also is one of the seuen, is the Empire renewed by the Pope, & is said to be the beast, which was & is not though it be, wheron the whore of Babilō sitteth. If it be objected that the seuenth head whereby Antichrist is signified, was to continue but a short time, as it is said *vers. 10.* and that this therefore cannot agree to the Pope, who hath reigned already in Rome many 100. yeares: I answer that this is spōke of purpose to arme the faithfull with patience, who other wise would thinke the reigne of Antichrist very long, & our Saviour Christ also to be slowe in cōming. Whereas in truth neither is our Saviour Christ slow in cōming as *Peter* sheweth, neither is the kingdome of Antichrist long. But in respect of God with whom a 1000. yeares are as one day, & in cōpariſon of the eternal kingdome of Christ (with who the faithfull are to raigne after they haue suffered vnder Antichrist), it is to be accompted very short. And surely if the whole time from the Ascension of our Saviour vntil his returne vnto iudgement, is noted in the Scriptures to be very short, and that to this end that we should not thinke it long, then is the raigne of Antichrist (which is but part of this time) much more short. The holy Ghost in the beginning of the Reuelation signifieth that the time of fulfilling the prophecies therein mentioned was at hand. And our Saviour Christ promiſeth by the Apostle, that after a very litle while he would come: & in the last chapt. of the reuelatiō, he saith, yea, I come quickly. And *Iohn* likewise in his Epistle noteth that the whole time of Antichrist was but a part of the last howre.

10. And

10. And further whereas the Papists object, in respect of the time, that Antichrist is not yet come, because the Romane Empire is not yet dissolued, and consequently that the Pope is not Antichrist: it may notwithstanding evidently be shewed out of the same chapter of the Apocalypse compared with the event, both that the Empire is dissolued, and that Antichrist is already come. For the Empire is then knowne to be dissolued, when it is diuided among ten who shall haue receiued power as kings, as *Iohn* noteth, the fathers teach, & the Papists themselves confesse. But it is most certaine that the old Empire of Rome is diuided among ten kings at the least, who before the dissolution had not soueraigne authority: and that the Empire which now is, being but a title, and contayning no such kingdomes, is not capable of such a partition. And that Antichrist also is come it is as euident. For those ten hornes which in the Apostles time had not receiued the kingdome nor soueraigne authority, but were gouernours of the prouinces by deputation from the Emperours, were after the dissolution of the Empire to receiue power as kings with the beast; or, as the Papists reade, after the beast, that is Antichrist. If therefore the gouernours of the kingdomes whereinto the Romane Empire was diuided, haue receiued power as kings, then it is certaine that Antichrist is already come. For either after him, or at least with him they were to receiue their soueraignty. It is as certaine therefore that Antichrist is come, as it is sure that the gouernours of the prouinces which once belonged to the Empire are soueraigne princes and not liege tenants vnder the Emperour. And that this Antichrist which is already come is the Pope, it is plaine enough by the same chapter. For whosoever succeedeth the Emperours (who were the sixt head) in the gouernement of Rome, as the seuenth head of the Romane state, he is Antichrist. But the Pope as the seuenth head of the Romane state succeedeth the Emperours (who were the sixt head) in the gouernement of Rome; therefore he is Antichrist. If you say, the seuenth head was not come in the Apostles time *verse 10.* and yet there were Bishops of Rome then: I answer that the Bishops of Rome, in the first three hundred yeares, were

meane men in respect of their owne estate, & nothing lesse then heads of the Romane state. And that howsoever afterwards they obtained great authority, & more & more aspired vnto the soueraignty: notwithstanding, vntill the sixth head was taken out of the way, the 7. was not reuealed. But after the sixth head was gone, the 7. succeeded in the government of Rome. In so much that now for a long time the city of Rome hath so wholly belonged to the Pope, as that the Emperour hath no manner of right therein. To conclude therefore, If Antichrist was to sitte in Rome professing her selfe the church of God, & that after the taking away of the Romane Emperour whom he was to succeed in the government of Rome, as hath bin proued: it followeth necessarily, seeing these notes agree to the Popes of Rome and to none but them, that therefore the Pope is Antichrist.

*Experi de eccl.
p. 37. n. 9. vrbem Romanam
ad papam plenam
iure spectare
constat. & pag.
258 n. 7. Romana
urbis
Papa domino
cessit, ut iurisdictionem
in
eius seruaret.*

Chap. 4.

Of the conditions of Antichrist, and his opposition vnto Christ.

1. **N**ow if to those former notes of place and time, we shal ad the rest, & find them all properly to fit the Popes of Rome, then may it not be doubted, but that the Pope is Antichrist. In the next place therefore let vs consider his condition & qualities, in respect whereof he is called the man of sin, for first Antichrist in respect of his opposition to Christ he is an aduersary, in respect of his pride & ambition, *ut supra* listed vp aboue al that is called god &c. Fro these 2. notes therefore we may argue thus; *He that is such an aduersary as the scriptures describe opposed vnto Christ in emulation of like honour, he is Antichrist: The Pope is such an aduersary as the scriptures describe opposed vnto Christ in emulation of like honour: Therefore the Pope is Antichrist.* The truth of the proposition is testified by the Apostle, implied in the name *Antichrist* which signifieth *hostem & emulum Christi*, and confessed by the aduersaries. The assumption Bellarmine would disproue by this slender argument; because the Pope

2. Thess. 2. 4.

forsooth professeth himselfe the seruant of Christ. For euen as he professeth himselfe to be Christs seruāt, so he termeth himselfe, the seruant of seruants, (which is *Chams* title) when as in truth he would be esteemed Lord of Lords. But this is so false from disprouing the assumption, as that the Pope could not be such an aduersary as is described in the scriptures, and consequently not Antichrist, vnlesse he professed himselfe to be the seruant of Christ. Let vs therefore consider what manner of enemy Antichrist is according to the scriptures. First, he is an Apostate or reuolter: 2. a disguised enemy or hypocrite; that is, one that is fallen indeed fro god & his truth as it were a star fro heauen, yet retaineth the name & profession of Christ; vnder which name & professio he oppugneth christ & his truth: Enē as a rebellious subiect, when he presumeth without commission to leuie a power of men against his Soueraigne, that he may deceiue the rest of the subiects, abuse the name and authority of his prince to colour his rebellious practises. And that this is the property of Antichrist, *Hilary* hath well obserued: *It is the property of Antichrists name, to be contrary to Christ. This is now practised vnder the opinion of counterfeited piety: this, vnder a shewe of preaching the Gospell, is preached, that our Lord Iesus Christ may be denied whiles whiles he is thought to be preached.* *Augustine* saith, we haue found many Antichrists which confesse Christ with their mouth.

Ad Auxenium

Tract. 3. in 20. an. Epistol.

2. First I say he is an apostate, yea the head of that Apostasy or falling away fro the truth, mentioned 2. Thess. 2. in so much as some of the learned as *Chrysostome*, *Augustine*, *Theodoret*, *Theophylact*, *Oecumenius* by that Apostasy vnderstand Antichrist himself. Yea *Beitar* himselfe affirmeth that by Apostasy in that place Antichrist himselfe may be most fitly vnderstood. But the Papists, which falsly hold that the visible church of Christ cannot er, & much lesse fall away, expound this Apostasy of defection, to be a reuolt or falling away, fro the Roman Empire. Neither do we deny but that also there hath bin a defection fro the Romane Empire; but yet we deny that it is vnderstood in this place. *Ambrose* saith, then shall desolation draw neere, *ber* cause many falling by error shall reuolt from the true religio. *Ebed* saith him a reuolter, saith *Augustine*, namely fro the Lord God.

In 2. Thess. 2. De ciuit. Dei lib. 20. c. 19.

Catech. 11. Cyrill, *Now is the Apostasie, for men are revolted from the true faith.* Chrysostome and Occumenius, *the Apostasie hee calleth Antichrist himselfe, because hee shall cause many to revolt from Christ.* Or else he calleth apostasie *in anti christi* *the departure from God and the thing it selfe.* The same hath Theophylact in effect, And likewise Theodoret on this place, *The defection (saith he) hee calleth Antichrist himselfe, giving him a name from the thing it selfe. For his endeavour is to withdraw men from the truth, and to cause them to revolt.* *Primasius* by Apostasy vnderstandeth *the forsaking of the truth, and Lyra, the departure from the Catholike faith.* But to omit humane testimonies, the holy ghost who is the best expounder of himselfe, sheweth what kind of defection hee speaketh of. For afterwards in the same chapter he noteth this Apostasy to be of those, who because they haue not loued nor beleueed the truth that they might be faued (but haue taken pleasure in vnrightheadnes) are therefore giuen ouer by the iust iudgement of God to belecue the lies of Antichrist to their damnation. But more plainly the same Apostle speaking of that Apostasie which in these later times was to accompany the reuelation of Antichrist, he saith *1. Tim. 4. 1. 2. The spirit speaketh, evidently that in the latter times some shall make an Apostasie from the faith, attending to erroneous spirits and doctrines of diuells, speaking lies in hypocrisie, hauing their owne conscience feared.*

3. Now the Papists are as ready to obiekt this Apostasy to vs, as wee to them. How then shall we discern whether we or they haue made this revolt? The Apostle in the same place setteth downe two of those doctrines of diuells, as certaine notes whereby those which make this Apostasy may be discerned. *1. Tim. 4. 3.* *Forbidding (saith hee) to marry, and commaunding to abstaine from meats, which God hath created to bee receiued with thanksgiving.* The former whereof Hierome also hath noted to bee a marke of Antichrist, *Nota est Antichristi prohibere nuptias.* But these notes agree not vnto vs, who neither forbid marriage, nor commaund abstinence from any meats for religion sake. As for the Papists (especially since the times of Gregory the seauenth, they forbid marriage to some men at all times,

and

and certaine meats to all men at sometimes and that for religion sake: esteeming of marriage in their clergie worse then adultery or Sodomy; and eating of flesh in Lent, or other forbidden times, as a mortall sinne. And as touching the falling away of the Church; certaine it is, that although neither the inuisible church in generall, nor any one sound member thereof can fall away from faith either totally or finally: yet not onely the members of visible churches, but also the churches themselves consisting of hypocrites, as of the greater part, may fall away. As the Church of England which was in King Edwards daies, revolted in Queene Maries time, from Christ to Antichrist. So hath the church of Rome (which once was famous for her faith) as may appeare not onely by those notes set downe by the Apostle *1. Tim. 4. 3.* and some others which hereafter shall be noted: but also in those innumerable particulars both in doctrine and maners wherein they haue revolted from the purity of the primitive Church, And of this catholike Apostasie the Pope is head.

4. Secondly, Antichrist is not an open and outward, but a couert & disguised enemy, oppugning Christ & his church not by open violence, but with all deceiueablenes of vnrightheadnes. For he is not so foolish as to profess himselfe to be Antichrist, Neither could that be which the Apostle testifieth (as Radephus Flauiacefs saith) that Antichrist should attaine vnto ecclesiasticall honours, and in the temple of God that is the society of the faithfull, should take the chaire of honour, vnto whose first pretended a kind of conformity with the faithfull he should deeme those of whom he is to be ordained. Therefore Antichristianisme is called the mystery of iniquitie: whereupon the Glose saith, *2. Thess. 2. 7.* *The impiety of Antichrist is mysticall, that is, cloaked vnder the name of godlinesse.* And, as in the Popes mitre was wont, so also in the whore of Babylons forehead is written a mystery. *Apoc. 17.* And Antichrist himselfe is deciphered as an hypocrite, sitting *2. 1. Thess. 2. 4.* *in the temple of God, professing himselfe and his followers to be the only true church of God, using the two Testaments, pretending himselfe, as Hierome saith, to bee the Prince of the covenant,* *13.* And consequently head of the Church: deceiuing vnsounde

H

Christians

Apoc. 17. Christians with a glorious profession of religion (signified by the golden cup) & with a shew of counterfeit holiness (otherwise he could neuer so effectually deceiue many christians, as that the elect should be in any danger to be seduced) speaking lies in hypocrisie, oppugning Christ & his truth vnder the outward shew & profession of Christian religion, *having two hornes like the lambe*, countering in some things the humility & meekenes of Christ, & yet challenging that double power both spirituall & temporall which belongeth to Christ the lambe, as our chief priest and king: and not onely that, but speaking also like the dragon. Which is to be vnderstood partly of his blasphemous speeches which he doth vtter, partly of the doctrines of diuels which he doth teach, partly of those hellish curses which he thundreth against the true professors of the faith, partly of those great promises, which like the prince of the world he maketh to those that will adore him. These things need no application for those to whom the disguising & more then pharisaical hypocrisie of the Pope & Papists is knowne. For must not his holines be called *sanctissimus*, most holy, whē he is most wicked? doth not he call himself *Servus servorum*, the seruāt of seruants, whē in truth he maketh himself the King of Kings, and Lord of Lords? And as *Faber* hath obserued, the Pope in word saith that he is the seruant of seruants, but in deed he permitteeth himselfe to be adored, which the Angel in the *Apocalypse* refused. Fro which fact of the Pope, as if it were a rule of iustice, *Anthonius* concludeth, that there is no lesse honour due to the Pope then to the Angels. Whereupon (saith he) he receiuech from the faithfull adorations, prostration or falling downe before him, and the kisses of his feete, which the Angell permitted not to be done vnto him by Iohn the Euangelist. Neither was *Bernards* complaint either vnjust or vntrue, *Henhen, Domine Deus &c.* Alas Lord God, that they be first in thy persecution, which seeme to loue the primacie in thy Church, and to beare rule. And else where, *A filthy contagion* (saith he) spreadeth it selfe now adaiers through the whole body of the Church &c. All are louers, and all enemies, all friends, & all aduersaries, all domesticall or of the household, and none peaceable: all neighbours, and yet all seek their owne: they are.

Prefat. in hist.

Sum part. 3.
tit. 12. 5. 4.

Apoc. 22.
Serm. in con-
uers. Pauli.

In Cant. serm.
23.

are ministers of Christ, and they serue Antichrist. And such was the complaint of diuerse Bishoppes in their Epistle to Pope *Nicolas* recorded in *Auentine*: *Thou bearest the person of a Bishop* (say they) *but thou playest the tyrant: vnder the habite or attire of a pastor, wee feele a Wolfe: the lying title calleth thee Father, thou in thy deedes boastest thy selfe to be another Iupiter.* When as thou art the seruant of seruants, thou strinest to be the Lorde of Lords &c. Hee counterfeited the Lambe, in calling himselfe the vicar of Christ, and exercising the very same office which Christ himselfe had whiles he was vpon the earth. And because, by home, in the Scriptures often is meant power: he may be saide to haue two hornes like the Lambe, whiles he challengeth that twofold power which is peculiar to Christ the Lambe as our King and Priest, and vsurpeth both the swordes, I meane both spirituall and temporall. He speaketh like the Dragon, in teaching those doctrines of Diuels, mentioned 1. Tim. 4. 3. (*forbidding to marry and commanding abstinence from meates*) in belching forth most horrible blasphemies (whereof wee will remember some in the next chapter:) in his diuellish curses against the Saints, and Satannicall promises of the worlde and kingdoms thereof to them that will adore him. *Ecce in potestate nostra est imperium, ut demus illud cui vo-* *Auentin. An-*
luntum saith *Adrian* the Pope, Beholde the Emperre is in our power, that wee may giue it to whom wee will. And where- *Annal. Boier.*
as *Hierome* writing of those wordes, 1. Tim. 4. They speake in Hypocrisie (saith he) who being not continent, would seeme to be so chaste, as that they condemne mariage, and so abstemious as that they iudge those who vse the creature sparingly, whereas thei selues are giuen ouer to belly cheere, what could haue bene spoken more fitly to shewe forth the hypocrisie of the Pope & Papists. For do not they, whiles they condēne & condemne mariage, vnder the shew of vowed chastity practise all vncleannesse; and whiles they cōdemne all moderate eating of flesh, do not they vnder a colour of fasting, feast & feed themselves with the choicest dainties? Doe not many of them vnder the pretence of voluntary poverty gather infinite riches?

An. Do. 862.
Annal. Boier.
lib. 4.

Bellarm.

Luc. 4. 6.

Auentin. An-
n. Boier. lib. 6.

And doth not all their religion stande in *Opera operato*, in the bare performauce of the outwarde worke, that is to say, in hypocrisie? Neither are wee to omitte an hypocriticall policie which of late they haue vsed. For when as they coule not preuaile with their Sophistrie, that is to say, with their Bookes of controuersies: they hoped to preuaile among the simple with their hypocrisie, that is to say, with their bookes of deuotion. Wherein there is a notable shewe of counterfeit deuotion, zeale and holinesse, to blear the eyes of the simple and vnstaied. But it were to be wished, that as they are, so they were esteemed to be no better then baits of Antichrist, seruing to allure men vnder shew of deuotion, vnto idolatry & apostasie from God: especially if we consider that the principall of these bookes were set forth by *Parsons* & other Iesuits, who are plainly discouered euen by some of their owne side, to be mere Machiuilians and wicked Atheists.

Quodlibet
&c.

5. Thus you see what manner of aduersary Antichrist is. Now wee must shewe in particular wherein he is opposed to Iesus Christ. He is opposed vnto him as he is Christ, and as he is Iesus: as hee is Christ, that is, as he was annointed of God to be our Prophet, our King, and our Priest; in which respect especially he is called Antichrist. He is also opposed vnto him as he is Iesus, that is to say, as he is our Saviour. So that Antichrist opposeth himselfe both to the offices of Christ signified in the name Christ, and also to the benefites signified in the name Iesus. Now these things also most fitly agree to the Pope: who opposeth himselfe to Christ in all these respects, not indeede *aperte Mente* as an open and professed enemy, (for so it becometh not Antichrist, who was to be an hypocrite sitting in the Church of God &c.) but covertly and cunningly. For we must remember that Antichristianisme is the mystery of iniquity, wherein Christ was in word & shew to be professed, but indeed & truth, denied. First, thē to Christ our Prophet he is opposed, partly as he oppugne the prophcy of Christ, and partly as himselfe is a false Prophet. He oppugne the prophcy of Christ; First, in denying Christ to be our onely Prophet (whose voice in the canonically Scriptures concerning matters necessarily

necessarily to be beleueed vnto saluation, wee ought onely to heare) whiles he and his followers do teach that the scriptures are not perfect, and that besides the Apocryphall writings (which they haue matched with the canonically) their owne traditions also are necessary, and of equall authority with the scriptures. Secondly by withholding from the people the scriptures (which containe the whole doctrine of Christ our prophet) in a strange language, and also by reading and preaching vnto them their owne fancies and inuentions, out of the legends and liues of saints, and festiualls &c. in steede of the sincere truth of God. And by these two practises, the Pope, whiles he leaueth to Christ the name and title of beeing our prophet, he taketh the thing to himselfe. Again he is opposed to Christ our prophet as himselfe is the false prophet spoken of in the Apocalypse, teaching Antichristian errors and doctrines of diuells. For so many errors, as are taught and held by the Pope and church of Rome, are so many oppositions betwixt him and Christ our prophet. Of the errors of the Romish church there be many centuries or hundreds, and diuerse of them fundamentall. In respect whereof wee may truly say that the catholike Apostasie (for so I call the Romish religion) is the common sewre of many grosse heresies.

6 But it will be said, that howsoeuer the Pope holdeth diuerse errors, yet he teacheth not those, which the holy ghost hath noted as the peculiar doctrines of Antichrist. Whereof the authour of the Wardword reckoneth y^e three, and *Bellarmin* hath a fourth: But neither of them durst mention those two doctrines of diuells which *Pant* assigneth to that Apostasie, whereof Antichrist is the head, The first doctrine of Antichrist (say they) is, to deny Iesus to be Christ, Which they would proue out of 1. *Iohn*. 2. 22. & 4. 3, and 2. *Iohn*. 7. But the Pope (say they) doth not deny Iesus to be Christ. To the prosyllogisme or prooue of the proposition I answer, that these places of the Apostle *Iohn* doe not speake properly of the ground Antichrist, who is the head of the Antichristian body, but of certaine petite Antichrists, or heretickes of those times, which denied either of the natures of Christ, (for he speaketh

1. Tim. 4. 3.

Of this see
more in the 2.
booke and 24.
chapter.

of such as were then already come into the world:) and therefore from thence it cannot be proved that the great Antichrist shall directly and expressly deny Iesus to be Christ. Notwithstanding, seeing they are called Antichrists not onely because they belong to the Antichristian body as inferiour members thereof, but also as it may be thought, because they did after a sort deny Christ as the great Antichrist also should doe, although not after the same manner: I doe therefore thus farre graunt the proposition it selfe, that Antichrist was in some sort to denie Christ. For *Iohn* speaketh not of the manner how he doth denie Christ. Neither are we to thinke that Antichrist will denie him after euery manner, but in such sort as shall be most consonant to the whole *mysterie of iniquitie*, and suteable to the rest of his lying and deceipt. That is to say, in outward shewe and semblance to professe Christ (as those Antichrists did, of whom *Iohn* speaketh) but in deed and in truth to denie him. To come therefore to the assumption: let vs consider whether the Pope and church of Rome doe not in some sort denie Christ. Christ may be denyed, either in deeds or words. *Quisquis autem fallit negat Christum, is Antichristus est*, *Andr. bo. soener in deedes* (saith *Augustine*) denieth Christ, he is Antichrist. *Let vs therefore marke* (saith he) *who it is that denieth, & let vs not attend to his tongue but to his works. I regard not what he speaketh, but how he liueth, Works do speake, and do we require words? He is the more lying Antichrist, who with his mouth professeth Iesus to be Christ, and by deeds denyeth him.* According to the Lawyers rule, it is more to testifie a matter by deedes then by words. And *Tullie* saith, *that where the things themselves beare witness, words are needlesse.* And as Antichrist was thus to deny Christ, both as he is the man of sin, and an aduersary oppugning Christ and his church: So doth the Pope, howsoever in word he professeth Christ. For euen the diuells themselves haue in word confessed Christ, whom notwithstanding by their deeds they deny. If therefore the Pope be a man of sin (which we shall proue anon) and an aduersary opposed vnto Christ, (which now we haue in hand to proue) then it cannot be denyed but that indeed he denieth Christ.

7 Secondly

2. Theff. 2.

Traill. 3. in
Epist. Ioan.

Contra Salust.

7 Secondly, Christ may be de denyed in word & doctrine, and that either indirectly and by consequent, or else directly & expressly. He that denieth Christ by consequent, howsoever openly he doth confesse him, doth indeede deny him; as those which deny either of his natures, or any of his offices. For such is the necessary coherence of truth with it selfe, as nothing can by necessarie consequence be deducted from it, which is not also true. And therefore it is impossible that the consequent should be false, the antecedent being true. Whereupon it followeth, that whosoever denieth the consequent, doth indeede deny the antecedent. Iesus is Immanuel, and consequently God and Man. He is Christ, and consequently annointed of God to be our King, our priest, & our prophet. He therefore that denieth any of these, denieth Iesus to be Christ. And further, is Christ truly God? then is he also *Iehouah*, one that is of & from himselfe, namely, as he is God: the is he also the Lord & creator of all things, gouerning all things with his presence and providence. Is he truly man? then hath he a true body consistng of three dimensions, length, breadth, thicknes, circumscribed, visible, continued in one place at once, as being but one body not discontinued. Is he the true Messias & Mediator betwixt God & man? then is he the only mediator, for there is but one. Wherefore whosoever saith, that Christ is not *veritas* God of himselfe, he denieth him to be God: or preferreth any creature before him either in heauen or in earth, he denieth him to be the Lord and maker of all; or assigneth a vicar vnto him to supply his absence on earth, denieth his omnipresence. Again, whosoever saith that Christ his body doth not consist of 3. dimensions, that it is not circumscribed, that it is not visible, that it is not contained in one place as all other bodies, yea as all other finite natures are; he denieth Iesus to be truly man, & consequently denieth him to be Christ. Lastly whosoever adioyne other mediators vnto Christ and in some respects prefer others aboue him, deny him to be the only mediator; & therefore deny him to be the true mediator, for there is but one, & consequently deny Iesus to be Christ. And thus as the Antichrists wherof *Iohn* speaketh (according to *Bellarmin* his own exposition) did, & as the graund Antichrist (according to our confession) doth deny Christ, not only in deed,

1. Tim. 2. 5.
Ad. 4. 12.1. Iolin. 1. 22.
Lib. 3. de pont.
76. ap. 14.

but also in word and doctrine, although not openly and expressly yet indirectly, and by consequent: So doth the Pope and church of Rome, deny Iesus to be Christ. For, what a God and Lord, what a creatour and gouernor of all things the Pope and Papists make our Sauour Christ, you may easily conceiue; First, when they deſſy him to bee *verbum* God of himſelfe, and conſequently Iehouah. For whoſoeuer is Iehouah, he is of, and from himſelfe. True indeed it is, that Chriſt is *ſilius a patre*, ſed *Deus a ſe*, quatenus eſt *Deus*: that is, ſonne of and from his father, but God of and from himſelfe, namely as he is God. And if he were not of and from himſelfe, he were not God. And although in the concrete we may and muſt ſay with the council of Nice, that Chriſt is God of God, that is, Chriſt who is God, is from the father who is God (the word God beeing taken *verbum*, *perſonalitè*) becauſe the perſon of the ſonne who is *Deus genitus* God begotten is from the perſon of the father who is *Deus gignens* God begetting: yet it is not likewiſe true in the abſtract, for howſoeuer the Godhead is communicated from the father to the ſonne by eternall generation, and from the father and the ſonne to the holy ghoſt by eternall proceſſion, yet the deity of the ſonne and ſo of the holy ghoſt, beeing the ſelfe ſame infinite eternall and indiuiſible eſſence of the father, is from, and of, and by, and for it ſelfe. And who knoweth not that ſuch is the ſimplicity of the diuine nature as that God is the godhead, and the godhead is God, and conſequently that Chriſt as he is God is the Godhead, which is of and from it ſelfe. And therefore to conclude, Chriſt is God of God, in reſpect of his perſon, and he is alſo God of himſelfe in reſpect of his eſſence which is of it ſelfe: he is God of God, the name God being vſed perſonally and relatively (for hee is God the ſonne, of God the father: and God begotten, of God begetting) and he is God of himſelfe, the name God beeing taken *ſeuſu* eſſentially & abſolutely, namely as he together with the father and the holy ghoſt is one and the ſame eternall Iehouah and onely true God. In which reſpect if the Papists deny Chriſt to be God of himſelfe, as they do when they accuſe this our doctrine of hereſie, and deny him ſo to bee *verbum* God of himſelfe

himſelfe) as we affirm, they do alſo deny him to be God. Secondly, when as not onely in heauen they ſet about him his mother whom they cal the *Queene of heauen*, deſiring her to commaund him, & to ſhew her ſelfe to be a mother (as though Chriſt were as they paint him a baby vnder his mothers gouernment) for ſo they ſay, *Sub natũ, & iure matris impera*, & againe monſtra te *eſſe matrẽ* &c. but alſo on earth, when euery ſtraueling prieſt cã by breathing out a few words out of his vniclean mouth, create his maker (for ſo they teach, *Sacerdos eſt creator creatoris ſui*, *Stella clericor.* that is, *the prieſt is maker of his maker*. And againe, *Qui creauit ſerm. diſcip. vos, dedit vobis creare ſe*, *Hee which made you, gaue you power to ſerm. 21. apud make him*.) & when he hath ſo done, offer him vp to his father, Wherein euery prieſt among the, being the ſacrificer, is after a ſort preferred aboue Chriſt, who is the ſacrifice. Thirdly, when as they appoint vnto Chriſt a vicar to ſupply his abſence, vnto whom they aſſigne all power which is in heauẽ and earth, yea *Vid. Cap. 5.* infinite power, which they ſay is tranſlated frõ Chriſt vnto him, what do they eſſe but make Chriſt a ſtinking, and with the Epicures an idle God, who hath as it were reſigned al his right & authority to the Pope. What a man they make our Sauour Chriſt who knoweth not, when they hold, & with fire & ſagot perſecute thoſe that will not hold the ſame, that his body is multipreſent, that is, preſent in many or rather infinite places at once, and that diſcontinued; for they ſay that it being in heauen is alſo preſent really and corporally vpon the earth, whereſoeuer their Maſſe is celebrated or their hoſte reſerued, howſoeuer it is not in the ſpace betwixt heauen and earth, nor in thoſe places where the hoſt is not (which is to aſſigne many or rather innumerable bodies to our Sauour Chriſt). And further that his very body, which they ſay is really preſent in the Maſſe, is void of quantity & qualitie, *diſſipatus eſt ab alijs* not circũſcribed, not viſible, nor any way ſenſible; & conſequently, no body. The which in effect is as much as to denie that Chriſt is come in the fleſh, which is the doctrine of that Antichriſt whercof *John* ſpeaketh. And here by the way note the abſurditie of Pa- *1. John. 4. 3.* piſts, who circũſcribe the deity of the father whiles they re- *1. John. 4.* ſemble the ſame by pictures or images, and denie the huma-
nitie

nitie of the sonne to be circumscribed: & consequently against all reason make the deitie finit, and the humanitie infinit. The office of Christ is his mediation. Now what a mediatur they make him you may easily iudge, whē they ioine infinit others with him. For the Apostle saith, that there is but one mediator betwixt God and man, and this one alone our Sauour Christ is, or else he is none at all.

1. Tim. 2. 5.

8. Again, Christ may be denied directly & expressly: & that may be done either secretly & in private, or else openly & in publick profession. After the latter sort Antichrist was not to denie our Sauour Christ: because he was to be an hypocrite & a disguised enemy as hath bene proued. Neither was it necessary that he should deny Christ expressly & directly, & yet this alway bee proued of diuerse Popes. Who howsoever they professed publicly that Iesus is Christ (which is all that our aduersaries alledge in this case, and yet that all is nothing, for the Diuels theselues haue publicly professed Iesus to be Christ) yet privately and among their fauourers they haue denied Christ, & not that onely, but haue shewed theselues also to haue bene meere Atheists, & diuels incarnat. For to omit *Iohn* the 22. who denied the immortality of the soule, & of some is called the 23. of others 24. were not *Alexander* the 6. & *Sixtus* the fourth, *Iulius* 2. and *Paulus* 3. besides diuers others, very Atheists? were not more then twenty of them knowne Necromancers and forcerers: not to speake of them which were not knowne, which renouncing Christ our Sauour, betooke theselues to the Diuel. As namely *Siluester* 2. *Benedict* 9. *Gregory* 5. & *Gregory* the 7. who also in a rage cast the Eucharist, that is according to their opinion the very body of Christ into the fire, because it did not answer to his questions when as he consulted there-with. And what may we thinke of *Clement* the seauenth who, when he was at deaths doore, said he should now be certified of three things wherof he had doubted all his life, viz. whether there be a God, whether the soule be immortall, and whether there be a life after this life. Or of *Iulius* the 3. who being forbidden by the Physicians the vse of Porke, commaunded his porke to be set before him, *Al dispete di Dio, In despeto of God?*

God? As for Pope *Leo* the 10. hee did plainly enough denie Christ when as more then once he called the Gospell, the fable of Christ. For whē he had receiued an incredible summe of money for indulgences, he said to Bembus, *O quantum nobis profuit illa de Christo fabula! O how much that fable of Christ hath profited vs!* And another time when Bembus alledged for his comfort a testimonie out of the Gospell, he answered: *Quid mihi narras fabulam illā de Christo? What dost thou tell me of that fable of Christ?* If therefore this bee a property of Antichrist to denie Christ, then it cannot be auoided but that according to our aduersaries owne groundes, the Pope who so many waies denieth Christ, is Antichrist. And so much of his opposition to the Prophecie of Christ. For of the other three doctrines which the Papistes assigne to Antichrist, we are to intreat when wee come to answer the obiections of the Papists.

Ex. Sibrand.
Lull. de pop.
Rom. 1. 10. c. 13

See booke 2.
chap. 14.

9. To the Priesthood of Christ our only priest and mediator, who according to the Scriptures with the oblation of himselfe once made hath perfectly redeemed vs, are opposed. 1. Their priesthood, whereby Christ is daily offred and his sacrifice repeated in their abominable sacrifice of the Masse propitiatory as they say both for the quicke and the dead: 2. Their owne satisfactions as prices of sinne opposed to the satisfaction of Christ: 3. Their adioyning vnto Christ other intercessours and mediators, by whose not onely intercession they hope to be heard, but also merites, hope to be saued. Of *Gregory* they say thus in their prayers,

Heb. 10. 11. 14

Hic nos saluet à peccatis,
vt in coelo cum beatis
possimus quiescere.

That is, *Let him saue vs from our sinnes, that in heauen wee may rest with the blessed.* Of *Thomas Becket* th'archbishop of Canterbury, because he died in the Popes quarrell, which like a rebell he maintained against his soueraigne king *Henry* the second, they say full deuoutly,

Tu per Thomæ sanguinem, quem pro te impendit,
Fac nos Christe scandere quod Thomas ascendit.

That is, *By the blood of Thomas, which he for thee did spend,
Make vs Christ to comewhether Thomas did ascend.*

Ex. Regm. Bre-
uiar.

Of Peter and Paule, Concedere amboū meritis atque
tis gloriam consequimur. Graunt that by the merites of them
both we may obtaine eternall glory. To Mary the blessed vir-
gin whom they idolatrously call our Ladie and the Queene of
heauen, they pray thus, *O unica spes miserorum, libera nos
ab omni malo, O thou that art the onely hope of them that are
in miserie, deliuer vs from all euill.* And elsewhere they call
her, *Desperatorum spes unicum, peccatorum saluatricem.*
The onely hope of them which are in despaire, and the Saviour
of sinners. Again, *Mediatric Dei & hominum, salus & spes
in te sperantium, O thou the mediator betwixt God and men,
the saluation and hope of them that hope in thee.* And some-
where it is said:

*O regina poli, mater gratissima proli
Speruere me noli, me commendo tibi soli.*

*O Queene of heauen, mother most deare to thy sonne, do not
thou despise me, vnto thee alone I comend me.* And againe:

In missali Pa-
ristenſi.

*Cum nulla spes sit altera
nisi tu virgo puerpera
patris parens & filia
cui me reconcilia,*

Seeing there is no other hope, besides thee O virgin mother,
the mother and daughter of thy father, to whom I pray thee re-
concile me. And to conclude (for innumerable such speeches
might be produced,) they say;

Ibid.

*O felix puerpera
nostra pians seclera
iure matris impera
redemptori.*

O happy mother which dost purge away our sins, by thy mother-
ly authority commaunde our redeemer. So that sometimes they
doe ioyne vnto our Saviour Christ other mediators not onely
of intercession, but also of redemption, (which indeede is pre-
supposed in the former) sometimes also they exclude our Savi-
our Christ, when as they say that Mary purgeth away the sins

of

Innocent, in o-
rat. in laudem
virginis.

of all the faithfull, and that she and no other is the onely hope
of them that are in misery and despaire. And not to speake of
their blasphemous psalter, wherein they turne that which is
spoken in the Psalmes either of God or Christ, to the virgin
Mary: some of them say, that whereas the kingdome of Christ
consisteth in two things, iustice and mercie; Christ reserueth
iustice vnto himselfe, & mercie he hath giuen vp to his mother.
And therefore one saith, *A foro iustitie Dei appellandum est ad* Bernardinus
forum misericordie matris eius. From the court of Gods iustice, in Marias.
we must appeale to the court of his mothers mercy.

To As touching the kingdome of Christ, what doth not
the Pope oppugne in it? The realme and kingdome of Christ
is his church which he ruleth by his spirit inwardly, and out-
wardly by his word, which is both his scepter and his lawe,
and also by such officers and ministers as hee hath ordained
both in the church and common wealth. The church and peo-
ple of God this sonne of perdition seeketh to destroy. First by
killing the bodies of the true seruants of Christ that refuse his
marke, in respect whereof hee may most worthilie be called
an *anathema* or *abaddon* that is, a destroyer, & his church the whore
of Babylon, which is drunke with the bloud of Saints and of
the Martyrs of Iesus, as shall be shewen in the second booke
and seventh chapter. And as hee killeth the bodies of those
that will not receiue his marke, so hee murdereth the soules of
them that submit theselues vnto him, poysoning them with his
damnable errors and making them drunke with the wine of
his fornications, after which they shall drinke of the cuppe of
Gods wrath. Now in making hauocke of mens soules he ta-
keth such liberty vnto him, as that if he should draw with him
innumerable soules into hell, yet no man may lay vnto him
Domine cur ita facis? Syr, why do you so? And in the Canon, *Si*
papa dist. 40. it is sayd, *If the Pope do cary with him innumera-*
ble peoples by trouper into hell, no man in this world may presume
to reprove his fault, because he is to iudge all, and to be iudged of
none, vntlesse he be found to erre from the faith, which the Pope
as he is Pope cannot doe. Hereunto Bellarmine answereth
that the words of this Canon bee not the words of any Pope.
but

Apoc. 9.

Apoc. 14. 9.

Gloss. iur. can.

Oppert. pag. 183.

num. 12.

Lib. 3. de post.
Rom. cap. 21.

1. Tim. 2.

2. King. 6.

but of Boniface the Archbishop of Mentz. Yea, but say I, the Pope hath so approued this speeche being deliuered by another, as that hee hath canonized it, and appointed it for one of the canons of his law. Which is more then if it had bin spoken by himselfe. But *Bellarmin* replyeth; If this sentence of *Boniface* be not true, why do you obiekt it; if it be true, why do you not receiue it? I answer, because it being not onely false, but blasphemous also and Antichristian, is notwithstanding by the Pope authorized for a Canon in his lawe. Moreover, one of the chiefe works of Gods spirit the spirit of adoption, which is speciall faith, apprehending the righteousness of Christ to our iustification, hee labourerth to extinguish in the hearts of men, calling it presumption: acknowledging no other faith but such as is common to the diuells (which consisteth onely of knowledge and assent), and yet not requiring that in the lay people whome vnder the name of implicite faith, hee nuzleth in palpable ignorance, and leadeth them beeing blind, as *Elizab* did the Aramites, euen whether it pleaseth him. The pure wheat of Gods word hee suppresseth and keepeth from the people in an vnknowne tongue, and seedeth them with the mast of their Legends and festiualls and lyes (I should haue sayd liues) of Saints. The lawes of Christ he partly dispenseth with, and partly abrogateth, making them of none effect by his owne constitutions and traditions. In the church, in steede of the offices and functions ordayned by Christ, hee hath created a new priesthoode, erected an hierarchy, consecrated orders and religions of his owne. In the common wealth hee absolueeth the people from their obedience to their princes if they shal displease him. And it is a principle among them, that it is lawfull for him to depose Emperours and Kings, and to absolue their swoine subiects from fidelity and allegiance towards them. And thus you see how the Pope opposeth himselfe to the prophecy, priesthoode and kingdome of Christ. Whereunto I might adde how he is opposed to these offices of Christ, not onely in these respects allreadie mentioned, but as an *amulus*, as an apurophez, an antipriest, and a counterking seeking in his Antichristian pride to match

our

our Sauour Christ in all those offices: but hereof I shall haue occasion to speake in the next chapter. Now to the benefites of Christ he is opposite, as he is an enemy to the grace of gods: as hee taketh away Christian liberty, and taketh vpon him to make new lawes, to binde the conscience: as he abridgeth the merites of Christ, and ascribeth the merite of saluation not onelie to our owne works prescribed of God, but also to such as haue beene in superstition, will worship, and idolatrie, deuised by themselves: as he teacheth men to seek saluation elsewhere then in Christ. All which oppositions of the Pope to Christ, whosoeuer shall duely consider, hee will not seeke further for Antichrist.

Chap. 5.

Of the pride and ambition of Antichrist, aduancing himselfe above all that is called God, &c.

I.



Ve Antichrist is not onely *hostis* an enemy to Christ, but also (as our aduersaries confesse), *amulus* Christ, that is, such an aduersarie as is opposed vnto Christ in emulation of like honour, as the word *Antichrist* doth also signifie. It remaineth therefore that wee should speake of the pride and ambition of Antichrist, whereby hee seeking to match Christ our Sauour, aduanceth himselfe as the Apostle speaketh *Above all that is called God, or that is worshipped, insomuch that hee sitteth in the temple of God, as God, shewing himselfe that hee is God*, or as the Papists themselves reade, *as though hee were God*. Where (for auoiding of error) we are to vnderstand the pride of Antichrist to be described such as is incident to a wretched man,

1. The 2. 4.

Vulgar edit.
Rhem.

E. 14.

a man of sin, a sonne of perdition. And the greatest pride that is incident not onely to any man, but to any creature, be it the diuell himselfe (whose *Satanicall* pride Antichrist was to imitate and not to exceed) is this, to seeke to be as God. When as therefore it is said that Antichrist aduanceth himselfe aboue all that is called God, or that is worshipped, it is not meant that hee shall seeke to aduance himselfe, aboue God or the deitie it selfe: For God being infinite in goodnesse, excellencie and power, there cannot bee conceived a better, a superiour, a greater. And therefore wee cannot imagine how Antichrist should aduance himselfe aboue God: And it is euident that the height of Antichrists pride heere spoken of, is noted in these words, *Insomuch as he shall sit in the temple of God, as God*. By all therefore that is called God, we are to vnderstand all those to whom the name of God is communicated: not essence, for that cannot be communicated to any that is not god. Now the name of God is communicated to Angells in heauen, *Psal. 8. 5. cum Heb. 2. 7. & Psal. 97. 7. cum Heb. 1. 6.* and to princes and magistrates on earth, *Exod. 22. 28. Psal. 82. 1. 6.* And where as it is said that hee shall aduance himselfe aboue all that is worshipped, wee are to vnderstand by the word *sicque* not God himselfe, but any thing that is worshipped as God, or wherein God is worshipped. So *Wisd. 15. 17.* images, and *Act. 17. 23.* altars among the heathen are called *idola*. Such in the church of Rome, are Saints, images, the crosse and reliques of Saints, the eucharist, &c. The meaning then of the Apostle is this, that Antichrist being a wicked and wretched man, shall aduance himselfe aboue all that is called God, as Angells and Kings, or that which is worshipped, as Saints and images and altars, the crosse and eucharist it selfe, insomuch that he shall sit in the temple of God as God, that is, hee shall rule & raigne in the church of God, challenging a soueraigne, vniuersall and diuine authority ouer all those that profess the name of Christ, as if he were a God vpon earth, shewing himselfe whether by words or by deeds that he is god, or which is all one, behauing himselfe *sicque* *sic Deus*, As though he were God. The like things were foretold of *Antichristus Epiphaneus*, who is thought

to

to haue bene a type of Antichrist. *Dan. 11. 36.* But (to come to the application of this propheticie) if *Antiochus* were comparable to the Pope in aduancing himselfe aboue all that is called God: or if I shal not proue out of their owne (I meane popish) writings, that he hath lifted vp himselfe in such manner as is scarcely credible to be incident vnto a mortall mā; then let not the Pope be deemed Antichrist, but rather looke for some other, who shall goe beyond him in Antichristian insolency and *Satanicall* pride.

2. From this place therefore of th'apostle, I argue thus: *For hee soener aduanceth himselfe aboue all that is called God or that is worshipped, insomuch that he sitteth in the temple of God, as God, taking vpon him as though he were a God, he according to the testimony of th'apostle, is antichrist, that is, Amulius Christi*, such an enemy as in a kinde of emulation seeketh to match Christ and to be equall to him, *But the Pope of Rome (as shall be proued) aduanceth himselfe aboue all that is called God, or that is worshipped, insomuch that hee sitteth in the temple of God as God, taking vpon him as though he were a God vpon earth, therefore according to this testimony of th'apostle the Pope is Antichrist*. And first that the Pope aduanceth himselfe aboue all that is called God, it is plaine, because he listeth vp himselfe not onely ouer Kings and Emperours on earth, but also aboue the Angels in heauen. Of his lifting vp himselfe aboue Kings & Emperours is the testimony before alledged 2. *Theff. 2. 4. Papa superior* especially to bee vnderstood. For he speaketh of such an aduancement whereby Antichrist should be reuealed, as was to be hindered for a time by the Romane Empire. Let vs then consider how he aduanceth himselfe aboue Kings and Emperours who are called Gods. The Pope if you will beleue him & his followers, is the King of Kings and Lord of Lordes, by whom Princes raigne, and from whom the right of Kings dependeth. For you must know that as they full solemnly dispute, the Empire or temporall rule, as well as the priesthood or ecclesiasticall dominio is translated vnto the successours of Peter: *tum censetur* that Papa, requisa

K

num. 39. c. solita, extr. de maior. & obed. & c. per venerabil' opt. qui filij sunt legimini. Antiochia de Rosidus, 2 Lib. sacre, 1 Clem. 5. in cōcil. vienn. 1 R. Cuperi pag. 235. n. 62.

Rex venit ante fores, iurans prius vrbis honores;
Post homo fit Papa, sumit quo dante coronam.

That is, *The King of the Romans commeth before the gates, swearing first to the honours & privileges of the citie, afterward he becommeth the Popes man, of whose gift he receiveth the imperiall crowne.*

4. And thus hath the Pope lifted vp himselfe aboute al that is called God vpon earth, that is to say, Kings & Emperours: let vs now consider whether he exalteth himselfe aboute those which are called Gods in heauen, that is to say, the Angels. First, in generall it is auouched by himselfe & his approued writers, *that the power of the Pope is greater then all other created power.*

* Antonin. sum.
part. 3. tit. 22.
c. 5.

* *Potestas Papam maior est omni alia potestate creatura.* That vnto him is giuen all power aboue all powers as wel of heauen as of the earth. *Quis totum docet nihil excludit, Hec that saith all excludeth nothing:* that to the vicar of the creatour, that is the

* Concil. Later.
10. sess. 10.

Pope, every creature is subiect: and more particularly, that he hath *vicariatum Christi*, Chrestes vicarship, not onely about things in heauē, in earth, in hel, but also about the Angels both good & bad: * *Pontificem Romanū habere imperium in angelos ac demones, That the Pope hath rule ouer the Angels and Devils.*

* Nicolaus Eg.
mildanus apud
Bat. de vit. pōr.

That he hath power to command the Angels, for so they say, * *Papa Angelis habet imperare, & Papa angelis precipit.* And according to these testimonies which auouch his right, is the Popes practise. For not onely he challengeth greater honour & reuerence to be done to himselfe then is due to the angels (for he admitteth of adorations & fallings downe before him, which the angels refuse because they are our fellow seruants): but also he taketh vpon him to commaund the holy Angels at his pleasure to remoue soules departed out of purgatory into heauen. *Clement the 6.* in his bull concerning those which

* Gregor. Hæ.
imburg. in ap-
pellat. Sigism.
apud Iuellū.

should come to Rome to celebrate the Iubile, he commaundeth the Angels of heauen, that if any of the should die in that journey, to bring their soules being wholly freed from Purgatory into the glory of Paradise. His words be these: *Propter mandatum angelis paradisi, quatenus animas a purgatorio penitus absoluant, in paradisi gloriam introducant.*

* Canonensis,

5. It remaineth that I should shew how the Pope aduanceth himselfe aboute the *obsequia*, that is the thinges wherein God is worshipped, or which are worshipped as God in the church of Rome, as namely the Saints, the crosse, the altar, and their God of bread. As for the Saints they are subiect to the Pope *quoad canonizationem*, standing at the cutesse and free disposition of the Pope whether to bee deified that is as they speake to bee canonized, or to be depofed. For such is his authority (if you will beleue him) in canonizing of Saints, that hee can canonize whom he will, yea of a damned person cast into hell he can make a saint in heauen, and contrariwise hee can vsnaint those which before were canonized. The crosse which they say is to bee worshipped with diuine worshipping, is notwithstanding made an ensigne of the Popes authoritie, and is borne before him as the mace before the magistrate, or the sword before the prince, & when their procession is at an end it is laid vnder his feet. And that he may be knowne even literally so to sitte in the material temple as if he were a God, it is to be noted that his seat in the church is aboue the altar, But their chiefe *idol* is their God of bread, which because they imagine it to be Christ himselfe it is worshipped among them as their maker and redeemer, notwithstanding in the Popes processions and journeyes it is made an attendaunt on his holinesse. For I shall not neede to tell you now which you heard before, how Pope *Hildebrand*, when it did not answere his demands as being not vsed to speake, did cast it into the fire. It is worthy to bee remembered which is reported by *Ioannes Monlucius* the Bishop of Valence, who was the french kings Embassadour at Rome, & testified by others, that when the Pope is to trauell abroad, three or foure dayes before, hee sendeth the Eucharist (that is Christ their maker) on horseback accompanied with muletores and horsekeepers, and courtifants and cookes with sumpterhorses and all the baggage of his court. Afterwards the Pope who professeth himselfe his vicar followeth, attended with Cardinals, Primates, Bishops, and Potentates. And when he commeth neere to the place whither he trauelleth, their Christ is brought to meeete him on the

Antonin. part.
3. tit. 22. cap. 5.

* *Tholus Mat.*
pit. in tract. de
canoniz. sanct.

3. dub.

Antoninus part
3. tit. 22. c. 5.

* *Gregorius per.*
orationem sua

a pana inferni
quæ infinita est
absoluit.

Lib de religio-
ne ad Reginam
matrem.

Fulmen brut.
pag. 12. & 131.

way that it may be caried before him into the towne. But with what difference of honour is hee and his attendant caried in such solemne processions? The Pope either rideth on a goodly white horse vnder a stately canopie, or else is caried aloft vpon noble mens shoulders in a chaire of golde, when the Christ of the Papists, the Popes attendaunt is caried vpon a simple hackney in comparison with no such magnificence: & yet that hackney is the Popes vicar appointed in his stead to carie the *Monstrance*. In a word, he is *supremus nomen in terris* the chiefe or supreme *supra* that is to be worshipped on earth.

6 But let vs come to the height of Antichrists pride, for it is not sufficient for the Pope to be lifted vp aboute all that is called God, or that is worshipped, vnlesse he take vpon him as if he were God, and seeke to match himselfe with Christ, as the

richrists pride may also be applied, which is described in these words, *inasmuch that her sister in the temple of God as God, behauing himselfe as if he were god, or (which is all one) shewing himselfe that he is god.* For of his followers and flatterers hee is said to be all and aboue all, the cause of causes, and the first

cause. *Bald. in c. ecclesia vi lite pendente*, that hee is *nomen quoddam, visibilem quendam Deum prae se ferens*, a certaine diuine maletly shewing himselfe to be a certaine visible God. Agreable to the prophecy 2. *Thess. 2. 4. uisibilis factus*, that is as *Reza* translateth *prae se ferens*, *hebr. moreh i faciens se apparere* of some he is called *terrenus Deus* or *Deus in terris*, a God vpon earth. In the council of Laterane it was said to him, & he heard it willingly. *In es alter Deus in terris, thou art another God vpon earth*: in honour of that hellhound *Satan* the 4. it was written, and presented to his view, that he is worthilie be-
lieued to be a God vpon earth,

Oraculo vocis mundi moderatis habenas,

Et merito in terris credentis esse Deus.

By the oracle of thy voice thou governeest the world, and worthily art thou beleued to be a god vpon earth.

The Canonists call him, Our Lord God the Pope. For so it is written not onely in diuerse old editions, but also in that

new

newe edition which by the authority of Pope Gregory 13. was corrected and published, *Credere dominum Deum nostrum Papam, conlitorum dicta decretalis & istius pō se potuisse statuerē praei statuit, haereticum censurā: ut beleue that our Lord God the Pope the author of this, and the aforesaid decretal, could not decree as he hath decreed, it ought to be iudged hereticall.* And as they willingly heare themselves called God (and not onelie themselves heare or reade it, but by their authoritie appoint the same to be published vnto the world) so they are content to bee worshipped and adored as God. Neither was the complaint of *Frederic* the second vnto;

Pontifices Romanos affectare dominationem & diuinitatem, at- que ut ab hominibus haud aliter, imō, magis quam Deus time- amur. That the Popes of Rome affect Lordshippe, and diuinity, and that they may bee feared of men no other wise, yea more then God. *Franciscus Zabarella* a Cardinall of Rome saith,

The Popes haue bene made to beleue (such is their pride) that they can doe all things what they list, euen vnlawfull things, with it they are *plusquam Deus*, more then God. These are more then sufficient to proue that the Pope taketh vpō him as if he were a God; although he should not in word affirme any such thing of himselfe. But so shamelesse is this Antichrist,

that he affirmeth the like things of himselfe, As namely that those things which he doth, be done by a diuine power: and the reason is giuen by his Lawyers, because the Pope *canonicallie elected*, is a God vpon earth. Whereupon *Innocentius*, 3. vseth these words, *ut nostrum prodeat de Deo vultu iudicium* that our iudgement may proceed from the face of god: That *Peter* & con- sequently his successor the Pope (for to that purpose it is allea- ged) is assured into the felowship of the vniuersall vnty. And in

one place he not only affirmeth, but by testimony also confir- meth that he is God. *Satis euidenter* (saith he) *ostenditur, a secula- ri potestate nec ligari prorsus, nec solui posse pontificē, quē constat a pio principe Constantino Deū appellari. nec posse Deū ab homi- nibus indicari manifestū est.* When the Pope proueth he cannot be iudged by any secular power, by this realō. God cannot be iudged of me. The Pope is god, therefore the pope may not be iudged of me.

K4

The as.

Stayton in
epist. dea cat.
ante princip.
doli in.

* In ecclesia
ut lite pendet.
& in Concl.
Lateran. sub
Julio. Bald. in
L. bar. de off.
priet.

* Gomefius de
regul. cancell.
Decius c. 1.
de constitutio-
nib. Cardill.
pro concil.
trident. Bald.
Cod. sentent.
rescindendi. l.
vlt. & de elec-
tione. Felin. c.
ego. N. de iure.

* Christoph.
Martell. in
conc. Lateran.

sess. 4.
In arcetri-
umph.
Impress. Lug-
dun. 1555

In Epist. ad
Otho. Bazar.
duc. apud A-
uentin. lib. 7.

Apud Iuellam.

Gregor. 9. de
translat. epist.
c. quanto. &
inter corpora-
lia
ut ecclis. bene-
fic. c. ut noli. 2.
Capistran. fol.
23.
Bonifac. in 8.
de cleri.

c. fundamen-
ti in sexto.
dissint. 96. c.
satis euiden-
ter.

Lib. 7. Eber-
hardus Ep.
fol. 40. genfii.

assumption he approoveth by the forged testimonie of *Constantine*. And therefore not unworthily by a worthy Bishoppe in *Aueninus*, the Pope is said to be Antichrist, in whose forehead this name of blasphemy is written: *Deus sum, errare non possum. I am God, I cannot erre.*

7 But as I said, the name *Antichrist* signifieth such a one as seeketh to match Christ. Let vs therefore farther consider how this agreeth to the Pope. For if the Pope doe seeke to match himselfe with Christ, then by this argument alone if there were no more, hee may be certainly conuined to bee Antichrist. In Christ wee consider his natures and his offices. As touching his nature the Pope if you will beleue their blasphemies, *aque ac Christus Deus est, eius secunda intentionis compositum ex Deo & homine. As well as Christ he is god, abeing of the second intention compounded of god and man.* And in respect of the one nature is greater then man, and in regard of the other lesse then God, so they say of the Pope, *Est quasi deus in terris, maior homine, & minor Deo, plenitudinem obtinens potestatis. He is as it were a god upon earth, greater then a man, and lesse then god, having the fulnesse of power.* That he is a man I shall not neede to proue, howbeit some of his followers cannot well tell what to make of him. They say hee is the wonderment of the world, neither God nor man, but a neuter betwixt both. That hee would bee supposed and acknowledged as a God, besides all the allegations in the former section, it appeareth also by the diuine properties which are attributed to the Pope. His holinesse (that is to say) the Pope, (for his holinesse is himselfe,) is *Deus vindictæ* the god of reuenge, true without error, yea without possibilitie of erring, for hee cannot erre, whose will must stande for reason as if it were the rule of iustice. For euen as some of his friends say he often beatech vpon that of the Satyre,

Sic voluisti inbecilli prouatione voluntas.

So I will, so I command, my will must stand for reason. And therefore it were no better then sacriledge to call in question any of his doings. For power, whether you vnderstand *potestatem*, or *potensiam*, that is authority or might, hee would seeme

to

to be infinite in respect of both, for infinite power is giuen vnto him. And if vnto Christ was giuen all power in heauen and in earth, then the Pope who is his vicar hath the same power. He forsooth is the cause of causes, of whose power none must enquire, seeing of the first cause there is no cause: yea to doubt of his power, is no better then sacriledge. *Excepto peccato potest quasi omnia facere quæ potest Deus, Sinne excepted, the Pope may doe all things as it were which God may doe.* He can change the nature of things, yea of nothing he can make something, and of vniustice righteousnesse, for hee hath the fulnesse of power.

8. If you respect his office he hath the same which Christ had while he was on the earth, howbeit there is great oddes in their outward estates. For it is not fit that the Pope should resemble Christ who now is glorified in heauen as he was contended, but as the Pastor of the whole world *supernal & beauly*, & as he shall come to be our iudge, to whom it is certain that all men of necessity must obey. For it is euident that the worke of redẽption being accomplished, the power of Christ was extended as well in heauen as in earth. *Mat. 28. All power is giuen vnto me in heauen & in earth.* Which power is translated vnto his Vicar, &c. In respect of his office therefore, he is the foundation, the head, the husband, the Lord of the vniuersal church, in vñction Christ, & is therefore to be called *Christus Domini, the Lords Christ*. Now if it be objected that Christ alone is the head of the Catholike Church and so of the rest: answer is made, that Christ and the Pope in the Church are vñ & idem caput, one and the same head, and doe make one and the same consistorie: for it were monstrous thing that the Church should haue two heads. And to the same purpose saith a Cardinal of Rome, *The iudgement of the Pope is reputed the iudgement of God, and his sentence, and his consistory, the consistory of God: and therefore Christ and the Pope are not properly two heads, but one, as Boniface the eighth declareth.* In extr. v. c. vñam sanctam. But to speake more particularly of his offices. For prophecie, hee is

L

the R. Cupers de eccl.

^b Eph. 3. 21. 22. 4. 15. 5. 23. Col. 1. 28. ^c Eph. 5. 24. 1. Ion. 3. 19. 2. Cor. 11. 2. 1. Cor. 3. 11. 12. ^d R. Cupers, de eccl. pag. 128. num. 36. ^e Idem pag. 30. num. 8. ^f J. de turrecresna, summ. de eccl. lib. 2. c. 26.

* Extr. in
10. 11. 22.

* Ius. a. Ca-
pist. de P-
pe & eccl. e
authoritate.

Vid. Eras-
mus in 1.
1. 1. 1.
Papa super
mundi.

Clem. in pro-
am. in gloss.
* Nec deus es
nec homo: quasi
neuter es inter
vnumque.

* 1. 1. 1. 1.
Rod. Cupers de
eccl. pag. 61.
num. 52.

* Sub finem
tit. de censib.
exalt. & pro-
cur in Clement.
ad verbum vo-
luntus & Abb.
Panorm.

de constitut. de
transit. episc. c.
quanto in gloss.

* Gerobus a-
pud Autentia.
lib. 5.

* Dist. 40. non
not in gloss.

* Lib. exrema.
fist. 7.
* Cupers de ec-
cl. pag. 50. num.
45. 46. 1. 1. ma-
nor. & ibid. c.
vñam sanctam
in gloss.
* Bald. eccl.
fist. 1. 1. 1. pen-
dine.
* In L. sacrile-
gij. c. de crim.
sacril.
* Panorm. ex
Hostiens. extr.
de transit.
prelat. c. quan-
to. & de eccl. li.
c. 1. 1.
* De transit.
episc. c. quato
in gloss.
* Bellarm. de
pont. Rom. l. 5.
c. 4.
* R. Cupers de
eccl. pag. 50.
num. 45. 46.
* Bellarm. de
concil. l. 1. c. 2. 1.
lib. 2. c. 31.
* Joan. de turre-
cre. sum. de ec-
cl. lib. 2. c. 27.
* R. Cupers. pag.
34. num. 1.
* Bonifac. 8. c.
quonia de im-
muni. in 6.
* Panormit.

Orat. Cornelij
episcopii
in concil. tri-
dent. sub. Pau.
to 3.
De trans. 2.
pife. c. 2. quia
in gloff.
Cyprian. pag. 125
mon. 9.
capit. fol. 13.
C. de summa tri-
niti. in f.
Decret. Greg.
l. 1. de elec. c.
12. Si o. c. 6.
in gloff. Concl.
Elicat. &
Tident.
R. Cyprian de
eccl. pag. 31.
num. 13.
Pigh. lib. 6.
c. 13.
R. Cyprian.
pag. 11. 18.
l. de turre.
crem. lib. 3.
c. 64.
l. c. 1. mon. 9.
93.
Bridan.
l. de turre.
crem. sum.
lib. 2. cap. 16.

the vniuersall or ecumenicall Bishop, and Pastor of Pastors, the Ordinary or Bishop of the whole world: Who is *dom a light into the world, but men haue loued darkenesse more then light,* who hath the supreme authority of interpreting the scriptures, who is the supreme iudge in controuersies of religion, hauing an heauenly arbitrement, and as it were a diuine and infallible iudgement, who is aboute generall counells, for although in a generall counsell the vniuersall Church is represented, in somuch that nothing is greater then the Counsell, Tamen Pa-
pa eidem omnimoda supereminet autoritate, Notwithstand-
ing the Pope surpasseth the same in all manner authority, whose iudgement is to bee preferred before the iudgements of the whole worlde, in somuch that if the whole worlde should determine against the Pope, wee must stande to his sentence, for so they say, *Pape semetis totius orbis plexo prefer-
tur:* And againe, *Si totus mundus sentiret (or as the
glosse readeth semetis) contra Papam, videtur quod sen-
sentia Papa standum esset, ut 24. q. 1. hac est fides, hac gloss.*
who is of greater authority then all the Saints, and in re-
spect thereof is of greater perfection then the whole body
of the Church besides. But it is not sufficient for this Antichrist
to preferre himselfe aboute the whole Church which is the bo-
dy of Christ, vnlesse also hee sought in respect of the prophe-
ticall office to match himselfe with Christ the head of the
church, yea and in some respects to ouermatch him.

9. He seeketh to match himselfe with Christ, 1. in ta-
king vpon him to make newe articles of Faith, and to pro-
pound doctrines not contayned in the Scriptures as necessa-
rie vnto saluation. 2. In makinge fise Sacraments more
then Christ appointed, (some whereof hee preferreth aboute
baptisme) and those two which Christ hath ordained he hath
so altered and chaunged as that the one is scarcely, the other
not at all the same. And whereas Christ ordained the Sacra-
ment of his body and blood in two kinds, they notwithstanding
his institution will haue it administered to the people but
in one kind. For so it is professed in the Counsell of Con-
stance, that although Christ administered this venerable sacra-
ment vnto his Disciples vnder both kinds of bread and wine, and
although

although in the primitive church this sacrament was receiued of
the faithfull in both kinds, notwithstanding this custome of recei-
uing the bread only was vpo good reason brought in for the auoi-
ding of some dangers and scandales. 3. In makinge their owne
deuises, decretals & traditiōs of equal authority with the word
of God, Innocentius 3. commanded that the words of the canon
of the Masse should be held equal to the words of the gospell,
Agathe the Pope decreed that all the constitutions of the See
apostolicke are to be receiued, as authorized by the diuine voice
of Peter himselfe. And in the same distinction, this is the ti-
tle or argument of one chapter, *Inter canonicas Scripturas, et
decretales epistolarum numerantur,* that is, Among the Cano-
nicall scriptures the decretall epistles are numbred. Which in
the chapter it selfe is absurdly proued out of Augustine mis-
alledged. And as touching traditions (whereby are meant
all points of popery, which as themselves confesse are not con-
tained in the written worde) the holy Council of Trent
hath ordained that they are to bee receiued, and honoured
*Pari pietatis affectu ac reuerentia, Vth ac grau affectu de Sess. 4.
pietie et reuerentia,* as the written worde of God. Which de-
crete when as a certaine Bishop misliked, Cerninus the Popes
legate (who afterwarde was Pope, called Marcellus 2.)
caused him to bee expelled out of the Counsell. And last-
ly, least he should seeme in any thing to be inferiour to Christ
our Prophet, hee confirmeth his doctrines by miracles as they
call them.

10. And thus the Pope matcheth himselfe with Christ
our Prophet: let vs now consider how he aduanceth himselfe
aboute him. Which he manifestly doth in preferring his owne
and the churches authority aboute the scriptures. And if the
church be aboute the Scriptures, then much more is he, For he
not onely virtuallyt est tota ecclesia, that is, virtuallyt the whole
church, but also his power alone exceedeth the power of all the
whole church besides. Now that the authority of the church &
much more of the Pope who is superior to the church, is aboute
the scripture, it is both generally affirmed & by some particulars
confirmed, Cardinal Cusanus entitiled his booke, *De authoritate*

ecclesia & concilij supra & contra scripturam, Of the authority of the Church & councell above & against the Scripture. Syluester Prierias master of the Popes pallace saith, That indulgences are warranted unto vs, not by the authoritie of the Scripture, but by the authoritie of the Church and Pope of Rome, which is greater. Boniface the Archbishop of Mentz saith, That all men forreuerence the Apostolicke See of Rome, that they rather desire the auncient institution of Christian religion from the Pope, then from the holy Scriptures. This saying the Pope hath so approued, that he hath caused it to be inserted into the Canon lawe. The particulars which proue the Pope to aduance himselfe about the Scriptures are these. 1. Because he hath as they say authoritie to adde to the Canonall Scriptures, other bookes that are not in the Canon. And that those which be in the Canon, haue their Canonall authority from him. In the 19. distinction c. 19. *Si Romanorum*, Pope Nicolas not onely matcheth their decretall Epistles with the holy Scriptures, but also affirmeth that the Scriptures are therefore to be receiued, because the Pope hath iudged them canonically. Another saith, *Whosoever resteth not on the doctrine of the Romane church and Bishop of Rome as the infallible rule of God, à qua sacra scriptura robur trahit & auctoritatem*, From which the sacred Scripture draweth strength and authority, hee is an Hereticke. Eekius saith, *Scriptura nisi ecclesia auctoritate non est authentica*, The Scripture is not authenticall but by the authority of the Church. For I will not tell you how some of them haue not bene ashamed to say, that the Scripture without the authoritie of the Church, is of it selfe no better worth then AEsopes fables. Pighius saith, The authority of the church is about the Scriptures, because the authoritie of the Church hath giuen the Scriptures canonically authority. Secondly, whereas the Scriptures are not the words and syllables, but the true sence and meaning thereof, They teach that the scriptures are to be vnderstood according to the interpretation of the Pope and Church of Rome: and that sence which the Pope assigneth to the Scriptures, must bee taken for the vndoubted word of God. The Pope (saith one) hath authority so to expound

Contra Lutheri conclusionem de potestate Papae.

Dist. 40. c. 1. p. 274.

Dist. 19. c. 1. Romanorum. In 19. de successione. 2. cap. 112.

Syluester Prierias contra Lutherum.

De ecclesia.

Vid. Chemnit. exam. part. 1. pag. 47.

Hervaeus de potestate Papae.

pound the scriptures, that it is not lawfull to hold or thinke the contrary, A Cardinall of Rome saith, *If any man haue the interpretation of the church of Rome concerning any place of scripture, although he neither know nor vnderstand whether and as do expresse how it agreeth with the words of the scripture, notwithstanding he dei verbo habet ipsum verbum Dei, the very word of God.* And if the sence, which they giue, be diuerse according to the variety of their practise and diuersitie of times, we must acknowledge that the scripture is to follow the church and not the church to follow the scriptures. Whereupon Cardinall Cusanus, *It is no Nicol. Cusanus maynell* (saith he) *though the practise of the church expound the scriptures at one time one way and at another time another way. For the vnderstanding or sence of the scripture runneth with the practise. And that sence so agreeing with the practise is the quickning spirit. And therefore the scriptures follow the church, but contrariwise the church followeth not the scriptures.* And this is that which one who was no small foole in Rome aouched, *The Pope saith he may change the holy gospell, and may giue to the gospell according to place and time another sence.* And to the same purpose was the speech of that blasphemous Cardinall, that if any man did not beleeue that Christ is very God and man, and the Pope thought the same, he should not bee sub Felice Pacondemned. To conclude therefore with Cardinall Cusanus, *This is the iudgement* (saith he) *of all them that thinke rightly, that sound the authoritie and vnderstanding of the scriptures dem legatos in the allowance of the church: and not contrariwise lay the foundation of the church in the authority of the scriptures.*

11 Thirdly, the Pope challengeth authority about the scriptures, when he taketh vpon him to dispense with the word and law of God, For whosoever taketh vpon him to dispense with the law of another challengeth greater authority then the others, and it is a rule among themselves, *In praecepto superioris non debet dispensare inferior*, the inferior may not dispense with the commaundement of the superiour. That the Pope doth dispense with the lawes of God it is euident. For scarcely is there any sinne forbidden there, wherewith he doth not sometimes dispense, nay whereof hee will not, if it be for

Antonin. part. 3. tit. 22. cap. 6. §. 2.

his aduantage, make a meritorious worke. Incest is an horrible sinne, forbidden by the law of God and by the lawe of nature. And yet there is no incest, excepting that which is committed betwixt the parents and the children, which hee hath not authority forsooth to dispense with: for as they say, hee may dispense against the law of nature. The Pope dispensed with *Henric* the eighth to marie his sister in law, and with *Philip* the late king of Spaine, to marry his owne niece.

15. q. 6. authoritatem in gl. ff.

Antonin. sum. 3. part. tit. 1. cap. u. §. quod Papa sum. angel. dict. Papa.

Pope *Martin* the first dispensed with a certaine brother that married his owne sister. And *Clement* the seauenth licensed *Petrus Almaratus* the Spaniard for a summe of money, to marie two sisters at once &c. Disobedience to parents, perjury that is breaking of lawfull oathes, rebellion against lawfull princes, murdering of a sacred prince, are condemned by the lawe of God as haynous offences. But if children shall cast off their parents to enter into a Sodomiticall cloister, if the Pope shall absolue the subiects from their oathes and forbidde them to obey their princes, if he shal excommunicate a lawfull prince, or suborne a wicked traytour, to murder his soueraigne: then disobedience to parents, perjury and rebellion in subiectes, murdering of sacred Princes, is not onelie a warrantable but also a meritorious acte. For as you haue heard *Papa ex iustitia potest facere iustitiam*. The Pope of sinne can make righteoulnesse. And that the Pope may thus dispense with the word of God, his canonistes and diuines doe diuersely dispute. One saith, * *Potestas in diuinas leges ordinari in Rom. in pontifice residet*. Power ouer the lawes of God remaineth ordinarily in the pope of Rome. Others say, *Papa potest dispensare contra ius diuinum*. * *Præilegium contra ius diuinum concedi potest*. The Pope may dispense, or grant a priuiledge against the law of God: that is, as another saith, hee may dispense against the law of God in particu'ar, but not in general. *Papa potest dispensare contra Apostolum*, the Pope may dispense against the Apostle. * The Pope may dispense against the new testament vpon a greate cause. * The Pope may dispense against the Epistles of *Paul*. And to put this matter out of doubt which is so doubtfullie handled by some

popish

popish writers, this question in *summa angelica* is determined, and decided, out of diuerse authors approued in the church of *Papa*. Rome, That as in the precepts of the second table the Pope cannot dispense vniuersally (for that were not to dispense with them, but wholly to abrogate the lawes themselves) but in particular cases *ubi ratio legis deficit*, where the reason of the lawe faileth: so hee may dispense with all the precepts of the old and new testament. But how shall wee know where the reason of the lawe faileth? This may partly be knowne by those examples in the scripture where God himselfe dispensed with his lawes. But where there is no example of Gods dispensation in the like case, then it appertaineth to the Pope alone to declare, when and in what particular case the reason of the lawe faileth. And I firmly beleue (saith the authour of that booke) that if any man, craving a dispensation in any case against the lawe of God, interpose not importunity of reward or suite, but simply put himselfe into the hands of the Pope by declaring his case, that God will not suffer his vicar to erre in dispensing. So that whereas the lawes and commandements of God are to bee vnderstoode with this exception onely *Nisi Deus ipse aliter voluerit, vnlesse God himselfe otherwise appoint*, because hee alone may dispense with his owne lawes: notwithstanding by the popish diuinitie they are to bee vnderstood with this exception, vnlesse the Pope otherwise appoint: that is, wee are bound to keepe euery commandement of God, vnlesse the Pope interpose his authoritie betwixt God and vs (as the tribunes of the comunity among the Romanes were wont to intercede against other magistrates) and exempt vs from the obedience thereof.

12 And as the Pope may dispense with all the lawes of God, so in the last place, hee may and doth take away some, and abrogate others. *Papa potest tollere ius diuinum ex parte non in totum*: the Pope may take away the law of God in maior, & vbi: part, but not in whole. Thus hee taketh away the second commandement out of the decalogue, because with it his Idolatrie cannot stand, and to make vp the full number of ten, he

* Michiel Alcedina, Christian. parent. lib. 7. c. 17. Gratian. p. 1. c. 1. p. 1. c. 1. q. 1. de decimis. Dist. 34. c. 1. Lect. 15. q. 6. authoritatem. * Abb. Panorm. extr. de divor. l. 1. cap. fin. * Felin. de con. firm. cap. si. aucta canonum.

diuideth the last commandment into two, against all reason and authority of antiquitie. But that commandment concerning images and diuerse others the Pope also abrogateth by his countermaunds. God forbiddeth vs either to worshippe or to serue any but himselfe. *Mat. 4. 10. 1. Sam. 7. 3. Ex. 20. 3.* The Pope commaundeth vs to worshippe Angells and Saints, yea and the reliques of Saints. God forbiddeth the making and worshipping of images, the Pope commaundeth the contrary. God condemneth stewes, the Pope alloweth them, yea one of them built a famous stewes. God condemneth concupiscence as a sinne, the Pope alloweth it for no sinne. God commaundeth all the faithfull to drinke of the cup in the Lords supper: the Pope forbiddeth the same. God commaundeth euery soule to be subiect to the higher powers: the Pope exempteth his cleargie *inigo seculari, from the secular yoke.* God commaundeth all to marry, who haue not the gift of continencie: the Pope forbiddeth all his cleargie, though neuer so incontinent, to marry. Besides, it is euident that the Popes lawes in the church of Rome are in greater estimation then the lawes of God, the obedience of them beeing more straightly vrged, and the disobedience thereof more seuerely punished, then of Gods lawes. As for example, it is more safe for a man in the church of Rome to bee a meere Atheist & a worshipper of no God, then not to bee a worshipper of their God of bread, though otherwise a good Christian: better for a priest to bee a Sodomite, then to marry: better to bee a drunkard and whore-monger then to eat flesh in Lent: better with the begging friers to set forth a new gospell (which they called the gospell of the holy ghost and the eternall gospell, wherein they taught that Christ is not God, and that his gospell is not the true gospell, and no more to be compared with their gospell then the nutshell is to be compared with the kernel) then for that learned man *Guilielmus de f. Amore* to write against them and their gospell, for him the Pope disgraced and deposed from all his dignities when he would not suffer them to be disgraced: him he sent into exile, when hee retained them in his high fauour. Yet because he had rather be Antichrist, then seeme so, he

Six. 4.
Concil. trid.
sess. 5.

Anno. 1254.
Math. Paris.
1254.
Nauiter. 1. 2.
3. 6.
Bal. in lib. de
vitis pontif. in
append.
1. Fox.

he caused the friers Gospell, when it was complained of, to be burnt, yet secretly; that his Friers might not be disgraced nor scandalized. Better for priuate men to reade any bookes of idolatry or any villany whatsoever, then to read any parte of the scriptures in their owne tongue. To these, many other particulars might be added wherein the Pope aduanceth his owne lawes aboue the commaundements of God, and his owne authority aboue the authority of the Scriptures. Let vs therefore humbly conclude according to the popish humilitie, that as the Pope is aboue the Church, so the Church is aboue the scriptures. *Humiliter confitemur* (saith a Papiſt) *ecclesia au-* *Jean. Maria*
thoritatem esse supra Euangelium: We humbly cōfesse that the *veritas apud*
authority of the church is aboue the gospell. *Lucium.*

13. To his prophetical office let vs adde his priesthood. *Amicis epistol.*
For the Pope forsooth is *Pontifex Optimus Maximus* (an epi- *dedi. ad Gre-*
dect which the Heathen giue to their chiefe God *Jupiter*) hee *80^r. 33.*
is that great Priest according to the order of *Melchisedec*, *Lib. c. c. m.*
whose foote must be reuerently kissed of his Cardinals when *sess. 11. c. 5.*
hee rideth into any citie in his *Pontificalibus*, and the Bishop
of the citie beginning this *Antheme*, *Ecce sacerdos Magnus, i. fundamenta.*
Behold the great Priest, He is the Prince of Priests, and head *de elect. in 6.*
of the Christian religion. He is that Priest of Priests, who
remitteth both fault and punishment both to quicke and dead: *Paul. 4. ad du-*
whereas Christ remitteth onely to the liuing: and (as they say) *cem Tiberenim.*
forgiue the fault but not the punishment, neither doth this *in bulla.*
indulgent father graunt pardon alone for sinnes past, but also *Stencbus. &*
for offences to come. *Sin. Regius in*
ord. in concil.

14. But I hasten to his kingly office. For hee forsooth
is the King of Kings and Lorde of Lords, the *Laon* of the *2 Lib. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1.*
tribe of Iuda, to whom all power is giuen in heauen and in *in bull. ad re-*
earth, yea and vnder the earth. For as hee hath a triple crowne, *gem & reginā*
so hee hath a triple Empire, in heauen and in earth, and (where *maire Gallie.*
Christ hath none) in purgatory. *His power is greater then all Antonin, in*
other created power, extending it selfe in some sorte vnto *um. part. 3. 11.*
things Caelestiall, terrestriall and infernall: So that of his *22. ca. 5. 5. 1. &*
power that may be verified which is said in the Psalme of Christ *5. & 6.*
Psalm. 8.

& that aptly because he is Christs vicar, Thou hast put all things under his feete. The beastes of the field, that is, men living on the earth: the fishes of the sea, that is to say, the soules in purgatory: the foules of heauen, that is to say, the Angels and the soules of the blessed. Another wrote and taught that the Pope is the Lorde of things in heauen, on the earth, and vnder the earth. In heauen, for as you haue heard he hath power ouer the Angels and Saints, and soules departed. *Papa angelis praecepit, & potestatem habet in mortuos.* The Pope commaundeth the Angels, and hath power ouer the dead. In earth, for he is, *Totius orbis Dominus* the Lord of the whole earth, hauing *caelestis & terrestis potestas* both heauenly & earthly power, obtaining the kingdome of the whole world, vnto whom forsooth belongeth that prophetic, *Domus habitabit a mari ad mare & a flumine vsq; ad terminos orbis*: He is regular, pe: shall rule from sea to sea, and from the river vnto the endes of the world: his power reacheth ouer all the faithfull principally, & secondarily also ouer the infidels: for vnder his feete, that is, vnder his iurisdiction are put the beastes of the field that is the Paganes, oxen that is Iewes and Heretickes, and Sheepe that is Christians, and it extendeth it selfe vnto all the partes of the world, not onely knowne but also vnkowne, inasmuch that the parts of the new found world are at his disposition to distribute and bestow. And that the Paganes are subiect to the Pope it appeareth, because the Pope ruleth the world in steede of Christ. But Christ hath full iurisdiction ouer every creature. Seeing therefore the Pope is Christs vicar, nomā may lawfully withdraw himselfe from his obedience, euen as none may lawfully withdraw himselfe from the obedience of God. Anton. part. 3. tit. 22. §. 8. The Deacon which inuested the Pope was wont to vse these words, I inuest thee into the Papacy, *Vt praeis urbi & orbi.* Thus thou mayst rule both the citie and the world. And likewise the Cardinal Bishop that anointeth him, vseth this forme of words, *Ego te inuigo in pontificem urbis & orbis.* Now this Empte or Monarchy which the Pope hath ouer the whole world is twofold, for hee hath the two swordes as it is stoutly proued.

proued out of the gospel, where one of Christs disciples saith, *Ecce duo gladij, behold two swordes, ciuill and Ecclesiasticall.* For as Pope Nicolas saith, *Christus beato aeterna vita clauige- ro terrent simul & caelestis imperij iura commisit.* Christ hath giuen to blessed Peter the key bearer of eternall life (and so to the Pope) the right both of the earthly and heauenly Empire. Cuill, as hath bene shewed ouer all Kings and rulers, in respect whereof hee writeth himselfe King of Kings, for all secular power is immediatly giue to the Pope: and he is aboue kings euen in temporall matters, yea hee alone is the true Lorde of temporall things. Wherefore Pope Boniface the eight, sent vnto Philip the French king and tolde him, *That he was Lord Martinus Te- both in spiriuit and also in temporall matters, throughout the worlde.* And therefore that the King should holde his kingdome at his hande, and honour and worshiipe him, *Vt dominum regni sui, as the Lorde of his Realme.* Stencheus. for otherwise to thinke and holde (hee said) it was Heresie. And as touching the Romane Empire, the gouernment thereof belongeth to the Pope, being Gods vicar on earth: as vnto him by whom kings doe raigne. And surely whosoener denieth the temporall swordes to be in the power of Peter, doth full ill attende to the worde of the Lorde, saying vnto him, *Put up thy sword into the sheath.* And did not the Lorde I beseech you (as some of the Popes fauourits full solenely dispute) commaund Peter Luk. 5. 4. to launch into the deepe, that he might signifie the height of power in Peter. And againe, *Why did the Lorde sende Peter onely to the Sea to fishe with an angle or hook, but that he would insinuate that he intended to see Peter oner the whole surging Sea of this tempestuous worlde? and why doth he commaunde him to fishe with an iron hook, but that he was disposed to commit violence vnto him the swordes both of the spiriuit and temporall Empire?* *Statis &c.* Hereunto wee may adde that worthy dispute of Antoninus Archbishop of Florence, part. 3. tit. 22. cap. 5. §. 17. *That the Pope being the vicar of Iesus Christ in the whole world, hath, in deede, the place of the living God, the vniuersal iurisdiction both of spiriuit in sum. & of all & temporal things.* But the immediat administration of temporal

things he receiveth not unlesse in the regior of the Westerne Empire by reason of the graunt made to the church by Constantine. Now, that he useth not the temporal administratiō in other countries, but only in the parts of Italy &c. this is not for want of authority, but that hee would nourish in his sonnes the band of peace and unity. For since the Empire was diuided, and of diuerse in diuerse partes diuersly and tyrannically vsurped, the Church to auoid the scandal of the Lawes hath made her selfe tributarie with Peter &c. And as touching those which say the Pope hath dominion ouer the whole world, not in temporall matters but in spirituall ones, they are like the counsellors of the king of Syria, who said 1. King. 20. their goddes are goddes of the mountains, that is of spirituall goods, but they are not goddes of the valleys, because they haue not the dominion of temporall goods. And in the same place he addeeth; That from the

Th. Aquin. in 2. sent. in fine. Antonin. part. 3. lib. 22. cap. 6. §. 6. 1. de iur. crim. in sum. de eccl. lib. 2. cap. 80.

Dist. 11. c. no. l. e. errare.

1. de iur. crim. lib. 1. c. 1.

Amic. epist. dedic. ad Greg. 13. prefat. Cnistr.

1. D. 40. c. si consistorium with God, & iudgement seat with Christ. For so they

Papa, et R. C. write: *Idem tribunal Christi & Papa iudicabit: Inter Papam &*

Ioan. Andreas

in e. quanto de translat. Panorm. c. licet. de elect.

& R. Cuperi. pag. 29. p. 16. & 42. n. 14.

sentence of all Kings and Princes men may appeale to the Pope. As touching his ecclesiasticall authoritie which (as some say) is the foundation of the Church, hee is superiour and greater then all the residue of the vniuersall Church, and this is proued by seuen arguments, 1. Because hee is the Pastor of the vniuersall Church, 2. Because hee is the head of the vniuersall Church, 3. Because hee is that prelate which hath authority ouer the whole Church, 4. Because hee is the prince of the vniuersall church, 5. Because hee hath supreme power in the Church, 6. Because hee alone hath fullnesse of power in the Church, 7. Because hee is Christs vicar generall in the whole vniuersall Church, For in the Apostolicke See the Lord hath placed the principall of the whole Church, and therefore worthily is he called *Ecclesia princeps ac rex regū totius*, The prince of the church & king of the kings of the earth, yea *Princeps optimus maximus*. Of whō the saluatiō of the church vniuersall after Gods dependeth. He is the head, the roote, the Monarch, the fountaine of ecclesiasticall power, hauing the same

Deum unum & idem sit tribunal, unumque & idem consistorium. Hee maketh lawes which bind the conscience and that with guilt of mortall sinne, he is the liuing lawe, yea he hath all lawes in the closet of his breast, and hee can dispose about lawe and retaineth the fulnes of power so as hee needeth no addition, he alone hath the fullnesse of power, as beeing the prince of the churches lawes. And euen as the first mooner governeth the church triumphant, so doth the Pope rule the church militant. For seeing in the church triumphant there is one soveraigne prince to whose obedience that whole church is most perfectly subiect, that is to say, God: it followeth necessarily that one soveraigne prince ruleth ouer the whole militant church, that is to say the Pope, whose comandments all are bound to obey. And thus much of the Popes power, in heauen and in earth, in respect whereof it is saide that the iurisdiction and care of the whole world is committed to the Pope, not onely as by the name of the world is imported the earth, but also as by the name of the world is imported heauen, because hee hath receiued iurisdiction ouer heauen and earth.

16 There remaineth the third part of his kingdome which hee hath in purgatorie. For as one of their approved authours saith, *Purgatorium est peculium Papa*, Purgatorie is the Popes peculium, where, as also in hell hee hath so great authority, as that by his indulgences he is able to deliuer thence so many soules as it pleaseth him, and to place them in heauen and in the seats of the blessed. In so much as this is become a probleme in the church of Rome, whether the Pope may empty all purgatorie wholly and at once, and by Antoninus the Archbishoppe of Florence it receiue this determination vnder a threefold distinction, namelie, that in respect of his absolute iurisdiction the Pope may by communicating his indulgences absolve all that are in purgatory from that paine, and so make a gaole deliery. For seeing Gregory the Pope by his prayer absolved Traian from the paines of hell which is infinite, therefore much more may the Pope by communication of indulgences absolve all that are in purgatorie from that punishment which is but finite. And forasmuch as Christ may take away all paine, therefore the Pope

R. Cuperi. pag. 62. n. 66. de constitut. c. licet in sexto.

R. Cuperi. pag. 29. n. 1. 1. de iur. crim. lib. 3. c. 1.

R. Cuperi. lib. 2. c. 1.

Clement. lib. 5. de hereticis. c. ad nossum in gloss.

Antonin. sum. part. 3. lib. 2. c. 1.

Angelus Caris. scifi.

Psalm brut. ex. bulla Clement. 6.

Antonin. part. 3. lib. 2. cap. 5. §. 6. & 7.

also.

also who is his vicar may. This the Pope may doe in respect of his absolute power. But if you regard the orderlie execution thereof, in that respect the Pope may not nor ought so to doe. Neither in deede is hee pleased to let out any from the paines of purgatorie vnlesse he bee well pleased for his indulgences and pardons. Howbeit I must needs confesse, it was a cheape yeare of soules when *Leo* the tenth sent *Torelius* about with his pardons, offering to euerie one for the payment of ten shillings (but not a penny vnder) to sette at libertie the soule of any one which they should name in purgatory And lastly if you respect Gods acceptation, that is, whether God would take it well that the Pope should release all that bee in purgatory at once, or not, *Anonimus* answereth, he cannot tell. And to conclude this kingly office of the pope with that venerable acclamation of the reuerend fathers in the counsell of Laterane, Thou art all a: d about all, * to thee all power is giuen in heauen and in earth. And againe, * In the pope is all power above all powers in heauen and in earth. And thus it appeareth evidently that the Pope is Antichrist, not onely because he is *animus*, that is an aduersary opposed vnto Christ, as was proued in the former chapter, but also because he is *emulus* and as it were a counterchrist, who seeking to match out Saujour Christ, aduanceth himselfe above all that is called God, or that is worshipped, insomuch that he sitteth in the temple of God as god, shewing and demeaning himselfe as though he were a God vpon earth.

Gal. in vita
L. c. 10. &
1. Ex.

* Seff. 10. in
orat. Scepbi, Pa-
tracensis.

Chap. 6.

Of other vices or sinnes of Antichrist.

1. **N**ow are wee to intreate of other vices and sinnes of Antichrist. For albeit by the application of the two former noates concerning the opposition of Antichrist vnto Christ, and his incredible ambition in aduancing himselfe above all that is called God,

God, it plainly appeareth that the Pope of Rome meriteth to be called by that peculiar title of Antichrist the man of sin, 2. Thess. 2. 3. 4. because those two notes wherein the Apostle insisteth as sufficient proofes thereof, doe most properly agree vnto him: notwithstanding, many other notorious finnes of the Popes may be produced for the further euidence of this truth. Of which sins some are common to very many of them, and some are common to them all. For howsoever the crimes and enormities of such deepe dissemblers, as these Antichristian Popes haue beene, were many times either not commonly knowne to the world, or being knowne were not communicated to posterity, the writers of those times being for the most part the feruile flatterers of Antichrist: yet notwithstanding many of them were knowne, & of those which were knowne many are recorded to haue beene guilty of fearefull crimes, besides those which either were not known or not recorded. For to begin with their horrible impiety towards God, haue not many of these most holy fathers bewraied themselves to be very Atheists and scornors of religion? Such were those which before I named, *Iohn* the 24. *Alexander* the 6. *Sixtus* 4. *Paulus* 3. *Clement* 7. *Iulius* 2. & 3. *Leo* 10. and besides them *Iohn* 12. alias 13. who vsed to blaspheme God, & at his deceit to call vpon the diuell, & in his feasts to drinke vnto him. Many of them also (as canonically those which reuoceth god betake themselves to the diuell) haue bin knowne forcerers & necromancers, besides those which were not known. It is recorded euen by Popish authors of *Syluester* the 2. that he did homage to the diuell, & that by the diuell he was placed in the Papacy, to which end he had betaken himselfe both in body & soule to the diuell. Such a one was *Gregory* 7. as Cardinal *Benno* testifieth, & such also were all the Popes sio *Syluester* the 2. to *Gregory* the 7. But among them *Benedict* 8. alias 9. who before his Papacy was called *Thieophylact* is most worthy to be remembred. For he was wont in woods & mountaines to sacrifice to the diuell, & by magicall art to allure women vnto him: he kept a sparrow which brought him newes sio all coasts. And when he had sold the Papacy to *Gregory* the 6. for a 500. pound & thought by sorcery to recouer it againe.

Chap. 4. 5. 8.

Luitprandus
lib. 6. *Pasice*.
temp.

Pasice. tempo.
Stella.
Platina. &c.

againe as he first had gotten it, and to that end consulted with the diuell, he had his neck wrung in sunder; his successor *Gregory* the sixth, being a forcerer as well as he, and now as it may seeme in greater fauour with the diuell then hee: and to these three which I haue named some twentie more may be added. But now I come to speake of their finnes against the second table.

2. For many of them haue beene murderers and otherwise barbarously cruell. As for example *Gregory* the seauenth, who poisoned six Popes to make himselfe a way to the Papacie, and sought to murder *Henry* the Emperour as hee was at his prayers in the church. *Innocentius* the fourth sought to poison *Comrade* the Emperour. *Clement* 6. caused the Emperour *Leuis* of Bauaria to be poisoned. King *John* was poisoned by a monk when the Pope had giuen sentence that he should be deposed, and so was *Henry* of Luxemburgh euen in the eucharist, and that as some report by the appointment of the Pope. By the Pope was *Parry* suborned to murder our gracious Queene *Elizabeth*, so was the Iacobine that murdered *Henry* the third king of Fraunce. In the church at Florence a massacre was intended, and *Iulianus Medices* murdered by the appointment of *Sixtus* the fourth, the eleuation of the sacrament being made the signe or watchword when this murder should begin. *Alexander* the sixth for 100000. crownes poisoned the great Turkes brother who was at Rome: he also, or as some say his sonne appointed his seruants to minister poyson to certaine Cardinals and Senatours whom he had inuited: but the seruitors mistaking the cuppes and giuing him of the same, dispatched him, together with the rest. *Paulus* the third poisoned his mother and his nephew, that to him might descend the whole inheritance of the Farnesian family. Hee poisoned his sister whom he vsed as his harlot, because shee fancied others more then himselfe: and that he might more freely abuse his owne daughter *Constantia*, hee poisoned *Bosius Sfortia* her husband. He poisoned one Bishop and two Cardinals because they inclined to the gospell. I might be long in this argument, but these may serue for a tast. But if besides these you desire

Bas. ex Mario
Mat. Paris. in
Henr. 3.

Gregory. 13.

Sixtus 5.

Volaterran.
geograph. lib. 5.
et Pollitanius
de conuersione
Palliani.

Bas. de Rom.
Post. actus.

to

to heare some other examples of their cruelty, you may remember how *Stephen* the 6. caused the body of *Formosus* the Pope to be taken out of the graue, and hauing cut of two of his fingers & cast them into the *Tiber*, he buried the body among the Laity; which body eight yeares after *Sergius* the 3. caused againe to be taken out of the graue, and hauing cut of the other 3. fingers, he casteth the & the body it self into the said riuier, & condemned him and all his actes, which other Popes notwithstanding as *Romanus* 1. *Theodorus* 2. *John* 10. ratified & approved. Likewise *Boniface* 8. caused the body of *Hermannus* of *Ferrara*, who before had bene canonized for a Saint, after 30. yeares to be pluckt out of his graue, & to be burnt. *Vrbani* the 6. cast seuen Cardinals into prison because they fauoured *Clement* the 7. and in spite of him put five of them into sackes and drowned the. And this is some part of their behauiour among themselves. For of their cruelty toward the Saints and Martyrs of Iesus who is able sufficiently to intreat?

3. To their cruelty I will add their perfidious treachery, & traitorous practises, especially towards the Emperours & Princes of Christendome. For first, the Emperours of Greece, by the Popes rebellious opposition against their soueraigne Lords in the vngodly defence of images, were bereaued of their dominions in the West. By which meanes the Empire being rent asunder & weakened, way was made for the Turke. And how focuer at the first they seemed to honour their newly erected Emperours in the West whom they created for their owne defence, yet afterward they neuer ceased vntill they had gotten superiority ouer them. And euer since it hath bene their practise to strengthen and aduance themselves and their owne See by weakening and deiecting the Emperour and all other Christiana princes. And this they had effected by diuerse diuinish policies. As first they haue vsed to picke quarrels against them, & vpo any pretext or colour of a iust quarell to excommunicate them & to absolve their subiects from their obedience. And if by these meanes they would not be brought into subiection, then to depose the if they could, & to set vp others against the. And if other means failed, to raise vp warres against them, & to send forth Croisades into all Christendome with large indulgences.

N

gences & promises of heauen to all that would fight their battles. And besides this, they haue also forbiddē al other christiāns to vse any trafficke with them & their subiects: and not onely that, but they haue exposed the princes themselves, sometimes their subiects also, to the violence of murderers, & their countries & kingdomes as a prey to spoilers, wartāting any to bereaue the prince or the subiect of their liues, & to take their kingdomes as a prey. Thus besides many others was *Henry* the 4. Emperour vsed by *Gregory* 7. & *Paschalis* the 2. who not onely excommunicated the worthy Emperour, absolved his subiects frō obedience, but also both vnder hād suborned such as should murder him, & openly set vp against him in the Empire, first *Rodolphus* the duke of *Suenia*, and then his owne sonne: & in the end the good Emperour being deposed, imprisoned, & dead in prison, his body might not for 5. yeares be vouchsafed christiā buriall. Thus was *Otho* 4. vsed by *Innocentius* 3. & *Lewis* the 4. by *Iohn* 22. *Benedict* 12. & *Clement* the 6. by whose meanes also he was poisoned. Thus diuerse kings of France, besides him that now is, haue ben intreated. But especially *Lewis* 12. a good king, by *Iulius* the 2. a notable Antichrist. For he not onely excommunicated *Lewis*, & interdicted his land, but also stirred vp al Christiāns against him, promising great indulgence and pardon of all sinnes, to euery one that should by any meanes whatsoeuer kill any French man. In his owne person also hee went to warre against him, & as he being armed brought forth his army on the bridge ouer *Tiber*, he cast his keyes into the river, and drew his sword, vsing this speech in the hearing of many thousands, seing *Peters* keyes doe nought auaile vs, I will therefore vse *Pauls* sword. And to conclude, thus also haue our Kings bene dealt with, as king *Iohn*, & *Henry* the 8. & our gracious *Q. Elizabeth*, whom (to omit the other) the Popes haue excommunicated, absolved her subiects frō obedience, as much as in the lieth deposed her from her crowne, exposed her to the violence of her secret & open enemies, raised rebellions against her, suborned cutthroats to murder her, sent forces into *Ireland* to win that kingdomes frō her, stirred vp the Spaniard & aided him against her, & lastly by an Antichristian deuotion giuen her realme of *Ireland* to the Spaniard, But who Antichrist cursed, Christ blessed, inso much

inso much that hauing through the Lords goodnesse ouerlind 8. Popes, since she came to the crowne, in the end after a long and happy reigne she died in peace. Another practise of Antichrist hath bene this, to bereaue the right owners of their crownes & kingdomes, & to set vp others which had no right, that they being aduanced by his meanes, should be obliged as vassals & seed men vnto his See. And to this end, when contentions haue risen betwixt Christian princes, he hath not only nourished the same, but also taken part with the one against the other; that the one being by his means vāquished & overcome, the other may acknowledge the Pope for his good Lorde. To this end was the title of the Romaine Empire translated frō the Greeks to the French in *Charlemaigne*, & from the French to the Almaines in *Otto*, whom the Pope caused to swear homage & fealty to him. To this end was *Pipin* crowned king of France, & *Childerick* deposed & shorne a Monke. But I shall not need to insist in the enumeration of examples: for scarcely is there any kingdomes in Europe, if any at all, which the Pope *Vide Fulm.* hath not in sonner times by these and other meanes made tributary pag. 74. & tributary to his See, vsing the kings as his vassals & making the swear homage vnto him. A third stratageme which the Popes haue vsed to weaken the Emperours and princes of christendome, & strengthen themselves, hath bene this, to persuade them to goe with their forces & chiefe of their strength into *Palesine* for the recovery of the Holy lād from the *Turks* and *Saracens*; that in their absence he might worke his will in any part of Europe, not fearing their strength if they should returne, being weakened by those warres; but rather hoping they should not returne to make resistance. And to this purpose consider onely the dealing of *Alexander* the 3. and *Gregory* the ninth, with the one and two *Fredericks* the Emperours. For *Alexander* the third searing the power of *Fredericke Barbaross*, by *Hartmannus* the Bishop of *Brixia*, perswadeth him to goe with his armie into *Palesine* for the recovery of the holy Lande: the Pope in the meane time sendeth a picture of the Emperour to the *Soldan*, perswading him, that by some secret ambuscament hee would apprehend him; which happened accordingly. The Emperour being

Bal. ex Mario
& Alalib. Pa-
uif.

released by the Soldan, after his returne cometh to Venice, where the Pope as you heard before treadeth on his necke &c. The other *Frederick* being first excommunicated by *Gregory 9.* because he went not to *Palestine* according to his appointme^t, at the length to satisfie the Popes pleasure, he tooke his voiage: and hauing recovered *Ierusalem* & other places from the *Soldan*, and made truce with him for 10. yeares, he sendeth these glad tidings to the Pope. Who hauing receiued the letters causeth the messengers to be slaine, and giueth out that the Emperour was dead. For the Pope hauing a moneths mind to the kingdoms of *Sicilia* & *Apulia*, wherof *Frederick* was the true heire, desired according to *Sauls* old policie against *Dauid*, to haue him dispatched by the infidels, & to that end was so earnest to haue him gone. For in his absence he seized on those kingdoms, & wrote to the *Soldan* that he should in no case restore *Ierusalem* vnto the Emperour. And when as the Emperour was returned, the Pope excommunicateth him againe, because hee had made truce with the *Soldan*, and would not absolue him vntill he had paid for his absolution an 100000. ounces of gold.

4. But now the filthy leachery of these hollow fathers, who would seeme so chaste as that they condemne marriage in their clergy, offereth it selfe to be spoken of. For although it be a rule among them, *Si non caste, tamen caute*, If not chastly, yet charily, & one of their Popes professeth *Honestius esse pluribus occulte implicari: quam aperte in hominum vultu & conscientia cum vna ligari*, That it is more honest to haue to doe with many women in secret, then openly in the face and notice of men to be tied to one, whether in marriage or otherwise: and therefore in all likelihood, a final part of their uncleannes (which they taught by all means to coöceale) is knowe to the world, yet notwithstanding very many of them haue bene detected and knowne to be most filthy fornicatours and adulterers, besides *Iohn* the 8. or rather *Loane* who was a harlot in mans apparell, and was deliuered of a childe in open procession. In this bedstee of whoremongers & adulterers (besides those which I either know not or doe not remember) are numbered, by diuerse authors, these which follow, *Sergius 3.* who by the notable stumpe^t *Marozia* begot *Iohn 12.* *Zando*, who in fornicatio begot *Iohn* the 11.

Nicol. 1.

the 11. and spent his time among harlots. Both these *Iohns* beeing as bad or worse then their fathers, *Iohn 13.* also was so giuen to whoredome as that he is said to haue turned the palace of *Laterane* into a stewes. And being at the length taken in adukerie, by the husband of the adulteresse hee was wounded to death. Such were *Iohn 14.* & 19. & 21. & 24. Likewise *Benedikt 6.* & 9. who by forcery allured women vnto him, and made them follow him vp & downe like Cades. In like manner *Benedikt 12.* who kept many stumpe^ts, and among others the sister of *Frauncis Petrarch* whom by great rewards he had purchased of her brother *Gerhard*. Such were *Christopherns 1.* and *Calixtus* the 7. *Gregory* the 6. and the 7. called *Hildebrand*, who as also *Pistor* the 3. were very inward with *Mauke* the countesse, *Innocentius 4.* had many bastards, and so had *Innocentius* the 8. who also vsed to paint his face. *Nicolas 3.* by his concubine begat a child which in nailes and haire was like a Bear, which some impute to the pictures of beares which hee being of the *Visine* family had caused to be made in his house. And therefore *Martin 4.* who kept the same concubine, fearing the like mischaunce, caused the pictures of the beares to be taken away. *Boniface* the 8. kept many harlots, & had by them diuerse nephewes, for so they call their bastards. *Clement 5.* was a common whoremonger and patron of harlots, and so was *Clement 6.* *Clement 7.* & 8. was worse then so: and *Clement 8.* that now is, hath beene no better then he should bee. And such were *Pius* the 4. who died betwixt 2. harlots, & *Sixtus 5.* of late memory, &c.

5 These are ordinary matters in the Romish votaries, among whome those Popes may be counted for men of the chaster sorte, who haue offended onely by fornication and adultery. But, as very many of their votaries, so also diuerse among the Popes haue fearefully sinned against nature by incest and Sodomie. Neither are we to maruell thereat, seeing they doe not onely embrace the meanes of lust, as idleness, fulnesse of bread, and abundance of worldly delights and carnall pleasures, but also reiect the remedie appointed of God, which is marriage; but especially because they beeing Idolaters

are by the lust iudgement of God giuen ouer to their lusts and to a reprobate sence, in somuch that they commit abominations against nature. It is recorded of *Iohn* the 13. and 23. *alijs* 24. that, besides all other their whoredomes and adulteries, the one committed incest with *Stephana* his fathers concubine; and the other with his brothers wife. *Alexander* the 6. not contented with diuerse other strumpets which he kept, by whome he had 6. bastards, committed incest with his owne daughter *Lucretia*. Hee also gaue leaue to Cardinall *Mendoza* to abuse his owne bastard sonne in incestuous Sodomy and Sodomiticall incest. *Paulus* the third committed incest with two of his nieces, prostituted one of his sisters to *Alexander* 6. to get a Cardinallship, and poisoned another because shee affected some other of her louers more then himselfe, neither did hee abstaine from his owne daughter *Constantia*. Of *Pius* it is saide that he kept incestuous companie with his owne sister. *Sixtus* 4. was not onely a filthy whoremonger and Sodomite himselfe, but also to incite and encourage others to the same filthinesse, hee built a famous stewes not onely of women, but also of males also. And hee gaue licence to the Cardinall of *Saint Lucie* and to all his familie; that they might in the three hote moneths of the yeere freely vse Sodomy. *Innus* 2. abused vnto Sodomy, besides others, two young noblemen of Fraunce, whome *Anne* the Queene had sent to Rome and committed to a Cardinall to be informed. *Innus* the 3. made his *Ganymedes* a Cardinall, and neither did he as some write abstaine from committing Sodomy with the Cardinalls themselves. His Legate at Venice (a fit couer for such a pottle) *Ioannes a Casa*. Archbishoppe of Beneuentum, set forth a booke in Italian metre in commendation of this sin, for which the Lord destroyed Sodom and Gomorrie with fire and brimstone from heauen. Such sinners against nature were, as authors testify, *Bedell* 1. *Clement* 7. *Iohn* 13. 14. & 24. *Leo* 10. and *Paul* 3. whose bastard sonne *Petrus Aloysius* I cannot passe ouer with silence: For hee treading in his fathers steppes, and being greatly loued and aduanced by him, besides incest with his

sister.

Tiber Constantia, and rapes with other women, and buggerie with diuerse men, he forced a Sodomiticall rape vpon *Cosmus Cherus* a worthy Bishoppe, vsing the helpe of his men to hold him by violence, whiles he committed that outrageous act. But it is shame to speake that which they are not allhamed to doe.

6. And yet this is not all that is to bee alledged against the Popes, that diuerse of them haue bene Atheists, many of them forcerers, murderers, traytors, Adulterers and Sodomits. For many of them haue bene most foule monsters (as some of their owne writers call them) compounded of these and other horrible crymes. Such, besides others, were *Sixtus* 4. *Iohn* 24. *Alexander* 6. *Clement* 7. and *Paul* 3. &c. Neither may it be obiected, that although diuerse Popes haue bene men of sinne, yet many of them haue bene holy men and Saints of God, and consequently not Antichrists: For howsoeuer all the Romane Bishoppes of the first 600. yeares are reuerenced as Saints and so called of Popish writers, as *Saint Syluester*, *Saint Leo*, *Saint Gregory* &c. a very few onely excepted, yet a very fewe of them which haue liued this thousand yeares are euen by Popish flatterers esteemed Saints; and those fewe which be, are honoured among them not for any true holinesse, but either for the Antichristian aduancing of their See, or for some supposed miracles which were no better then the lying signes & wonders of Antichrist. But so far indeede these Apostaticall Popes haue been from being Saints in the sight of God, that all of them haue deserved to be called men of sinne, sons of perdition, outlawes, although some of them were not so wicked as the rest. Men of sin, because besides those peculiar sinnes wherewithall euery of them were seuerallie infected, the whole order or successio of them hath been guilty of many other crimes also, as comon to them all, diuerse wherof the holy ghost hath set downe as noates of Antichrist. As namely those which I haue already proued, to be in the Pope himselfe, opposition or enmity to Christ, apostasy, hypocrisie, satanlic pride. For if the Pope be an heretick or false prophet teaching the doctrines of diuels, if a notorious hypocrite, if an apostate, yea the head of the catholike apostasy, if an aduersary opposed vnto

Onuphr. Pontif. Romani. Chronologia prefixa chate-chismo Canisij.

Christ, though a couert and disguised enemy, if the king of pride aduancing himselfe most insolently about all that is called God, as we haue proued him to be, then wee neede not doubt, but that in respect of these sins though he had no more, he deserueth to be called the man of sin.

Apoc. 17.

7 But vnto this, diuerse others may be added, as first and principallie the idolatrie, superstitious and counterfaite religions of the Pope and church of Rome. For the whore of Babylon, whereby is signified the Antichristian state, is described in the scriptures not onely as a spirituall adulteresse, but also as the mother of all fornications and abominations in the earth, which with the golden cuppe of her fornications, that is idolatries and superstitious, hath made drunke the kings and inhabitants of the earth. Now the idolatry of the Pope and church of Rome is manifold and grievous. As first, to the bread in the sacrament, which beeing a small creature they worship as their maker and redeemer, neither doe they thinke that they can worshippinge it enough, and therefore in the worship thereof the chiefe part of their solemne seruice consisteth. Secondly to the crosse and crucifix, and images of the trinitie, all which as they teach are to be worshipped with diuine worship, and are so worshipped among them. Thirdly, to the blessed virgin *Mary*, who hath bene worshipped among them as much or rather more then God. Her they call their Lady and goddesse, and queene of heauen. In her they repose their trust and assistance, to her they flie in their necessitie, of her they craue all good things, and from her they expect remission of sins and eternall saluation, in honour of her they haue deuised and vsed diuerse seruices, as offices, letanies, rosaries, psalters &c. full of blasphemous idolatries. Fourthly to Saints departed, who haue succeeded the tutelar gods of the heathenish Romanes, there beeing almost no cuntry, city, parish, trade or profession which had not their severall Saints to patronize them, no disease nor other calamity in themselves or their cattell for which they had not their peculiar saints, as it were *Aueruncos deos* to turne away those euills from them. In the merits of Saints they trust for remission of sinne and for eternall life. Them

they

they adore, to them they pray, and not onely them doe they worship but their images also and reliques. Wherein the Papists are more grosse idolatours then the very heathen. For the Gentiles did not worship the images themselves, but the persons represented by them: but the Papists hold that the very same worship is due to the image which belongeth to the person whom it resembleth. To these notorious idolatries we may add their diuerse counterfeite religions and orders deuised or authorized by the Pope, which are so many by-pathes misleading men out of the onely true way which leadeth vnto heauen, & besides them innumerable traditions, superstitions, triseries and fooleries. Vpon all which notwithstanding the fond people of all nations in these parts of the world, haue so stragely doted, as that they may most truly be said to haue bene belotted and made drunke with the wine of the whore of Babels fornications, that is to say, with the idolatries and superstitions of the Church of Rome.

8. Vpon their spirituall adultery, that is to say, their manifolde & grosse idolatry, hath followed their carnall adultery & vncleannesse. For seeing by their idolatry they had dishonoured God, as the Gentiles did, therefore the Lord hath giuen ouer them also to their harts lustes vnto vncleannesse. Neither haue they onely bene guilty of vncleannesse in themselves, but also the causes thereof in others; whiles they extenuate the sinne of fornication as though it were but a veniall sinne, and reckon adultery among the lesse and lighter offences: whiles they dispense with these sinnes and giue men leaue to committe them without controulment, or else assigne vnto them ridiculous punishments: but especially whiles they forbidde marriage vnto all their clergy, and mainteyne open stewes. For in forbidding marriage they open a gappe to all vncleannesse. *Tolle de ecclesia* (saith Bernard) *honorabile coniugium & thorum immaculatum, nonne repleas eam concubinarijs, incestuosissimifilijs, molibus, masculorū concubitoribus, & annid denique genere immundorum?* Take out of the Church honorable marriage and the bed undefiled, and doe you not fill it with keepers of concubines, incestuous fellows, Gonorrhoeans and Sodomites, & in

a word

B. Bale.

Vid. prefat. I.
Bale ad lectorem
libri sui de ac-
tibus Pontificis.

a word with all kinde of vnclane persons? For prooffe herof read but the actes of English votaries, who yet may not be compared with those of hotter countreys: remember the surrey taken here in England before the dissolution of Abbeyes, wherein our irreligious houses were found to be little better thū stewes of both sorts; not to speake of their secular Priests who were knowne for the most parte to haue bene the towne-bulles where they dwelt. Neither will I tell you of the innumerable murders of infants, besides those which died in their mothers wombes to preuent their parents shame, As for common stewes, they are mainteyned not onely in other popish countreys and cities, but euen in Rome it selfe, and not onely maintained by the Pope, but maintainers also of the Pope, to whom they pay as if hee were their bawle a yearly pension, which amounteth sometimes to 30000. sometimes to 40000. Ducates. It is said of *Paulus* the third that in his tables he had the names of 45000. curtizans, which paid a monethly tribute vnto him. Which, besides his patronizing of filthinesse, argueth his conetring of filthy lucre, of which wee are also briefly to speake. For of him in respect of these two vices, filthinesse and couetousnesse, it was said in old time,

Mat. Paris in
histor. 3.

Eius auaritia totus non sufficit orbis:
Eius luxuria meretrix non sufficit omnis.

Neither doth the whole world suffice his couetousnesse, nor all harlots his lechery.

a. Pet. a. j.

9. Of the insatiable auarice of the Pope and court of Rome many instances might bee giuen. For they haue found out innumerable waies and meanes to scrape together incredible summes of money out of all countreys, without measure or modestie, without shame or shewe of honesty. But it shalbe sufficient by application of *Peters* prophecy concerning false teachers in these latter times, to shewe, that through couetousnesse they haue with fained wordes and doctrines of their owne coyning made merchandize of al those that would bearken vnto them. As for example, they haue sayned that

Pau

Peter was obtained of Christ the Monarch of the whole Church, that to him was committed the right both of the spirituall and temporall Monarchy: that in this Monarchy the Pope succeedeth *Peter*, as Christes vicar generall, as the vniuersall Bishoppe, as the Lorde of the whole earth. They haue sayned a donation of *Constantine* wherein hee should not onely giue the Cite of Rome to the Pope, but also resigne vnto him the whole Empire of the West. Vpon these groundes they haue obtained both of Princes and Prelates, what their greedy couetousnesse armed with such avaritious shame not to demand, England, Fraunce, Germany and other countreys haue bene exceedingly; or, as some speake, miserably impoverished by the inrolerable exactions of the Pope and his Court. For first, the first frutes hee claimed of all spirituall promotions: which in these partes of Europe subiect to that See, did amount vnto two millions and foure hundred and three score thousand eight hundred forty and three Florenes. The first frutes of the spirituall livings in Fraunce, and the charges of obtaining the same livings, haue bene observed in three yeares, to amount vnto nine hundred fourtie and sixe thousand six hundred sixty and six french crowns. By the same title hee tooke vpon him to bestowe, or rather to sell openly and without shame the livings of the church; and not onely when they were void, but also before hand, and that to diuerse men. In somuch that sometimes ten, sometimes twelue haue purchased aduancements or reuersions of the same preferments against the next avoidance. But which of all them, whethe the living sold, was to haue the benefit of the Popes graunt, that was to bee decided at Rome: whether they were to their great charge, but to the enriching of the Romish Harpies, to repaire. This gainefull trade may well bee called making Merchandize of men; for together with the benefices the poore people were bought and sold. In respect herof *Blondus* saith, That all Europe almost sendeth tributes to Rome, greater or at least equal to the reuenues of the olde times. *Dum singula ciuitates à Romana pontifice beneficiis sacerdotalia accipiunt, whiles the spirituall promotions*

Ludovic. 9. ob.
sit. an. 1228.
tit. de tallijs.

Israel. ex lega-
tione Hadrian.
6. excus. p. vii.
semlberg. 1538.

Film. brui. ex
populatiq. sena-
tus Paris. 1.
dedit. 12. de.
laid. art. 72.

Ibid. art. 60.

in every Citie are received from the Pope. Moreover his yearly perquisites of elections, prebentions, dispensations, licenses & many such like merchandises the titles wherof, with their taxes or prices, are set downe in the booke called *Taxa cancellaria Apostolica*, are thought to furmount nine hundred thousand Florenes: not to speake of his smoke-farthings & Peterpence, which neuerthelesse did arise to no small summe. But besides his ordinary taxations, his extraordinary exactiōs were intollerable. For hee hath not bene ashamed to demand the tenths of all spirituall livings, in some whole realmes, for many yeares together: yea sometimes the third part of their living that were resident, and the halfe of theirs that were non residents, & that for diuersle yeares: & sometimes also all the money and goods of them that deceased. Out of Fraunce alone in the time of *Martin 5.* the Pope and court of Rome received 9. millions. In England the Popes pray was almost as great as the reuenues of the crowne, as *Banner* testifieth.

10. But his most odious merchandise is his setting to sale all manner of sinne, which is called *Taxa penitentiaria apostolica*, wherby is promised impunity to euery one who hauing committed any sin, be it neuer so grieuous, payeth according to the rate for his absolution: as namely for adultery, incest, Sodomy, the abominatio not to be spoken of committed with beasts, willfull murder, perieide, periurie, and such like. Hereof a notable Canonist writeth thus,

Culpa uilemarcas, bursas exaurit & arcas:

Si bursas parcas, fuge Papas & Patrlarchas:

Si dederis marcas, & eis impleberis arcas,

Culpa solueris quaq; ligatus eris.

But with what difference I pray you were these crimes rated? Forsooth hee that would bee absolved from adultery or incest, it must cost him foure Turons: if from both together, it must stande him in six Turons. And what if a Priest bury the body of a party excommunicated in Christian buriall, or if hee chaunce vpon ignorance to say Masse in a place interdicted? Either of these faultes must cost him six Turons and two Ducates. And here it is to bee noted that the

Mat. VII. 1301.
Mat. Paris. an. 1146.
Sylas lotorum commun.
In presul. in lib. Steph. Gardiner. de uers. obediens.
Vid: Muscul. loc. capm. de eccl. ministris. Nundinatio Rom. pontif. & Fulda. brut. pag. 61.
Ioan. Menandrus.

the Pope in a couetous pollicie forbiddeth many things which GOD doth not forbid, namely to this ende that the straiter his prohibitions are, the oftner hee may haue occasion to dispense therewith. As for example, he forbiddeth marriage in kinsfolke vnto the seauenth degree: but for money he will dispense therewith in all degrees of kindred, excepting that which is betwixt the parent and the child.

11 They haue with fained words through couetousnesse perswaded the world, that the Pope hath all lawes in the closet of his breast, that hee is the supreme iudge in all causes and controuersies, that to him lieth appeale from all iudges whatsoeuer, and that immediately. By which chanel haue flowed abundance of riches into the sea of the Popes treasure. And truly is it compared to the sea whereunto all riuers flow, and yet doth not ouerslowe. It is lawfull, saith one of their owne lawyers, to appeale from any to the Pope immediately: which (saith he) they haue provided that they might draw controuersies vnto their court, and so might satisfie their owne auarice, which notwithstanding they shall neuer doe, noting that it is insatiable. And heereunto appertaineth that acclamation of one of their owne chronographers: for, hauing shewed that scarcely there was any spirituall promotion which was not become litigious; & the cause brought to Rome, but not with empty hand; *Reioyce* saith he our mother Rome, for the fountains of the treasures in the earth are opened, that vnto thee may flowe riuers, and heapes of money in great abundance. *Reioyce* over the iniquity of the sonnes of men, because in recompence of so great euils there is a price or reward giuen vnto thee. Be glad for thy helper discord, which hath burst out of the bottomlesse pitte of hell, that vnto thee many rewards of money might be gathered in heapes. Thou hast that which thou alwaies thirsted after: sing a song, for by the wickednesse of men, and not by thy religion thou hast vanquished the world. Vnto thee doth not the deuotion of men or pure conscience driue them, but the committing of manifold crimes, and the decision of controuersies procured by money. Furthermore with fained words they haue taught, that there is a purgatory, wherein the soules of many

Antonin. sum. part. 3. tit. 22. cap. 5. §. 17.

Theodoric. Niem. ital. 6. c. 37.

Petr. Ferrari. trionfies vnto their court, and so might satisfie their owne auarice, which notwithstanding they shall neuer doe, noting that it is insatiable.

sent. in de fin. §. sed ad quicumque.

Abbas vrsperg. pag. 321.

*Petr. Ferrari-
ens. in form. li.
bell. quagitur uorion,
ex sublit. s. ex
suo corpore.*

of the elect are tormented for a time: that out of this purgatory the soules may be deliuered by the prayers of the liuing especially, by the satisfactorie prayers of those whom they call religious, by masses and trentalls of masses, by the works of supererogation and merites of others applied vnto them. By this conceipt, which was the foundation of religious houses, the Popes cleargie had gotten the chiefeft possessions of all Europe into their hands. *Monasteries* (saith one of their owne writers) were founded in times past, for debell. quagitur uorion, though now adayes for rapine and couetousnesse: in somuch that they haue at this day destroyed the world, and brought to nothing the state of the Empire and of all lay men. Wherefore all such places, as are or shall be made, may worthe bee called netter framed to catch lay mens goodes. In this small land of ours the reuenewes of the irreligious houses, which were dissolued, did arise according to the olde rents (which are scarce the tenth part of the true valewe) to the summe of a hundred thirtie foure thousand six hundred and three pounds, two shillings fourepence halfe pennie. Neither are the Popes owne reuenewes arising from these grounds to be omitted. For purgatory forsooth is his peculier, and the merites of Saints and works of supererogation which are the treasure of the church, are in his disposition. So that by his applying thereof to whom hee pleaseth hee can either shorten their time in purgatorie, or wholly set them at libertie by his indulgences and pardons accordingly as hee is paide for the same. And yet there are many more deuises and fained words, whereby the Pope maketh merchandise of men for the enriching of himselfe and his clergie. As by his iubileyes, and canonizing of Saints, by his promising of remission of sinnes and eternall life to those that will fight his battailes or execute his wicked desires: by his doctrines of merites and works of supererogation, of inuocation of Saints, of adoration of images and reliques, of pilgrimages, and in a word by all the doctrines almost of Poperie, I meane those, which bee peculier to the Pope and church of Rome, which are fained words deuised in

diuellish

diuellish pollicie to mainetaine their insatiable lust, ambition and couetousnesse. By all this which hath bene saide it plainlie appeareth that the Pope most worthilie deserueth to bee called the man of sinne: especiallie if you consider that in respect of diuerse of the aforesaide sinnes, hee is such a sinner as *Ieroboam* was, who caused all Israell to sinne. For hee is not onelie an apostate, but also the heade of the catholike apostasie: not onelie an hereticke, but the false prophet and brocher of popish heresies: not onelie an idolatour and adulterer, but also the cause and author of these abominations in all the Christian world, making all sorts of men drunke with the wine of his fornications.

12. It remaineth therefore that we should consider whether the other two titles of Antichrist do belong to the Pope, namely that he is the sonne of perdition, and the outlaw or lawlesse person. As touching the former, there is no questiō to be made but that if he be the man of sin as hath been proued, hee is also the child of perdition, in that sense that *Indas* is so called. *Iohn 17. 12.* And that hee deserueth most iustlie to bee called the outlawe or lawlesse person it is most euident. Not onelie because hee is a transgressour of the lawe (for seeing euerie sinne is *transgressio* A transgression of the law, therefore hee that is the man of sinne, must needs be: *Quoniam the outlawe*) but also because he professeth himselfe to be the sonne of *Beliall*, that is to say a man without yoke, who taketh himselfe to be bound to no law, but chalengeth authority to break all lawes or at least to dispense with them. For first as touching the lawes & authority of men, *Papa solius est omni lege humana*, that is, the Pope is not bound to any humane lawe. *Legi non subiacerit ulli, he is subject to no law.* And according to the fulnes of power he may, as himselfe professeth, *de iure supra ius dispensare*, dispense with the lawe above lawe: yea hee may doe all things, *supra ius, contra ius, & extra ius, above lawe, against lawe, and without lawe.* And therefore of all others most worthilie called the outlawe. And as for humane authority, he is to iudge all, but to be iudged of none. *Nec totum Orbem, proprium est.*

O. 4.

hec post.

*Casus Papales.
apud Hostien-
sem etc.
Innocent. 3.
extr. de concess.
præbend. c. præ-
positi.
Bald. in c. cum
super de causis.
propriet. et
hec post.*

*Petr. de palu- nec totius mundus potest Papam iudicare aut deponere. Not the
de, de potestate whole cleargie, nor the whole world may iudge the Pope or depose*

Papa. art. 4.

*Francisc. Z-
bavella.*

Joan. 13.

*Extr. de tran-
sit. episc. e.
quas in gloff.
inter casus pa-
pales.
Dm. 1. 16.
R. Capers de
ecclesia pag.
29 num. 1. &
62. num. 66. de
constitutionib.
e. licet. in sexto.
Hostiens.
Francisc. de
Rip.*

*R. Capers. pag.
68. num. 32. &
dist. 40. non nos
in gloff.
Extr. de con-
cess. prabend. e.
proposit in
gloff. dist. 40.
non nos in gloff.
Joan. de Pari-
sit e. 20.
Cencil. tom. 1.
in purgatione
Sixti.
Dist. 40. Non
in gloff.*

*Extr. de tran-
sit. episc. e.
quas in gloff.
inter casus pa-
pales.
Dm. 1. 16.
R. Capers de
ecclesia pag.
29 num. 1. &
62. num. 66. de
constitutionib.
e. licet. in sexto.
Hostiens.
Francisc. de
Rip.*

*R. Capers. pag.
68. num. 32. &
dist. 40. non nos
in gloff.
Extr. de con-
cess. prabend. e.
proposit in
gloff. dist. 40.
non nos in gloff.
Joan. de Pari-
sit e. 20.
Cencil. tom. 1.
in purgatione
Sixti.
Dist. 40. Non
in gloff.*

*Extr. de tran-
sit. episc. e.
quas in gloff.
inter casus pa-
pales.
Dm. 1. 16.
R. Capers de
ecclesia pag.
29 num. 1. &
62. num. 66. de
constitutionib.
e. licet. in sexto.
Hostiens.
Francisc. de
Rip.*

*R. Capers. pag.
68. num. 32. &
dist. 40. non nos
in gloff.
Extr. de con-
cess. prabend. e.
proposit in
gloff. dist. 40.
non nos in gloff.
Joan. de Pari-
sit e. 20.
Cencil. tom. 1.
in purgatione
Sixti.
Dist. 40. Non
in gloff.*

*Extr. de tran-
sit. episc. e.
quas in gloff.
inter casus pa-
pales.
Dm. 1. 16.
R. Capers de
ecclesia pag.
29 num. 1. &
62. num. 66. de
constitutionib.
e. licet. in sexto.
Hostiens.
Francisc. de
Rip.*

*R. Capers. pag.
68. num. 32. &
dist. 40. non nos
in gloff.
Extr. de con-
cess. prabend. e.
proposit in
gloff. dist. 40.
non nos in gloff.
Joan. de Pari-
sit e. 20.
Cencil. tom. 1.
in purgatione
Sixti.
Dist. 40. Non
in gloff.*

*Extr. de tran-
sit. episc. e.
quas in gloff.
inter casus pa-
pales.
Dm. 1. 16.
R. Capers de
ecclesia pag.
29 num. 1. &
62. num. 66. de
constitutionib.
e. licet. in sexto.
Hostiens.
Francisc. de
Rip.*

*R. Capers. pag.
68. num. 32. &
dist. 40. non nos
in gloff.
Extr. de con-
cess. prabend. e.
proposit in
gloff. dist. 40.
non nos in gloff.
Joan. de Pari-
sit e. 20.
Cencil. tom. 1.
in purgatione
Sixti.
Dist. 40. Non
in gloff.*

*Extr. de tran-
sit. episc. e.
quas in gloff.
inter casus pa-
pales.
Dm. 1. 16.
R. Capers de
ecclesia pag.
29 num. 1. &
62. num. 66. de
constitutionib.
e. licet. in sexto.
Hostiens.
Francisc. de
Rip.*

*R. Capers. pag.
68. num. 32. &
dist. 40. non nos
in gloff.
Extr. de con-
cess. prabend. e.
proposit in
gloff. dist. 40.
non nos in gloff.
Joan. de Pari-
sit e. 20.
Cencil. tom. 1.
in purgatione
Sixti.
Dist. 40. Non
in gloff.*

him. Neither doth he indeede subiect himselfe to the lawe of God. For, hee not onely taketh vpon him to dispense with the world and law of God, as you heard before, but also thinketh hee may lawfullie breake the lawes of God. *Hee hath bene made to beleene that he may do all things, euen unlawfull things, and that he is more then God, as Zabarella saith.* And therefore some of them, when they haue bene admonished of their wicked practises, haue vsed to answer, *Am nos I Pope?* thereby signifying, that beeing Pope he might doe what hee list. Neither is he indeede subiect to any other lawe but to his owne will or rather lust. *In his que vult, est ei prouisione voluntas, in those things which he will, his will is vnto him for reason. Legi non subiacet vlti: Indiciuque est pro lege suum.* He is subiect to no law: and his iudgement is in stead of law. So that of him is verified that propheticke concerning Antiochus the type of Antichrist, *that he would do what him listeth, and that his will should be to him for a law.* To this purpose his followers say, that he is *lex viuens, a liuing lawe, and hath all lawes in the closet of his breast, that he can of wrong make right, of vniustice righte confesse, that to him all things are lawfull.* That the Popes power is absolute, and extendeth as farr as him listeth: *that he may not be accused of Simonie, nor murder, nor adulterie, nor any other crime, excepting heresie which they say elsewhere is not incident vnto him.* Nay his actions may not be inquired into, neither may any man say vnto him, *Why do you thus?* Yea it were no better then sacriledge to call in question the Popes faith, and to iudge of his actions *est Ponere os in calum, it is to set a mans face against heauen: to accuse him is to commit the sinne against the holy ghost, which shall neuer be forgiven neither in this world nor in the world to come.* But what if it be apparant that he hath committed adulterie or murder, or that himselfe is a wicked man, as indeede many of them haue bene monstres of men? Forsooth the actions of the Pope must bee interpreted in the good part. For if a priest when hee is seene to bee ouer-familiar with a woman must bee thought to blesse her, much

much more is it to be presumed in the Popes behalfe. Or if they bee so blacke as that they will admitte no other colour, then the fautes of the Pope must bee excused, as the murders of Sampson, the thefts of the Hebrewes, and the adultery of Iacob. And to the same purpose saith another, *Every faute of the most holy Father must be interpreted in the good parte, and if it bee theft or any thing that is in it selfe euill, wee must interpret it to bee done by diuine instinct.* And as touching his person, the Pope bee he neuer so wicked, is alwayes presumed to be good. *Quis enim sanltu dubitet esse quem apex tanta dignitatis assollit? In quo si defuit bona acquisita per meritum, sustinuit que a loci predecessore prestantur.* For who would doubt that hee is holy (saith the Pope of himselfe) whom the height of so great honour aduanceth? In whome if good things gotten by his owne merite be wanting, those suffice which are performed by the predecessor in the same place, meaning Peter. And againe, *There is a certaine spirituality according to De maior. & state, when a man is in the most holy and most spiritual state, obedient vnto and in this state is the Pope alone. And therefore every one must call him most holy Father.* Seing therefore the Pope is the man of sinne, and a most notorious transgressour of Gods lawes, seing hee holdeth himselfe bound to no lawe but esteemeth his owne lust for a lawe: seing his transgressions of the lawe must not be called into question, but eyther must be commended as vertuous actions, or, excused as done by diuine instinct, seing himselfe though neuer so wicked must be deemed most holy in that he is Pope, it cannot bee denied, but that about all men he most deserueth to be called: *apostate, the outlaw, or lawlesse person.*

¶ Of the miracles, or rather lying signes and wonders of Antichrist.



And thus much may suffice to haue spoke of the qualities and conditions of Antichrist: now we haue to intreat of his actions and effects. And first of his miracles as he calleth them, or rather, as the holy Ghost termeth them, lying signes and wonders. In speaking whereof I will not flie to y^e Bellarmine's owne grounds, For whereas there are three things (as he saith) mentioned in the Scriptures concerning the miracles of Antichrist, it shall appeare by the helpe of God, that all which the Scriptures haue foretold concerning this matter, doe most fitly agree to the Pope and church of Rome. The first is, that Antichrist and his followers should do many signes and wonders which they call miracles. For so saith our Saviour Christ, *Mat. 24. 24* (which propheticke the Papists themselves vnderstand of Antichrist & his adherents) *They shall worke great signes & wonders, insomuch that the very elect, if it were possible should be seduced.* He saith, they shall worke great signes, & not he, (saith Bellarmine) because not onely Antichrist but his ministers also shall worke signes. And the apostle speaking of Antichrist, saith, his coming shall be according to the efficacy of Sathan in all power in lying signes & wonders. And likewise *John Apoc. 13. 13.* affirmeth, that Antichrist worketh great signes in the sight of men. And that this note agreeth to the Pope & church of Rome, it is most euident. For they abound with innumerable signes & wonders which they call miracles. Inasmuch that there is among them almost no Saint or Authour of any sect, who is not renowned for many faire miracles: no temple or monastery of note, no image or reliques of saints vnto which the people went on pilgrimage, which was not famous for miracles: no doctrine which cannot be proued out of Scripture, that is to say, no point of popery which they haue not commended to the people and authorized by such signes and wonders as they call miracles. And in regard of these miracles.

Lib. 3. de pont.
Rom. cap. 15.

Mat. 24. 24.

2. Thess. 2. 9.

Apoc. 13. 13.

miracles (which they esteeme as a note of the true church) they contemne and despise all other churches, which doe not vaunt of miracles as they do.

2. And yet notwithstanding, al their miracles are nothing worth: First, because they serue to confirme vnto us as shall be shewed, & therefore are not to be regarded. Secondly, because the vaine brag of manifold miracles among those that professe the name of Christ in these later times (wherein miracles need not for the confirmatio of Gods truth, which heretofore hath bin sufficiently confirmed) is so faire frō being a note of the true church, as that rather it is a plaine signe of false teachers, & an euident marke of the Synagogue of Antichrist. For their owne deuises indeed & doctrines of men do stil need signes & wonders to confirme the. But the truth of the gospell which we professe hath bin sufficiently confirmed by the miracles of our Saviour Christ, & of his Apostles and Disciples. Whosoever therefore will not beleue this doctrine, thus confirmed, neither will he beleue though one should rise frō the dead to preach vnto him. Luke. 16.

Againe miracles are graunted not for the beleuers, but for the that liue in infidelity. And as *Augustine* saith, *Quisquis adhuc prodigia, ut credat, inquit, magnum est ipse prodigium, qui mundo credens non credit: Whosoever yet seeketh after wonders that hee may beleue, is himselfe a great wonder, who when the worlde beleueth, doth not beleue.* And therefore in another place he saith, *Contra istos mirabilarios cantum me fecit Deus meus &c. Against these miracle mongers my God hath made me wary, saying, There shall arise in the last daies false prophets working signes & wonders, that they might bring into error, if it were possible, the very elect.* Likewise *Chrysostome*, or whosoever was the authour of those learned Homilies vpon *Mat. 24.* in the 40. Homily (where hee proueth that the true Church of Christ cannot now bee knowne or discerned by signes or other meanes, but onely by the Scriptures) hee saith, that now the working of signes and wonders is altogether taken away (namely among the true professors) and and the working of counterfeit miracles is more found among false Christians. And that, *Peter* in the history of *Clement* de-

Tharastus in
cōcil. Nicen. 2.

De ciuit. Dei
lib. 22. c. 8.

Tract. 13. in
mens &c.

Chrysost. homil.
49. in Mat.

shewe and appearance, but in deed and in truth. Whereby they, in deauouring to deceiue all and to make them believe lies, are permitted both in the iustice of God to seduce the wicked, & in his mercy to try the faithfull. And therefore signes & wonders as they haue not alwayes bin signes & tokens of true teachers & professors of the truth, but onely then when they haue bin wrought for the cōfirmation of the truth: So in these latter times, the same being wrought for confirmation of vntuthes are vndoubted signes of the synagogue of Antichrist.

4 Let vs then consider whether such signes and wonders be wrought in the church of Rome. It is recorded of Gregory the 7. who was the first of the Popes which was openly acknowledged to be Antichrist, that as he was a notable forcerer, so he wrought many signes and wonders: & among the rest he vied to shake fire out of his sleeves. And of his votaries, after he had forbidden mariage in the clergy, *Auentinus* writeth that upon that occasion many false prophets did as it were cast miste, and by fables and miracles did turne away the people of Christ from the truth. And againe, *False prophets did then arise, false Apostles, false priests, who by counterfeite religion deceived the people, wrought great signes and wonders, and began to sit in the temple of God, and to bee aduanced aboue all that is worshipped. And while they endeauour to establish their owne power and dominion they haue extinguished Christian charity & simplicity.* And since those times the church of Rome hath much boasted of her manifold miracles, which haue beene partly deuised and partly wrought for the confirmation of such Antichristian doctrines & idolatrous superstitions as cannot be cōfirmed by the scriptures: as namely the absurd doctrine of transubstantiation, and adoration of the breaden God, the heathenish doctrine of purgatory, and superstitious prayer for the dead: the idolatrous inuocation and worshipping of Saints, the more then heathenish adoration of images & rotten reliques: the Antichristian aduancing of the Pope aboue all that is called God or worshipped: and such like doctrines of diuels & lyes of Antichrist, for the confirmation whereof the miracles of the Apostolick church of Rome haue bin inuented. But how many miracles

Sor-

sooner they produce for the countenancing of such vntuthes, they are so many arguments to proue their church Antichristian, & their Pope Antichrist. Because as Antichrist and his followers were in these latter times to abound with signes & wonders, but alwayes such as serue to lead mē into error: so neither Turks nor Iewes, nor any other churches of Christians, but onely the Pope and church of Rome, do vaunt of miracles: and yet all their miracles are such as serue to deceiue men, & to make them beleue vntuthes. And therefore although they were in respect of their substance neither counterfeite nor fabulous (as in deed the most of the miracles in the church of Rome are) yet were they to be esteemed as notes & signes of false prophets & Antichrists, because their end is to seduce mē, & confirme lyes.

5 Secondly they are called lying signes in respect of the substance, being (as *Augustine* speaketh) *vel signenta mendacium* De unitat. hominū, vel portenta fallacii spiriūū, either fictions of lying men, eccl. 1. 6. or wonders of deceiuitfull spirits. And such are the miracles whereby the aforesaide points of Poperie are warranted and confirmed. And of them there are three degrees. For many of them were such fabulous fictions, ridiculous fables, incredible lyes, (whereof their legends and festiualls are full,) as none would euer beleue, were they not intoxicated, & made drunk with the whore of Bylons cuppe of fornications, and also giuen ouer of God to beleue lyes. And these loud lyes and more then poetickall fictions were in such request in the church of Rome, that the records of them (I meane their legends & festiualls and such like fabulous treasures) were both publickly and priuately read in the vulgar tongue, whē as the holy scriptures were kept frō the people in an vnkown language. The 1. degree then is of such miracles as neuer were indeed, nor yet in appearance, but in the opiniō only of men belotted & giuen ouer to beleue incredible vntuthes. The 2. is of such as were pharastickall & in appearance only, as being crafty couētiāces of deceitfull men, or ingling tricks of legerdemaine. As for example, the nodding or mouing, the smiling or frowning, the lieweing or speaking of images, the apparitions of souls deceased, the manifold cures supposed to be wrought by hints departed, or their images & reliques, &c.

P. 4.

reliques, &c.

Miracles are
diuine testimo-
nies whereby
the Lord doth
beare witnessse
to his truth,
Heb. 2. 4.

Annal. Bajor.
lib. 4.

lib. 5.

& such like. For of these two sorts there be innumerable wonders recorded, in their legends and festiualls & liues of Saints, which are either altogether fabulous, as beeing reports of things which neuer were not so much as in apparaceor if any such things haue bene done in the sight of men, they haue bin either prestigiatory conueyances of wicked men, or mere illusions of the diuell. The third degree is of such as were lying miracles in respect of the forme (as *Bellarmino* speaketh) although true in respect of the matter. For howsoeuer they were things truly done, yet they surpassed not the whole strength of nature: whereas true miracles are supernaturall, neither can bee wrought by any naturall causes whether knowne or unknown, but onely by the omnipotent power of God. And such lying signes are the principall miracles of the Apostolicall church of Rome. Neither is the Pope and al his adherents able to produce any one true miracle wrought by the finger of God for the confirmation of those doctrines which are peculiar to that church, that is, to speake more plainelie, for the prooffe of any point of popery. But all their miracles as they are lying signes and wonders in respect of their ende, so also in regard of their substance, being either merely fabulous and therefore such things as neuer were not so much as in shewe and appareance, or merely phantasticall, that is such things as were in shewe onely and not in truth: or merely natural and therefore but counterfiteite miracles effected by the power of the diuell.

Nicol. Lyran.
in Daniel. 14.

Alexander de
Hales.

6 Some of their owne writers confesse, that sometimes there is great deceiuing of the people in fained miracles by the priests and their adherents for temporall gaine. And another faith, in the sacrament appeareth flesh, sometimes by the conueyance of men, sometimes by the operation of the diuell. I once did see an image of Saint *Nicolas* as it was said, when it with many others was burnt in the market place at Chester by the appointment of my father then Bishoppe there, which was made with such a deuise that if one standing behind did pull a certaine string which was in the back part thereof, it would moue the hand as if it blessed the people. But that it may appeare that

in

in the Church of Rome were lying miracles, and that the Popish people were giuen ouer to belsene lyes, I will for a tattle recite a few examples out of their owne records. Their Golden Legend (so called because as gold excelleth all other metals so that Booke * excelleth all other bookes) in the inuentio^{* Viz. in lying.} of the body of *S. Frenin* the martyr, reporteth that after the Sunne had miraculously sent his beames through a stone wall vpon the graue, and thereupon they had digged there to find the body, there issued thence such a sweete smel as they weened they had beene in Paradise. Which odour spread it selfe not onely through the citie of *Amiens* where the body lay, but also vnto diuerse other cities. The sweetnesse wherof as it moued the people of diuerse cities to bring their oblations to this glorious Saint: so it cured some a farre off (as the Lord of *Baugency*) from their diseases. But when this body was taken vp and caried in the citie of *Amiens*, straunge wonders were wrought. For then (that I may vse the wordes of the English Legend) the elemētes them moued, by the miracle of this Saint. The snow, that was that time great on the earth, was turned into powder and dust by the heat that was then: and the yse that hung on the trees became flowers and leaues: and the meadowes about *Amiens* flowered & became greene. And the Sunne which by his nature should goe lowe that day, ascended as high as hee is on *S. Johns* day at noone in the summer. And as men bare the body of this Saint, the trees enclined and worshipped the body, & all mauer sick men of what malady they had, they receiued health in the inuention of the blessed body of *S. Frenin* &c. In the Legend of *S. Patrick* the Irish Saint, by whose praier forsooth all venomous beastes were banished out of Ireland (for you may not thinke it was so before) wee read and reading smile, that on a time a sheepe being stolen, hee admonished all the people that whosoever had stolen it should within seven daies restore it to the owner. The 7. daies being expired, the sheepe was not restored. Then (saith the Legend) *S. Patrick* commaunded by the vertue of God, that the sheepe should bleate and erie in the belly of him that had eaten it. And so it happened that in the presence of all the people the sheepe eried and bleated

Q

in

in the belly of him that had stollen it.

7. In the Legend of the Annunciation of our Lady, wee are told of a noble Knight, who betooke himselfe vnto an Abbey: and because hee was vnlearned, there was a Master assigned vnto him. But either hee was so dull or the inuenter of the tale so doltish, that in a long time hee could learne no more but these two words, *Aue Maria*. Which words as he alwaies had in his mouth whiles he was aliue, so they grew out of his mouth when hee was dead. For these wordes (saith the Legend) he had so sore imprinted in his heart that alwaies hee had them in his mouth, wherefoeuer hee was. At the last hee died, and was buried in the Church-yard of the brethren. It happened, after that vpon his graue their grew a right faire *Floure de lyce*, and in euery flower was written in letters of gold *Aue Maria*. Of which miracle all the brethren were marueyled, and they did open the sepulchre, and found that the roote of this *Floure de lyce* came out of the mouth of the said Knight, and anon they vnderstood, that our Lord would haue him honoured for the great deuotion he had to say these wordes, *Aue Maria*. Likewise in the booke of the conformities of S. Francis, which Booke I could wishe were more common, that Popery might appeare vnto all in her colours, there is a miracle recorded for the proofe of transubstantiation; that on a time frier *Fraunceis* saying Masse did finde a spider in the Chalice, which hee would not cast out but drunke it vp with the blood. Afterward rubbing his thigh, & scratching where it itched, the spider came whole out of his thigh without any harme to either. But if the bread and wine after consecration bee turned into the very body and bloud of Christ, then more manuellous and I am sure more true is the story of victor the Pope, and *William* Archbishop of Yorke, and *Henry* of Luxemburgh the Emperour, all which were poisoned, the two first with that which was in the Chalice, and the Emperour with the hoste which a Monke had poisoned. And to these many more worthy miracles of the Church of Rome may be added. But you will say, that howsoeuer their are many miracles where in the Church of Rome glorieth, yet notwithstanding, those

speciall

speciall miracles which are assigned to Antichrist in the Scriptures, haue not beene wrought by the Pope or any of his followers.

8. This is indeed the third thing which *Bellarmino* obserueth, that whereas there are three examples of Antichrist his miracles, specified in the Scriptures: yet none of them haue bene wrought either by the Pope or any other in the church of Rome. But I answer, that of these three miracles one agreeth not to Antichrist, as shalbe shewed hereafter, and the other two agree to the Pope. For howsoeuer *Bellarmino* and other Papists from these groundes doe argue, that the Pope is not Antichrist: yet from thence may the contrary be gathered. The former of these miracles is, that Antichrist or at least his ministers shall make fire come downe from heauen. The second, that hee shall cause the image of the beast to speake. These two miracles *Bellarmino* vnderstandeth literally, and from thence argueth thus; *Antichrist or his ministers, shall make fire come downe from heauen, and shall cause the image of the beast to speake. But neither the Pope of Rome at any time, nor any of his followers haue caused fire to come downe from heauen, nor yet made the image of the beast to speake, therefore the Pope is not Antichrist.* The argument is grounded on *Apos. 13. 13.* literally vnderstood. For such is the absurde peruerseuence of the Papistes, that in other partes of Scripture which are simple and playne they doe hunt after mysticall and allegoricall senses: but in this Booke of the Revelation which is most mysticall and allegoricall, without all reason they insiste in the literal sense. As for example in that thirteenth chapter, where the holy Ghost speaketh of the marke of the beast, which the followers of Antichrist should receiue on their foreheads & on their right hands, they grossely vnderstande this of a reall and visible marke wherewithall men of all sortes should suffer themselves to be branded as the slaues or cattell of Antichrist. Where the holy Ghost speaketh of the image of the beast, which Antichrist putteth life into and causeth to speake, they vnderstand it of a materiall image animated and made to speake. Where the

Lib. 2. cap. 17.

The author of the Ward word.

Apos. 13. 13.

holy Ghost speaketh of fire to come downe from heauen, they vnderstande it of materiall fire brought downe from heauen. Which course whosoever followeth in expounding the prophecies in the Reuelation, must neuer looke to see them verified in the euent. The which I speake, not that literally they doe not agree to the Pope, but because (the mysticall sence being the more like to bee true) our aduersarie groundeth his argument wholly vpon the literall interpretation. But I will make it plaine that both these miracles agree to the Pope not onely in the mysticall sence, but also in the literall. And to that purpose let vs consider these miracles severally.

9. And first as touching that of fire, which Antichrist shall cause to descende from heauen, if it bee literally vnderstood, you shall perceiue that it agreeth to the Pope, because in diuerse Popish miracles there hath bene (as they say) fire brought downe from heauen. But seeing the place is rather to bee vnderstood mysticall and allegorically, as well as other prophecies of the Reuelation: wee are not therefore by the coming downe of fire to vnderstand literally a reall descending of materiall fire, but that which mysticall in the Scriptures is meant by the coming downe of fire from heauen. You are therefore to bee informed that descending of fire from heauen, in the Scriptures signifieth three things: 1. Gods approving of the religion and sacrifices of his seruants: 2. His sending downe of the graces of his spirit vpon his children: 3. His vengeance executed from heauen vpon his enemies. For the first, it is cleare that the Lorde in former times vsed to testifie his approbation of the religion and sacrifices of his seruants, by sending fire from heauen to consume their sacrifice: in which respect hee is said to answer them by fire from heauen. *Leuit. 9. 24. 1. Chron. 22. 26. 2. Chron. 7. 1.* wherunto some adde *Gen. 4. 4. Iud. 13. 20.* Wher as therefore the people of Israel halted between *Ishmael* and *Baal*, *Elias* to proue what *Ishmael* whom he worshipped was the true God, and his worship the true religion, by prayer miraculously caused fire to come downe from heauen to consume the

the sacrifice, *1. King. 18. 38.* Whosoever therefore doth by such signes and wonders confirm that doctrine and religion which he professeth, as though God answered him by fire from heauen, he may be said to cause fire to descend from heauen, in the sight and opinion of men; who thinke such miracles to bee wrought by the finger of God, according to this example of *Elias*, that is, so to haue confirmed his religion in the opinion of men, as if hee had with *Elias* fetched fire from heauen. If therefore the Pope of Rome or his ministers haue, by as strange signes and wonders in the opinion of men, confirmed their religion, as though God from heauen approued thereof, as hee was wont to signifie his approbation in answering by fire from heauen: they may be sayd to haue made fire to come downe from heauen, although they neuer had caused materiall fire to descend. But if besides many other strange signes and wonders which they call miracles, they haue confirmed their superstitious religion and Antichristian doctrines by bringing fire from heauen; then can it not be denyed but that this place doth most fullie and properly agree vnto them. But you must remember how *Saint Iohn* saith in the sight of men, not that they haue done so indeede, but only that they haue made men beleue so.

10 As for example, to proue that their sacrament of the altar after the words of consecration is the very body of Christ, and to be worshipped no otherwise then Christ himselfe, wee haue a narration in their festiual which was wont solemnely to be read in the church on *Corpus Christi* day: the words whereof I will recite vnto you. *Also we find (say they) that in Deneshire beside Exbridge was a woman lay sick and was nigh dead, and sent after a holy person about midnight to haue her rights. Then she man in alhast came might, ariso and went to the church, and took Gods body in a box of linnen, and put it into his bosome, and went forth towards that woman. And as he went through a forest in a faire meade that was next his way, it happened that his box fell out of his bosome into the ground: and he went forth and wist it not and came to this woman and heard her confession. And then hee asked her if she would be consfled;*

and he said, yea sir. Then he put his hand in his bosome & sought the box. And when he found it not, he was full sorie and sadde. And saide, dame, I will goe after Gods bodie and come anon againe to you, and so went forth sore weeping for his simple- nesse. And so as hee came to a willow tree hee made thereof a rodde, and stripped himselfe naked, and beat himselfe that the blood ranne downe by his sides, and saide thus to himselfe, Ah thou simple man! Why hast thou lost thy Lorde God, thy maker, thy former and creatour? And when hee had thus beate himselfe, hee did on his clothes and went on foorth. And then hee was iouare of a pillar of fire that lasted from earth to heauen, and hee was all astonied thereof, yet hee blessed himselfe and went thereto. And there lay the sacrament futen out of the boxe into the grasse, and the pillar shone as bright as any Sunne, and it lasted from Gods bodie to heauen. And all the beastes of the Forrest were comen about Gods bodie, and stood in compasse round about it, and all kneeled on foure knees, save one black horse that kneeled but on that one knee. And that blacke horse was a friend of hell, who had turned himselfe into that shape that men might steale him, as diuerse had done and were hanged for him, &c. If any man object that all this narration is a foolish fiction, I answer that this was as verillie beleueed as it was solemnelie read. And therefore to countenance their abominable idole of the masse, they haue in the sight, that is, in the iudgement, opinion, and beliefe of men; caused fire to come downe from heauen that it might point out the body, & from it reach to heauen.

11 To winne credite to such Saints as they haue canonized, and consequently to cause men the more deuoutlie to pray vnto them, to adore their images and reliques, to goe on pilgrimage to them, they haue coyned in the life or legend almost of euerie Saint, straunge and incredible miracles. And this is the ordinarie conclusion of many legendes, Then let vs pray to this worthie Saint, or glorious martyr, that he will pray to God for vs, that by his merites we may haue pardon and forgiveness of our sinnes, or something

to the like effecte. Wee reade of diuerse of their Saints, who when they haue beene beheaded haue caried their heads in their hands, some one mile, some two miles. And it is a wonder that, hasting from so sharpe a banquet, they did not leaue their heads behind them for haste. Among manie other miracles they tell vs of fire also which they haue caused to come downe from heauen in the sight, that is iudgement and opinion, of men besotted and giuen ouer to beleue their monstrous vntuthes. In the life of *Prothe* and *lavinia*, they make fire to come downe from heauen to kill *Melancy* the false accuser of *Eugene*. They haue brought downe a pillar of fire reaching from heauen vnto the earth where the bodie of *Saint Edward* the Martyr lay. Vpon the head of *Saint Martin* as hee was laying masse they haue fetched downe a tongue of fire from heauen to make him equall as they say to the Apostles. In the fable of *Saint George* they make fire to come downe from heauen to burne the idoles with their temple and priestes. In the life of *Barbara* wee reade that when her owne father beeing her persecutour had drawne his sworde to slay her, shee was miraculously taken vp in a stone and caried into a mountaine; where two shepheades were feeding their sheepe. And when one of them had bewraied her to her father, and shee in her charitie had cursed him, anon his sheepe became locustes and hee consumed into a stone. Then her father hauing apprehended her deliuered her to the iudge, who put her to death. Whereupon they bring downe fire from heauen to consume her father. Their doctrine of purgatorie and prayer for the dead, is confirmed by manie wonders and strange apparitions of soules departed, begging masses for their deliuerance out of purgatorie. And in like manner it is reported that when *Burstan* the Bishoppe of Winchester staying all night in the churchyard; as his manner was, said ouer his psalmes for the soules departed, comming to these words, *requiescant in pace* let them rest in peace, he heard the voice of an infinit number out of the grauts crying, Amen. But to this purpose also in their legend they haue made fire

Joan. L'aurius
in apocad. ad
falsit. tempor.

to descend from heaven. When as they tell us of a certaine Bishoppe, who, appearing in the clouds of heaven to another here vpon earth, did let some fire drop vpon him to giue him a taste of the torments in purgatorie. Besides these examples many other might be found if they were woorth the seeking in their fabulous writings, as also in some other of their stories which testifie that diuers times in the church of Rome, fire hath bene brought downe from heauen. But these which I haue recited may suffice: in seeking and setting downe whereof I should haue thought my time and paines not wel bestowed (such are the ridiculous fooleries of popery, wherewith the churches in the time of darknesse haue bene pestered) sauing that I considered that the more incredible the report is of Popish miracles, the more evidently it is proved, both that the Pope is Antichrist, and the Papists the followers of Antichrist, vpon whome God hath sent strong illusions that they might beleue lyes. In the first sence therefore the prophecy *Reuel.* 13. doth fite the Pope and church of Rome, who by greate signes and wonders do so confirme their Antichristian errors and superstitions in the sight, that is, in the iudgement, opinion, and beliefe of men besotted and made drunke with the whore of Babylons cuppe of fornications, as though God did seeme to approoue thereof in answering by fire from heauen. And this interpretation seemeth to be confirmed by the words; for it is not directly said that Antichrist should cause fire to come downe from heauen, but onely thus, that he doth great signes, inasmuch that fire descendeth from heauen in the sight of men. That is, inasmuch that in the iudgement of men God seemeth to answer him by fire from heauen, and to beare witness to his doctrines by miracles wrought by the finger of God.

12 But descending of fire signifieth also the bestowing of the grace of Gods spirit which is called fire *Mat. 3. 11. Act. 2.* 3. In which sence the Pope may be said to make fire come downe from heauen, but wee must adde *before men*, that is in their opinion and conceipt. For he forsooth, as the church of Rome beleaueth, giueth not onely the graces of the spirit to men, but also the power of sanctification both to men and also

to some creatures of his owne, as to his *Agnus Dei*, and his holy water sprinckle &c. And in this sence doth *Primasius* expound this place. Thirdly, the coming downe of fire signifieth the wrathfull vengeance of God executed vpon his enemies, which often in the Scriptures is called fire, to wit, the fire of Gods wrath. As *Elias* therefore brought fire from heauen to consume the two Captaines and their fifties: so Antichrist, according to this interpretation, shall with a diuine reuenge, as it were with fire from heauen, take vengeance vpon his aduersaries, but here also we must adde *before men*, who shall thinke that those against whom Antichrist shall send the thunderbolt of his wrath, are punished with a Diuine reuenge, and as it were with fire from heauen. This also is verified of the Pope of Rome, who with a diuine reuenge (as he forsooth is *Deus vindicta*, *The God of reuenge*) pursueth his enemies, but especially with the thunderbolt of excommunication as themselves doe call it. Which as it is terribly sent from this Iupiter of Rome, so is it fearefully executed with putting out and casting downe of lights from aboue, as if the fire of Gods wrath were at their commande, or as if with *Gregory* the seventh they could shake it out of their sleeves.

And well may this be reckened among the wonders of Antichrist. For it were more then a wonder, that Kings and Emperours should by excommunications from the Pope bee either so daunted in themselves or abandoned of their subiectes as some haue bene, but that the Popes haue professed and their followers haue beleued, that God himselfe doth whatsoever is done by the Pope, who being Canonically elected is a God vpon earth, and hath the same consistory and iudgement seate with God himselfe, whose vicar he would seeme to be; & consequently that those Kings and Emperours were deposed of God, who were excommunicated by the Pope: whereas other Princes and people that are not made drunke with the cuppe of their fornications haue esteemed their bulles of excommunication as *Bullas* that is bubbles, & the fire of vengeance which they cause to descend in the sight of men, as painted fire, or as the thunder and lightning of *Salomonem*, who (as the

R. Capers. de
eccl. pag. 01.
num. 52.

Gregor. 7. in e-
p. 1. ad Ger-
man. apud A-
ugustin. lib. 5.

Poet describeth him not vnlike to the Pope) *Flammæ Iouis & sonitus imitatur Olympi*, Imitateth the lightnings of Iupiter, and the thunder of heauen. But howsoeuer it is, whether this descending of fire from heauen is to be vnderstood literally or mystically, the prophecy of the holy Ghost concerning this first miracle of Antichrist is verified of the Pope and church of Rome, who haue caused fire to come downe frō heauen according to the literall sence: & according to the allegoricall interpretation they haue so confirmed their doctrines by signes & wonders, as if God had answered them by fire from heauen; and secondly they haue taken vpon them to bring downe the fire of Gods spirite, and to bestowe his grace as it pleaseth them: and lastly, they haue according to the example of *Elias* with a diuine reuenge & as it were with fire from heauen, taken vengeance of their enimies; not to speake of his punishing with fire all those that will not adore him.

13. And thus much may suffice to haue spoken of the first miracle. The second miracle (saith *Bellarmino*) is, that Antichrist or his ministers shall make the image of the beast to speake. But neuer Pope nor any minister of his did make an image to speake: therefore, saith hee, the Pope is not Antichrist. But I answer that this propheticke euen according to the Popish interpretation agreeth to the Pope and his followers, among whom it hath beene an vsuall practise to put life as it were into images in the sight and opinion of simple men, making them to sweate, to smile, to frowne, to nodde, to becke and many times to speake, which might happē without a miracle, for the Diuels sometimes did speake in the images of the Heathen. Notwithstanding wee are not after a Popish, that is to say, a grosse manner, but after a propheticall and spirituall manner to vnderstand this mysticall prophecy of the holy Ghost concerning the image of the beast. For if wee vnderstand the beast it selfe mystically, as needes wee must, or else wee shall make but a healtly interpretation of it: so wee are in like sort to expound the image of the beast with this life and speech thereof. The beast it selfe signifieth the *Romane* State especially vnder the Heathenish Emperours as hath bene

shewed.

shewed. The image therefore of the beast must signifie a State which hath some resemblance thereof, or at least the name and title of the *Romane* Empire, (as images beare the name of that which they resemble) and is indeed but an image thereof. Thus, besides the Popes courts both in Rome and other countreys, is the Empire renewed in the West, which besides the name and some titles and ornaments hath little or nothing of the olde Empire. For the old Empire consisted in the government of Rome and the provinces thereunto belonging, none of which the Emperour hath as a Soueraigne Prince by right of the Empire, and therefore is said to bee the beast which was and is not though it be, being indeed, as it is here called, but an image of the former beast. The life of this Empire is the imperiall dignity, and the speech are his edicts. Whosoever therefore caused this Empire, which in the west had lien void 325. yeares, to be renewed: whosoever at the first created this Emperour, & since hath taken order for the electiō of the Emperour, & confirmeth the electiō, he may be said to haue caused the image of the beast to be made, & to haue put life into it, & to haue procured authoritie vnto it, whereby it speaketh.

14. Now to whom all this is to bee applied, let *Bellarmino* himselfe be iudge. For he, in his bookes *De translatione imperij Romani*, by many testimonies labourerh to proue, first, that the Empire of Rome was translated, but he might better haue said renewed, in the West, and as it were reuiued by the authority of the Pope, and that *Charles* the great in whom this Empire was renewed, receiued the same by no other title but by the authority of the Pope. And that is the summe of his first booke. Secondly, that the Empire of Rome was translated from the family of *Charles* the great, and from the French nation to the family of *Otho*, and the nation of the Saxons and Germanes, and that *Otho* was aduanced to the Empire by the Pope: which is the scope of the second Booke. Thirdly, that the seven Electours of the Empire were ordained and appoynted by the Pope, which is the argument of his third booke. And in his first booke he setteth downe the State Chap. 4. of that controversie thus: the question is (saith he) who is the

author of this translation (or rather renovation: for the Empe-
rour of the East continued after vntill the yeare 1452. & before
this time had by the Popes meanes lost his right in Italy and
Rome, & therefore nothing was translated but the name & title)
& who it was that gaue the name dignity & power of the Ro-
mane Emperour, and *Cesar Augustus* in the west, to *Charler* the
great & his successors. We answer (saith he) *what which the cōsent*
of all nations proclaimeth, that Pope Leo 3. was either the only or
the chiefe and principall author of this translation: & that the
Dutch nation is to acknowledge the receipt of the Empire from
the Pope. Vnto the testimony of *Bellarmino* & of all those au-
thours whom he citeth, we will adde the professiō of the Popes
his selues. *Innocentius 3.* saith, the 7. Electours had their autho-
rity, *ab Apostolica sede, qua Romanū imperiū in persona magnifi-*
ci Caroli a Gracis transfudit in Germanos, From the See Aposto-
lick which translated the Romane Empire in the person of Charles
the great frō the Grecians to the Germans. Vpon which trans-
lation saith *Bellarmino*, *The Romane commonweale returned a-*
gaine to the same state wherein Constantine the great established
it, & wherein it remained frō Valentinian the elder, vnto Augu-
stus. Likewise *Adrian 4.* *The Romane Empire, saith he, was*
translated frō the Greekes to the Almaines, that the king of the
Almaines should not be called Emperour before he were crowned
of the Pope. Before his consecration he is king, after he is Empe-
rour. *Vnde igitur habet imperiū nisi a nobis?* From whence then
hath he the Empire but from vs? By the election of his princes he
hath the name of a king: by our consecration he hath the name of
Emperour, *Augustus, & Cesar. Ergo per nos imperat. Therefore he*
is Emperour by vs. Cull to mind Antiquities, *Zacharias* aduāced
Charles and gaue him a great name that he should be Emperour
or, *Imperator quod habet, totum habet a nobis. What sooner the*
Emperour hath, that bee hath wholly from vs. As *Zacharias*
translated the Empire from the Greekes to the Almaines, so wee
translated it from the Almaines to the Gracians. *Eccē in po-*
testate nostra est, vnde dicitur. Illud cui volumus. Behold it is in our
power to give it to whome we will. For therefore are we appointed of
God ouer nations and kingdomes, to destroy and pluck up, to build

Decret. Grego-
rian. de electi-
one. c. vltima.
Bilem.

De translat. im-
per. lib. 1. cap. 4.

Ad archiep.
Trenit. Mo-
guntin. & A-
grippin. apud
Auenin. lib. 6.


and to plant. In the Clementines it is professed that the Pope *Cap. Romani*
hath translated the Empire from the Greekes to the Germanes: *de iuratin-*
that he hath giuen power and authoritie to certaine of their
princes to elect a king to be Emperour: that the king thus cho-
sen receiueh from the Pope the approbation of his person vnto
the Empire, as also his anointing, consecration, and imperi-
all crowne: and that in respect hereof the Emperours are to
submit themselves vnto the Pope, and to bind themselves vnto
him by an oath of fealtie and obedience. And elsewhere in
their lawe it is said, *Imperator tenet imperium a Papa, vnde te-*
neur praestare iuramentum homagij, scilicet, quod vassallus praestare
solet domino suo. The Emperour holdeth his Empire from the Pope.
Whereupon, hee is bound to performe the oath of homaje, to wit,
which the vassall useth to performe vnto his Lord.

15 Thus therefore this argument is returned vpon the ad-
uersary. Whosoever causeth the image of the beast to be made, put-
teth life into it and causeth it to speake, he is undoubtedly Anti-
christ: But the Pope of Rome hath caused the image of the
beast to be made, putteth life into it, & causeth it to speake, there-
fore he is Antichrist. The assumption is proued, because the i-
mage of the beast is the Empire renewed in the west: the life is
the imperiall dignity, and the speeche are the edictes thereof.
This image the Pope causeth to be made, this hee putteth life
into, this he hath made to speake. For first he renewed the Em-
pire in the west, after it had lyeen void by the space of 325.
yeares, when hee annointed and crowned *Charles* the greates
Emperour of the west, & so caused him to be acknowledged:
after he translated the Empire to the Almaines, among whom
he hath appointed seauen electours as it were to renewe this
image, but so as himselfe putteth life therinto, by approuing
the person and satisfying the election, & maketh him to speake
by anointing him Emperour and giuing vnto him the name
and title of *Augustus* and *Cesar.* Which things I shal not need
further to proue, because they are matters wherof the Pope and
Papists do greatly boast. And therefore from their own professi-
on we may conclude that the Pope is Antichrist.

Chap. 8.

*Of the name and marke which Antichrist shall
impose vpon men of all sorts, with some
other effectes.*

Apoc. 13. 16.
17. 18.

I.  He second effect of Antichrist is noted Apoc. 13. 16. 17. 18. And hee made all both small and great, rich and poore, free and bond, so receiue a marke in their right hand or in their foreheade. And that no man might buy or sell, saue hee that had the marke, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name. Here is wisdom: let him that hath vnderstanding count the number of the beast: for it is the number of a man: and his number is six hundredth sixty and six. Of which propheticke Bellarmine saith thus. *Extentur omnes pertinere omnino ad Antichristum verba illa Ioannis Apoc. 13. &c. All men confesse that those words of Iohn Apoc. 13. doe undoubtedly belong to Antichrist.* From this ground therefore we may reason thus, *Whosoever enforceth all sorts of men according to this propheticke to take vpon them the name of the beast, or the marke, or number of his name, he is Antichrist: But the Pope of Rome enforceth all sorts of men according to this propheticke to take vpon them the name of the beast, or the marke and number of his name: therefore he is Antichrist.* For the clearing of this argument, two things are to be considered. First, what this name, number, and marke is: Secondly, whether the Pope impose the same vpon all sorts of men. The number is expressed in the text, to be 666. And it is plainlie saide to bee the number of the name. That we may not thinke it to be the number of the time when Antichrist should appeare as some haue imagined: neither can it in any good sence bee saide that Antichrist inforceth men to take vpon them the number of that time. And it is called the number

Lib. 3. de pontif. Rom. c. 10.

number of the name, because in the letters of the name this number is contained. For it is the maner of the Hebrewes and Greekes to vse their letters for notes of number, according to their order in the Alphabet &c. it is also called the nuber of a man, because (as it may seeme) the name of the beast, containing this number, is also the name of a man. And this I take to bee the most simple interpretation.

2 What the name is wherof the holy ghost here speaketh, it may easily be gathered out of the text. For 1. the holy ghost doth not speak of Antichrist his name properly, but of the name of the beast which Antichrist should cause all sorts of men to take vpon them. If therefore we know what the beast is, it will not be hard to tell what the name is. The beast whose name Antichrist shall compel men to take vpon them, is the former beast described in the beginning of the chapter. For so it is said, that Antichrist the second beast, exerciseth the authority of the former beast, that he causeth men to worship the first beast whose deadly wound was healed: that he causeth an image to be made to the beast, that he giueth spirit to the image of the beast, that he suffereth none to buy or sel which haue not the name of the beast: which cannot be vnderstood but of the former beast. Now that beast described in the former part of the chapt. is without doubt the Roman or Latin state, as hath bin proved heretofore & the Papists sometimes cōfesse, the name wherof without question is *Roman* or *Latin*. If therefore the name *Romane* or *Latin* in the learned tongues containe the nuber 666. then the name of the beast which Antichrist causeth men to take vpon them, is *Roman* or *Latin*. But in what language are we to account the nuber of the beasts name? Surely either in Greeke which is most likely, because the reuelatio was writtē in greek: or in Hebrew because the reuelatio (as some thinke) was giue in hebrew to St. Iohn being an Hebrew borne: or else we may take the beasts name according to his own language set down in Hebrew characters, because the Latines doe not vse their letters as the Hebrewes & Greeks do in numeratio. For seeing we know what the beast it self is, we might wel take that name which fitteth this nuber any of these ways. *Irenaeus* (whose matter *Polycarpus*

Lib. 5.

beene Saint Iohns disciple reporteth, that those, who had seen Iohn, face to face, did teach, that the number of the name of the beast according to the computation of the Greeke by the letters which be in it, shall containe 666. Hee therefore setteth downe three names in greeke letters containyng that number; in two whereof there is no shew of reason that either of them should be this name, seeing neither of them (I meane *Βελιδαι* & *Τουδαι*) is the name of the beast. The third name, is *Λατίναι*, whereof hee writeth thus: *Σεδ & λατίναις νομην sexcentorum sexaginta sex numerum; & valde verisimile est. Quoniam verissimum regnum hoc habet vocabulum, Latini enim sunt qui nunc regnant. But the name Latine also containeth the number 666, and it is verie likelie, because the most true kingdome hath this name. For they are Latines which now raigne. Which in effect is as much as if hee had said, the name Latine is very likelie, because it hath the number 666, and is the name of the beast which figureth verissimum regnum the most true kingdome, that is the Latin or Romane state. The name of the beast therefore in greek containyng the number, is *λατίναι*, that is to say Latine.*

Apoc. 13. 7.

3. In Hebrew the beasts name comprehending that number is *נור* that is *Romane*. For the beastes name beeing a nowne or name collectiue, may indifferently, according to the manner of the Hebrewes, be vttered either in the Masculine or Feminine gender. And the Feminine termination doth better fitte the prophecy, not onely because it rendreth the last number, but also because the beast as it is subiect to Antichrist beeing the adulterous Romane state, is elsewhere in the feminine called the whore of Babylon, and the mother of fornications. The most vitall name of the beast in it owne language, that is, the Latine tongue, is *Romane*, which in Hebrew characters is, as Master Foxe supposeth, *רומני* to the knowledge whereof as himselfe reporteth hee attained by earnest prayer. And that the name *Latine* or *Romane* in the learned tongues is the name whereof the holy ghost speaketh, it appeareth, because every thing here spoken of the name, agreeth fitly and properly thereunto. For first it is the name of the beast. Secondly

conity, he containeth the number 666, as may appear by this summation

α 30	β 200	γ 700
δ 1	ε 5	ς 40
ζ 300	η 40	θ 70
ι 1	κ 10	λ 50
μ 10	ν 10	ξ 6
ο 70	π 400	ρ 300
σ 600		
666.	666.	666.

Thirdly, it is such a name as he, to whom all other notes of Antichrist doe agree, (I meane the Pope) enforceth men to take vpon them, as shalbe shawed. Fourthly, because the name *Latine* or *Romane* is also the name of a man. For *Latine* was one of the auncient Kings of Italy, and *Romane* was one of the Popes. Wherefore I doubt not to conclude that the name is *Romane* or *Latine* in the learned tongues. For howsoeuer many others names may be produced which comprehend the number 666, yete sith they are not the name of the beast, or are such names as Antichrist was not to impose vpon men. But *Lib. 2. cap. 10.* of this, more hereafter.

4. Now lets see what that marke is whereof the holy Ghost speaketh. *Charagma* or *Chiriditer* is as it were a cognizance & a note of difference whereby men of any profession, or religion, are knowne and distinguished from others. And it is partly inward and partly outward. The inward is that which is imprinted in the soule: the outward is that which is either expressed or receiued outwardly, as namely in the forehead, or in the right hand. In the forehead that is by outward profession, and in the right hand that is by operation, as the ordinary glofe expoundeth. As for example, the character or marke of a christian or seruant of Christ is subiectio vnto Christ and acknowledgement of him to be our head & saviour. This inwardly is the grace of a true faith wrought in the soule by the finger of Gods spirit, whereby we beleue in Christ our saviour. For those that truly beleue are sealed or signed to saluation, That which

Eph. 1. 13.

S

outward.

outwardly is expressed, is either by confession of the mouth, or operation of the hands. In respect whereof, profession of the Christiana faith may truly be said to be the outward marke of a Christian, as also *determinatus modus viuendi &c.* (as the scholemēn speake) the certaine manner of liuing according to the law & religiō of Christ. So that he which beleueth with his hart & cōfesseth with his mouth that Iesus is Christ, & withal frameth his life according to the law & doctrine of Christ, he may be said to haue the marke of God *Apoc. 9. 4.* both in the heart by beleuing, & in the forehead by profession, & in the right hand by operation. See *Rom. 10. 9. 10.* & *2. Tim. 2. 19.* And furthermore the outward markes receiued to testifie our subiectiō vnto Christ & our cōmunion with him, as also to distinguish vs frō men of other religions, are the Sacramēts of Christ, as baptism and the Lords supper. And thus you see the marke of a Christian which is but one in substance, namely the true acknowledgement of Christ, is thus diuersly expressed & testified.

Apoc. 14. 11.

5. The like may be said of the marke of the beast, which is also called the marke of his name. The beast as wee haue proued is the Romane state, the name is *Romane* or *Latine*. The marke therefore of the beast is that whereby they of the Romish or Latine religion whom we call Papists, are distinguished frō others, that is their subiectiō vnto the Pope as their head and acknowledgement of the See of Rome. This inwardly in the soule is their implicite faith: whereby euery Papist is bound hand ouer head to beleue whatsoeuer the Pope or Church of Rome beleueth: and the rather because they are to be perswaded that neither of both can erre. That which outwardly is expressed is either by confession of the mouth or operation of the hands. So that the profession of the Romish religion and certaine manner of liuing according to the Lawes and customes of the Pope and church of Rome, may also be said to be the marke of Antichristians: euen as the obseruation of the Heathenish rites is called *2. Macab. 4. 10.* the Character, of the Grecians. Whosoever therefore in heart beleueth whatsoeuer the Pope & church of Rome do or shall beleue, & outwardly professeth the Romish religion & frameth his life according to the

the lawes & customes of the church of Rome, as for exāple to fall downe before images, to adore the Eucharist, to frequēt the Masse &c. he may be truly said to haue the marke of the beast. Moreover the outward markes receiued to testifie their cōmunion with the church of Rome, are certaine sacraments of their holy mother church, which as they say do *imprimere characterē indelebilem, imprimē a character that cannot be done away,* and therefore are not to be iterated, as namely their sacramēts of cōfirmatiō & orders. In the former whereof (which they prefer before baptism) all yōng ones are anointed in the forehead with oile, which they cal *Chrisma salutis, The Chrisme of saluatiō,* & without which they will haue none to be accepted christians. *Nunquā erit Christi unus* (say they in their law) *nisi cōfirmatione De consecrat. episcopali fuerit Chrysma.* In the latter, those of their clergy dist. 5. c. vi. besides their shauing on their heads, are anointed also on their heads, as Bishops, or on their hands as Priests. Thus you see also how the Characteristicall note or marke of Antichristians which is one in substance, namely subiectiō to the Pope & acknowledgement of the See of Rome, is diuersly expressed & testified. Whosoever therefore since the reuelation of Antichrist is a *Romane* or *Latine* in respect of his religiō, acknowledging the Popes supremacy, & professing himselfe a mēber of the church of Rome, that is to say, in one word euery resolute Papist, hath the marke of the beast, his name and number of his name.

6. Now it remaineth that, by application of this prophecy to the Pope, I should shewe that *hee causeth all both small and great, rich and poore, free and bonde, that hee should giue them a marke in their right hand or in their foreheads: And that no man might buy or sell, save hee that had the marke, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name.* Whereby thus much is meant, that Antichrist by his vsurped dominion and tyranny should make all sortes of men subiect vnto him, and to testifie their subiectiō both by wordes and deed: and that hee should suffer none to liue among them or to enioy the benefites of humane society, but such as acknowledge the See of Rome, profess themselves members of the Romane church, and vse the Latine religion and seruice. All which doth fully and only agree to the Pope of Rome. For

he, by his diuelish policy vsurped authority, lying wōders & al
deceitableness of vniuersoulesse, had not onely brought all
men both high & lowe into subiection, but also perswaded the
that vpon necessity of saluation, and paine of damnation, they
were to subiect theselues vnto him, & both by word and deed
to testifie their subiection. Hereunto belōgeth that oracle (for
sometimes they cal their their decrees) of Baniface 8. Subessa

Extr. de Maior.
et obed. c. vñ
sanctum.

(saith he) *Romano pontifici, omni humana creatura declaramus,
dicimus, definimus & pronunciamus omnino esse de necessitate sa-
lutis. To every humane creature we declare, affirme, define, and
prouince, that to be subiect to the Pope of Rome it is a matter
altogether necessary to saluation.* Whereupon the glossa saith,
*Quicquid saluatur est sub Romano pontifice. Whatsoeuer is sa-
ued, is subiect to the Pope.* The same is concluded by Thomas

Lib. de error.
Grecor. c. 72.
Antonin. sum.
3. part. tit. 22.
c. 6. s. 5.
An. 884.

Aquinas, and others, *That to be subiect to the Pope is of the ne-
cessitie of saluation.* Stephanus 5. alias 6. decreed that such
Canons as were concluded vpon and given out by the See of
Rome, are of necessity vnto saluation to bee obserued, *Ca-*

Ex. I. Bal. ast.
pontif. Rom.
Capistran fol.
26.
Cusert. pag. 46.
in summar.
num. 3.
Capert. pag. 36.
num. 21.

liximus 3. straitly forbad any to dissent from the Church of
Rome, for as the *Sauour* came to doe the will of his Father, so
Christians must do the will of their mother the church of Rome.
For to gainsay the Church of Rome is Heresie. Those which
danie the Pope to haue both powers, deny the Gospell: and they
which deny the Pope to haue the primacy of the vniuersall

Capistran fol.
32.

Church, their error is equal to the error of the Grecians, who
deny the holy Ghost to proceed both from the Father and the
Sonne. If therefore thou wilt not be an Heretike this must be thy
saith, that as there is one God immutable, so there is one vicar
general of God vpon earth (namely the vicar of Rome) whose

Clementin. lib.
5. de hereticis.
cap. ad nostrum
in Gloss.

saith, *For saing in the triumphant church there is one su-
preme prince to whose obedience all that church is most perfectly*

Anton. part. 3.
tit. 22. cap. 6.

*subiect, so via, God: it followeth necessarily that one supreme prince
is prebonds aen the whole militant Church, to wite, the Pope,*

9. 1.
Ibid. cap. 5. s.
27. ex Gloss.

*whose preceptes all are bound to obey. And this primed ge Christ
hath giue to the church of Rome, that al must be obedient vnto it,*

ordin. Papa ap.
p. 122.

*ne vñ a Christi. Therefore he susteineth the sentence of condēnatio
dei contemporāia, who conuinceth the Popes obedience as if he con-*

uincid.

uincid. *Gods omnipotency.* And to conclude, as I began, with an
other oracle or canon of their law, *Pecatum igitur paganis-
mū incurrit, quisquis dum Christianum se esse asserit, sed apostoli-
ca obedire contemnit. He incurreth therefore the sinne of Paga-
nisme, who soeuer professing himselfe to be a Christian, renoun-
ceth obedience to the See apostolike.*

7 And as he hath made all to subiect themselves vnto him,
all I meane whose names are not written in the booke of the
lambe, (for this is the vniuersality that the Papiſts bragge of)
so he hath caused all both small and great, rich and poore &c.
to testifie their subiection; as namely by plowing their faith on
his fleec, and binding themselves to beleue as he beleueth:
by professing his Antichristian faith and religion of poperie;
by obseruing his popish lawes, as to say superstitious and idola-
trous rites and customes, as frequenting masses, adoring ima-
ges and reliques, worshipping the crosse and Eucharist, pray-
ing to Saintes yea to Rocks and Stones, going on pilgrimage,
praying in latine and charon beades, &c. by taking his marke
both on the forehead in the sacrament of confirmation, and on
the hand in the sacrament of orders, but especially by taking
an oath of fidelity and obedience vnto him: For therein espe-
ciallie they receiue his mark both in the forehead by steepe
profession, and in the right hand which they lay on the booke.

This oath not onely graduates, prelates, Bishoppes, but Kings
also and Emperours were compelled to take. And whereas it is
said that Antichrist should take order that none might buy or
sell, vnlesse he haue the marke, or the name of the beast or the
number of his name: that speech doeth so fitte the Popes of
Rome as that it might seeme rather to bee a narration of that
which they haue done, than a prophety of that which they
were to doe. For Martin 4. in his bull annexed to the council
of Constance giueth straight charge to all gōernours, that they
should not suffer any Christians (such as John Wicklesse, John
Husse and Jerome of Prage who in that Bull are condemned
for hereticks) who acknowledge no other the See of Rome, nor em-
brace the doctrines and traditions of holy mother church, nor
beleueing as the church of Rome beleueth, nor liuing in:

S. 3.

the.

vid. Medit.
I. Fox in 4.
cap. Apoc.
Denei. Gre-
gori. libro 2.
tit. 24. de in-
reuer. c. Ego N.
Clementin. lib.
3. de inreuer.
Romani.

the communion of that church, that is to say, which have not the marke, nor the name of the beast, nor number of his name, they should not suffer them I say, *domilia tenere, lavam fouere, contrahere inire negotiationes & mercaturas quaslibet exercere, aut humanitatis solacia cum Christi fidelibus habere.* To keepe house nor harib, to make conuents, to exercise any trafficke or merchandise, or to haue any comforts of humane societie with other Christians. In like sort *Paulus* 3. when *Henry* 8. of famous memory had shaken of his yoke, and renounced his marke, he forbade al men to vse any trafficke or merchandise, or to make any contractes or covenants with him and his subiects: he deposed as much as in him lay, by his bull of excommunication, the king, disabled his posteritie, absolved his subiects from obedience, exposed his subiectes and their goods to violence and spoile, according to the inscription in his coyne, *Gens & regnum quod non seruiert mihi exterminabitur.* The nation or kingdome which serueth not mee, shall bee rooted out. The like thunderbolt *Pius* 5. sent out against our Soueraigne Ladie of blessed memorie *Queene Elizabeth*: and *Sixtus* 5. against *Henrie* the king of Nauarre (now king of France) and *Henrie* prince of Condee. And heereunto serue their bloodie inquisitors at this day: who are to suffer none to liue, or to haue the benefite of humane societie, who are but suspected of schisme or heretic. And who is an hereticke? That doth not beleue as the Pope and church of Rome beleueeth; though hee beleue according to the scriptures. And who is a schismaticke? That doth not acknowledge the Pope to bee the head of the church. Seeing therefore the Pope of Rome causeth all sortes of men to take vpon them the marke of the beast, and suffereth none to buy or sell that haue not the marke or name of the beast or number of his name, it cannot bee auoided but that hee is Antichrist.

8 And these were the principall effects of Antichrist noted in the scriptures: whereunto some others may bee added out of *Apo.* 13. which haue in part bene touched heretofore: as first, that he exerciseth al the power of the former beast

secondly

secondly that he causeth men to worshippe the former beast, thirdly that he forceth men vpon paine of death to worshippe the image of the beast. All which, as well as the former, agree to the Pope. For as touching the first, who knoweth not that the Pope hath swayed the Romane state for many hundred yeares? exercising a more soueraigne and absolute authoritie ouer men of all sorts; then euer the heathenish Emperours did. For hee forsooth hath the authoritie of the king *Bahl. in c. 1. of kings ouer his subiects*; hee is *perpetuus dictator, whom* *the princes of the world adore and worshippe*: hee is as *Rom. in. v. 11. the eighth in the greates libile Anno. 1300.* (hauling shewed himselfe the one daye in his pontificall vestimentes, and the second in the imperiall robes) proclaimed of himselfe, *I am Pope and Emperour, I haue both the heauenlie and the earthy Empire*, and as they speake in their lawe, *the Monarchs of both powers*: hee hath the princehood of the whole world, as wee haue heard before. And where doth he exercise this authoritie? in the sight of the beast, that is, at Rome, which is his Papall seate, and in the gouernements whereof hee succeedeth the Emperours.

9 And that the Pope maketh the inhabitants of the earth to worship the former beast, it is as euident; seeing his main policies and chief indeauours serue to magnifie the Romane state. To this end, besides many other policies in part observed before, do his lubieyes tend: wherein he vseth to promise plenary remission of al finnes to all that either come on pilgrimage to Rome, or miscarie in their iourney: as also the incredible indulgences and pardons which hee graunreth to those which shall come as Pilgrims to Rome, to visite the holie places there, especially the 7. churches which are priuiledged about the rest. To which purpose there is reported in an old English book, (and therepore no doubt as euident in times of popery) the whole pardon of Rome granted by diuerse Popes, a part whereof I will briefly recite for their behoofe, to whome the absurdities of Poperie are not knowne. The seauen priuiledged churches, whereof not onely that Authour

Annals London.

De 7. vitiis. c. 51.

speakeih, but *Quaprin* also of late hath written a whole booke, are 1. the church of Saint Peter in the Varican: 2. the church of Saint Paul without the walles: 3. the church of Saint Laurence without the walles: 4. the church of holy crosse in Jerusalem: 5. the church of Saint Mary Maior: 6. the church of Saint Sebastiane without the city: 7. the church of Saint John Laterane. To whiche church daily goe to the church of Saint Peter, Syluester graunted the third part of all their sinnes released, and 2800. yeares pardon. And the meritis of as many Lenton or *Quarins*. Now a *Quarin* saith my author is to goe without shooes and barefoot seuen yeares, and to fast bread and water on the frydayes, and to faste one night where he sleepeth another, to come under no covered place unless he be to heare masse in the church dove or porche pavane or drinke out of no other vessel but in the same that he made his vowe in. Hee that doth all these points seuen yeares together, doth and winneth a *quarin* that is to say, a Lenton. Besides, there is an image of our Lord in the church dove, having between his feete one of the pence that God was sold for, as oft as you looke upon that penny, you have 1400. yeares of pardon. In that church be eleven altars, of which 7. are specially priviledged with grace and pardon. At the first altar is the vylage of our Lord which looketh on that, hath 700. yeares of pardon, &c. Before the quene doore stand 2. ierusalem crosse, which kisseth the crosse hath 500. yeares pardon. From the annunciation to the assumption of our Lady, hangerth a cloth of our Ladies owne making before the quire, and as many times as a man kisseth it he hath 400. yeares of pardon, &c.

2. 10 They that visite the church of Saint Paul without the walles have 2800. yeares of pardon. Item on Childermasse day 4000. yeares of pardon. Item on the vias of Saint Martin when the church was halloved 14000. yeares of pardon, and as many *quarins*, and the third part of all sinnes released. Those that visite the church of Saint Laurence, at the high altar have 18000. yeares of pardon, and as many *quarins*. And who goeth thither every wednesday be delivered a soule out of purgatory, & himself quite of all sinnes. In the church of Saint Peter that is of holy crosse is given an hundred thousand yeares of pardon and as many

many *quarins*, and every Sunday a soule out of Purgatory, and the third part of all sinnes released. To the that visite the church of S. Mary Maior, is graunted, at the high Altar 14000. yeares of pardon, & as many *quarins*: And at the altar on the right hand 19000. yeares of pardon. And Pope Nicolas the 4. & S. Gregory each of them grunted thereto 10000. yeares of pardon. And fro the Ascensio of our Lord unto Christmas, yee have there 14000. yeares of pardon, and as many *quarins*, and the third part of all sinns released. To them that visite the church of S. Sebastiane is granted forgiveness of sinnes and all penance. At the high Altar is given 2800. yeares of pardon, and at the first Altar in the Church, 2400. There is a warte where he buried 49. Popes that were Martyrs: whose commeth first into that place delivereth 8. soules out of Purgatory of such as hee most desireth, and as much pardon thereto, that all the worlde cannot number nor reckon. And every Sunday you deliver there a soule out of purgatory. In that warte standeth a pitte in which Peter and Paule were hidde 250. yeares, he that putteth his head into that pitte and taketh it out againe, is cleane of all sinnes. To that place sine Popes each of them granted at thousand yeares of pardon, and as many *karins*. And so the grace that is at S. Sebastians is grounded that it cannot be taken away. To those that visit the Church of S. John Laterane, Pope Syluester gave as many yeares of pardon, as it rained dropes of water the day that he halloved the same Church. And that time it rayned so sore, that no man had seene a greater rayne before that day. And when hee had graunted this, hee doubted whether hee had so much power. Then a voice came from heauen, and said, Pope Syluester, thou haste power enough to give that pardon. And God graunted this much thereto, that if a man had made a vowe to Ierusalem, and lacked good to doe his Pilgrimage, if hee goe from S. Peters Church to S. John Lateranes, hee shalbe absolved from that promise. And any time that a man cometh to Saint John Lateranes, hee is quite of all sinnes, and of all penance, with that that he be penitent for his sinnes. Bleffed is the mother that beareth the child that beareth Masse on Saterdayes at Saint John Lateranes. For hee delivered all them


them that bee desired out of Purgatory to the number of 77. foules. Item on the tower of the Church standeth a double crosse, that was made of the sword wherewith Saint Iohn was beheaded, and euerytime a man beholdeth that crosse hee hath 14000. yeares Pardon. At the high altar a man may haue remission of all finnes, and of all penance, and innumerable pardon more then he needeth for himselfe. There is a graine wherem Saint Iohn laid himselfe, hee that putteth therein his head hee hath an hundred thousand yeares of pardon, and as many karins. These indulgences with many such like (which for breuity sake I omitte) my Authour saith are written in a Marble stone before the Quire dore &c. Besides these seuen, there are many inferiour Churches wherunto great indulgences have bene granted by the Popes. There are named in the aforesaid Booke 26. Churches, wherein is graunted, to them that visit any of them, 1000. yeares pardon, and in some 3000, in others 5000. some, wherein promise is made of release from a third parte of finnes, and in some from all finnes. Here is a Church of Saint Gregory, in which whosoever is buried, hee shall neuer be damned. Thus (saith my Authour) may a man haue at Rome great pardon and soule health, blessed beene the people and in good time borne that receiveth these graces and well keepeth them &c.

11. Hereby it appeareth that the Pope causeth the inhabitants of the earth to worship the beast with seuen heads, that is, seuen hilles: that with the citie of Rome (which wee haue proued to bee the whore of Babylon) the inhabitants of the earth haue committed spirituall fornication, and that with the cuppe of her fornications they haue beene infatuated and made drunke. And that the Pope hath caused men vpon paine of death to worshippinge the image of the beast which he hath animated and put life into, it is easie to proue, whether you vnderstande it literally or mystically. For literally, as they haue put life and motion into images and made them to speake in the sight of men: so haue they suffered none to liue that would not participate with them in their idolatry which they call worshipping of images. Mystically

stically the image signifieth either the Popes court, or Empire renewed, or both: the one resembling the authority and power, the other bearing the name and representing the dignity of the old Empire. Of the Popes court at Rome, and of his Legates and Officers abroad there is no question to be made, but that none are suffered to liue which worshippinge not them. And it is true also of the Empire. But by worshippinge the image of the beast, wee doe not vnderstand obedience to the Emperour in his lawfull decrees: but the obedience performed vnto him as hee is an image of the persecuting Emperours, inspired by the Pope, and seruing as his minister to establish and propagate the Romish religion. In this sence as hee who obeyeth him worshippeth the image of the beast, and is in the same predicament with those that receiue the marke of the beast, *Apoc. 14. 9.* So hee that obeyeth him not is put to death; and dying in this quarell is in the same happy state with those which refuse to receiue the marke of the beast. *Apoc. 14. 13.*

CHAP. 9.

¶ Of those things which Antichrist was and is to suffer.

1.  E haue heard what Antichrist was to doe to others: now let vs consider what the holy Ghost foretelleth shall be done vnto him. There is mention made *Apoc. 17. 12.* of the *Apoc. 17. ten hornes*, that is the rulers of the ten provinces subiect to the Empire in the West; who although in the Apostles time had not receiued kingdome or soueraigne authority, but were deputies onely vnder the Emperour: yet after the decay of the Empire in the west, they together with Antichrist diuide the Romane Empire among them, reigning by soueraigne authority, he in Rome and part of Italy, they in the other provinces. Of these ten hornes it is said, that they for a time should *giue their power and strength* *verf 13.* *to the*

to the beast, meaning Antichrist: and that in his quarell they shall fight against Christ the lambe in his members. But the blood of Martyrs being the seede of the Church, and the truth preuailing when it is most oppugned: Christ by the constancie of his Martyrs and preaching of his word *ouercometh*. For though in respect of the manner of his resistance hee seemeth a meeke lambe: yet hee shall be sure to overcome, because he is the king of kings and Lord of Lords; being able by weak and foolish things (as they are esteemed in the world) to overcome the wise and strong. And howsoever those fewe in comparison that stonde with him were condemned for hereticks and schismatickes, yet are they the called, chosen, and faithfull seruants of the Lord. Whereas contrarywise the generall multitudes (whereof the catholicke apostasy consisteth) are the slaues of Antichrist, and subiect to the whore of Babylon. For the waters whereon she sitteth, are peoples and multitudes, nations and tongues. But when as our Saviour Christ shall discover Antichrist, and by the ministry of the word, as it were the breath of his mouth, waste and consume him: then shall the ten kings, which before had ioyned with him, set themselves against him: and those which before had committed fornication with the whore of Babylon, shall hate her and make her desolate and naked, and shall eat her flesh and shall burne her with fire. And that this decay of the Antichristian state doth follow vpon the preaching of the gospell, it appeareth *Apoc. 17. 1. 6. 7. 8.* where it is said that vpon the preaching of the euerglasting Gospell, an angell saith, *It is fallen, it is fallen, Babylon that great city: for shee gaue to all nations to drinke the wine of the wrath of her fornication.* For vntill this time that Christ discover Antichrist and in some measure consume him with the spirite of his mouth, the ten kings are giuen ouer of God to support with one consent the beast and purple harlot; whome, after Antichrist is discouered, they shall hate and oppugne.

2 But let vs come to the application. For euen as from this place I proued before that Antichrist is already come; so may I now from hence conclude that the Pope is that Antichrist. That Antichrist is come, it is as certaine as that the prouinces

of the Empire are not ruled by deputies of the Emperour, but by soueraigne princes, who haue together with Antichrist diuided the Empire among them. And that the Pope is that Antichrist it is as certaine: For he it is, who, as well as the kings, hath risen by the decay of the Empire in the west: he it is, and no other, to whome these kings haue with one consent giuen their strength and power, submitting themselves vnto him as his vassalls, swearing to mainetaine and support him, fighting his battailes and drawing their sword at his becke. And being made drunke with the cuppe of his fornications they fought against the lambe, and persecuted those seruants of Christ whom Antichrist condemneth as hereticks and schismatickes: who notwithstanding are in truth the called, chosen, & faithfull; though few and despised in the world. When as contrarywise the vniuersality of people whereon the whore of Babylon sitteth, and whereof the adulterous church of Rome consisteth, are but the branded slaues of Antichrist. But howsoever these kings, whiles they were besotted and giuen ouer of God in his iust iudgement that they should submit themselves to the Antichrist of Rome, did seeke by all meanes to support him; yet when Christ had discovered him to be Antichrist, and by the preaching of his word as it were the spirite of his mouth began to waste & consume him, and more and more since the times of Luther to abate the opinion which men had conceiued of him; then these princes, not al, but some of them, began to reuolt from Antichrist, and to hate the Antichristian whore of Babylon the city and church of Rome, and as much as in them lyeth haue left her desolate and naked: and the rest in Gods good time shall accomplish his will. For this prophecie concerning that which Antichrist was to suffer, is as yet fulfilled but in part. And still there remaineth to bee fulfilled the finall destruction of Rome the seat of Antichrist, before the end of the world, foretold *Apoc. 18.* and the finall overthrowe of Antichrist at the glorious appearing of Christ at his second coming prophesied *2. Thess. 2. 8. Apoc. 19. 20.* Seeing therefore Antichrist the great enemy of Christ and his church is to be overthrowne by these three meanes, by the powerfull mi-

ministry of the word, by the puissant strength and power of Christian princes, by the glorious comming of Christ to iudgment; all faithfull ministers are to bee stirred vp serionslie and earnestly to oppose themselves against Antichrist, that by their ministry as it were the spirite of Chrills mouth, he may bee more and more wasted and consumed. All true Christian princes are to be excited not onely to hate the whore of Babylon, but also according to the prophecie of the holy ghost to make her desolate and naked, to eate her flesh and burne her with fire, & to do to her children as she hath done to the seruants of Christ. And finally all sound Christians are to be exhorted, earnestly and continually to pray that the Lord Iesus would not onely consume Antichrist, giuing successe to the ministerie of his seruants: but also that he would hasten his second coming and destroy him at his glorious appearing. *Euen so Lord Iesu, come quicklie.* And thus haue I shewed that the prophecies of

Apoc. 18. 6.

Ap. 22. 17. 20.

Conclus

the holy ghost in the scriptures concerning Antichrist do most fitly and properly agree to the Pope of Rome: whereupon I doe necessarily conclude, that therefore the Pope of Rome is the graund Antichrist described in the scriptures.

FINIS.

H. R. Key. 4. p. 49
vp. 2. r. 49. 13.



THE SECOND BOOKE

*maintaining that the Pope
is Antichrist.*

*The first Chapter, answering Bellarmine his first argument
concerning the name Antichrist.*

HAVING in the former Booke sufficiently proved by evident demonstration out of the worde of God, that the Pope of Rome is Antichrist: it remained that we should maintaine this our assertion against the arguments of the Papists. For as the force & evidence of our proofes may perswade vs to embrace this truth; so the weaknesse and sophistry, which appeareth in the objections of our adversaries may confirme vs in this perswasion. And the rather if we consider either the weight of this controuersie it selfe, or their will and skill to maintaine their part; or lastly, the aduantage which they seeme to haue in this controuersie. For first the controuersie it selfe is of such consequence, as that if our assertion be true, then is all Popery overthrowne, and all controuersies betwixt vs and them easily decided: then are all Papists liues of Antichrist, and all their doctrines peculiar to them, errors of Antichrist. And if you respect their will, you neede not doubte, but that they, being wholly deuoted vnto the Pope, haue done their best endeour to free their head and Lord from all imputation of Antichristianisme. And for their skill, they being men of great learning and much reading, you may bee well assured that they haue scarcely omitted any thing, which may be said in so weighty a cause. And questionlesse, they haue no small aduantage in
A this

this controuersie being to prooue the negatiue part. For whereas we cannot prooue the affirmatiue but by the concurrence of those manifold properties and markes which the holy Ghost hath assigned vnto Antichrist: they on the other side haue libertie to disprooue the same, and to prooue the negatiue, if they can but shew plainly & evidently, that any one seuerall and essentiall marke, ascribed vnto Antichrist in the Scriptures, dooth not agree to their Lord God the Pope. For if the Scriptures foretell vs as touching the place, that Antichrist shall haue his seat in *Babylon*, that is, Rome, which being situated on seauen hils, had in the Apostles time vnder the Emperour, and since vnder the Pope, dominion ouer the Kings of the earth, and that in Rome, professing her selfe the Church of God, because it is said, that Antichrist shall sit in the Temple of God: as concerning the time, that he should sit in Rome, after the remoouing and taking away of the Emperours, whom hee was to succede in the gouernement of Rome, as hath bene shewed out of these places, *2. Thes. 2. 7. 8. Apoc. 13. and 17.* and in respect of his conditions and qualities, that he should be for opposition an aduersary, although a disguised enemy; for pride and ambition, aduancing himselfe about all that is called God: for his other vices, a man of blime in generall, and more specially an horrible idolatour: in regard of his effects, that he and his followers should be workers of signes and wonders in the sight of men, that he should compell all sorts of men to receiue the marke or name of the beast, or number of his name: and lastly, for that which he was to suffer, that Christ shall consume him with the breath of his mouth, that is, the Ministerie of the Gospell; and that thereupon the ten hornes which first assisted him, shall afterwards assault him: It followeth therefore, that vnto such as we assume to be Antichrist, all these notes are to be applied, (as we haue applied them all to the Pope of Rome) whereas contrariwise the deniall of any one essentiall propertie, is an argument sufficient to prooue the negatiue. As for example, if any man will take vpon him to prooue, that the Turke is Antichrist, because some of the markes seeme to suite him, he shall neuer bee able to prooue it, because all the properties doe not agree vnto him. For neither hath he his seat in Rome, neither dooth he sit in the Church of God, neither is he a couert and disguised, but an open and professed enemy: neither may he be matched

with

with the true Antichrist, either in aduancing himselfe about all that is called God, or in idolatry, or in lying signes and wonders, &c. And from any of these we may reason thus. Antichrist was to haue his seat in Rome, which is mysticall *Babylon*: the Turke hath not his seat there: therefore he is not Antichrist. Antichrist sitteth in the Church of God: the Turke dooth not, &c. wherfore much more easie it were to prooue the negatiue, if it were true, then the affirmatiue. If therefore the Papists hauing bent all their forces, and imploied the vttermost of their skill, to prooue that which were most easie to prooue, if it were true, shall notwithstanding be found vnable to produce any one sound and sufficient argument, to cleare their Pope from Antichristianisme: haue not we just cause to confirme our selues in that truth, which before hath bene demonstrated, *viz.* that the Pope is Antichrist?

2. Let vs therefore consider their arguments, and conceits whereupon their arguments are grounded: not as they are propounded by the elder Papists, which liued in the daies of our forefathers (for their conceits concerning Antichrist were meere dotages) but as they are deliuered by the refiners of Poperie the Iesuits, and namely by *Belarmine*, whose bookes are as it were a shot whereunto many of them, as it seemeth, haue contributed. *Belarmine* therefore in his third booke *De pontifice Romano* reduceth all his arguments to nine heads. 1. Concerning the name Antichrist. 2. Concerning his person, whether he be but one man, or a state and succession of men. 3. Concerning the time of his coming, and death. 4. Of his proper name. 5. Of his nation & followers. 6. Of his seat. 7. Of his doctrine and maners. 8. Of his miracles. 9. Of his reigne & batels. From all which he hopeth (although in vaine) to prooue, that the Pope is not Antichrist.

3. And first from the name he argueth thus: *Antichrist* is hostis & emulus Christi, that is, such an enemy as is opposed vnto Christ in emulation of like honour: The Pope is not an enemy, nor opposed vnto Christ in emulation of like honour: therefore the Pope is not Antichrist. The proposition which we not onely graunt, but also take to be the ground of some of our proofes, that he labourerth to prooue, & in that proofe spendeth almost the whole first chapter. But the assumption, wherein is all the controuersie betwixt vs and them, that in a manner he

See lib. i.
cap. 4. §. 1.

Loc. Comm.
cap. de po-
restate Anti-
christorum.

For which of our writers ever denied, that *Antichristos* significeth *hostem et anulum Christi*? what though *Musculus* also saith, that Antichrist is he, who being an enemy vnto Christ, professeth himselfe to be his vicar, and saith that the word may signifie so much; yet he denieth not the former signification, but retaineth the same with this addition: That Antichrist is such an one as challengeth vnto himselfe the office and authoritie of Christ himselfe, and being indeed an enemy, & a counter-Christ, professeth himselfe to be the Vicar or Vicegerent of Christ vpon earth. And this may be proued by the signification of the name. For *anti* in composition, commonly signifieth three things; opposition, equality, substitution. Opposition, as in the word *antipodius*, *antiphor*: equality, as *antipus*, *antipus*: substitution, as *antipater*, *Proconsul*, *antipater*, *Proprietor* or *Legatus Prætoris*; *antipater*, the putting of one case for another: and in this sense the sacraments of the new Testament, substituted and ordained instead of the old, are called the *antitum* of them. And all these significations sometimes are incident to one and the same worde. As *antipater*, signifieth sometimes, *contrarius partis ducem*, the chieftaine of the contrary parts sometime *proprætorem*, that is, one who in the prouince hath the same authoritie which the Prætor hath in the city: sometimes also him *qui est vice prætoris*, as the Lieutenant or deputie. In like sort, all these significations may be applied to the word *Antichristos*, and it in them all most sely agreeth to the Pope. Who being indeed an enemy vnto Christ, and challenging vnto himselfe the office and authoritie of Christ, as if he were a counter-Christ, doth also professeth himselfe to be the Vicar of Christ.

Vltio modo.

4. Yea, but saith *Bellarmino*, *Antichrist* cannot by any meanes signifie the vicar of Christ: first because *anti* properly signifieth opposition, I answer, that *anti* simply signifieth for; & in composition, as many times it signifieth against, so sometimes also equal or like, & sometimes for or instead, as Greeke writers & Lexicographers do teach, &c. *S. condly*, we must (saith he) vnderstand the word as it is vsed in the Scriptures. But in the Scriptures it is vsed to signifie an enemy of Christ, which we doe confesse: albeit his proues are ridiculous, alledging, 2. Thes. 2. Mat. 24. where the word *antichristos* is not once vsed, Notwithstanding we accept his ground: that we are so to vnderstand the word Antichrist, as it is vsed in the Scriptures. Now it is vsed in the epistles of *Iohn* onely, and

and there ascribed not to open and professed enemies, but to such as being enemies, notwithstanding professed the name of Christ, as the heretiques of those times. Thirdly, at those authors (saith he) which haue written of Antichrist, haue vnder that name vnderstood a notable false Christ, who shall affirme himselfe to be Christ. If they meane that Antichrist shall be such a false Christ, as shall plainly and directly affirme himselfe to be Christ the onely Messias, that affirmation agreeth not with that Antichrist whom the Scriptures describe. If they hold that although in words he professeth himselfe a follower and seruant of Christ, and yet indeed obtrudeth himselfe vpon the Church, as if he were Christ, taking vpon him the titles, attributes, offices and authoritie of Christ, which in effect is as much as if he should say; I am Christ (Christ being a name of office) we also confesse so much, and withall professeth, that the name Antichrist in this signification, most sely agreeth vnto the Pope. Fourthly, he alledgeth *Henry Stephen*: but neither he nor any approoued Author denieth, but that *Antichristus* may signifie him, who being an enemy of Christ, professeth himselfe to be his vicar. And therefore all these foure arguments are frivolous: for although *Antichrist* do signifie an enemy to Christ, yet that doth not hinder but that it may signifie him which is the Vicar of Christ; because he which in profession is the vicar of Christ, may indeed be the enemy of Christ. 2. Because the composition of the word importeth so much. 3. Because the beast which figureth Antichrist, is said to haue two hornes like the Lambe: for horne in the Scripture signifieth power, & the two hornes his two-fold soueraigne power: whofoeuer therefore challengeth this twofold power, as the Vicegerent of Christ, he hath two hornes like the lambe: and the same person, as he is the Vicar of Christ in profession, so is he also that Antichrist, which is resembled by the two horned beast. The Scriptures therefore describe Antichrist, both as an enemy of Christ, and as the Vicar of Christ: an enemy indeed, and Vicar in profession.

5. And so much of his proposition, which we hold to be most true, that Antichrist according to the signification of the word, is *hostis & anulus Christi*, but withall we adde, that the word may signifie also such an aduersary as obtrudeth himselfe vnto the Church, as a *Prochristus*, that is, as a vicar of Christ. Let vs therefore come to his assumption, & consider how he proueth that the Pope is not *hostis & anulus Christi*, An enemy, & one that seeketh to match himselfe with Christ. Forsooth;

because the Pope confesseth himselfe to be the seruant of Christ, and subiect vnto him in all things: neither doth he by any meanes say, that he is Christ, nor make himselfe equall vnto him. As if he should say, he that professeth himselfe to be the seruant of Christ, is not an enemy of Christ, and he that dooth not call himselfe Christ, nor make himselfe equall vnto him, he is not *emulus Christi*. As touching the former, I answer, that vlesse the Pope did confesse himselfe to bee the seruant of Christ, he could not be such an aduersarie as Antichrist is described to be in the Scriptures, that is, a couert and disguised enemy, who vnder the name and profession of Christ, oppugneeth Christ and his truth. And what though he professeth himselfe to be the seruant of Christ, dooth it therefore follow, that he is not an enemy to Christ? Surely no more then it followeth, he is *seruus servorum Dei* indeed; because he calleth himselfe so. Deceiuers, such as Antichrist is, pretend good names: false Prophets, such as Antichrist is, are Wolves in Sheepe skinnies: neither are any enemies so pernicious or dangerous, as those which make semblance of friendship. And that the Pope is *emulus Christi*, that is, an aduersarie opposed vnto Christ in emulation of like honour, we haue prooued heretofore at large, shewing how in many things he matcheth himselfe with Christ, and in some things aduanceth himselfe aboue him. So that the former part of his speech dooth not prooue his assumption, as being inconsequent, the latter needeth prooue, as being vntue. And yet this is all that he bringeth to prooue, that the Pope is not *hominis et amulus Christi*. But the vntueth of this assumption, we haue heretofore demonstrated at large, when as we concluded thus: He that is such an aduersarie as is described in the Scriptures, opposed vnto Christ in emulation of like honour, he is Antichrist as the Papists confesse: But the Pope is such an aduersarie as is described in the Scriptures, opposed vnto Christ in emulation of like honour, as we then prooued at large: therefore the Pope is Antichrist.

The seru-
ant of
Gods ser-
uants.

2 lib. 1. cap.
4. et 5.

The

The second Chapter: maintaining that Antichrist is not one definite and singuler person.

1.



He second argument which *Bellarmino* vseth, to prooue, that the Pope is not Antichrist, is drawne from the person of Antichrist, namely, that Antichrist is one certaine man, whereas the Popes haue beene many. His reason is thus framed: Antichrist is but one singuler person.

The Pope (meaning the order or succession of Popes) is not one singuler person.

Therefore the Pope is not Antichrist.

To the proposition I answere, that as the Pope is one, so is Antichrist. The Pope is one person not in number and nature, as one certaine and singuler man, but one at once by lawe and institution, though successively so many as haue enjoyed the Papacie. For euē as the Papists when they say, that the Pope hath beene the head of the Church and Vicar of Christ these 1500. yeares, doe not meane any one Pope, but the order and succession: so we when we say, that the Pope hath beene Antichrist almost these thousand yeeres, wee meane not any one Pope onely, but the whole rowe or rabble of them since the yeere 607. And thus Antichrist, that is, the head of the Antichristian body, which was reuealed after the taking away of the Romane Empire, & is to continue after a sort, vntill the end of the world, is one person: one I say at once ordinarily, but continued in a succession of many. The proposition thus denied by vs, *Bellarmino* labourerh to confirme by authoritie of the Scriptures, and testimonies of the Fathers. Out of the Scriptures he produceth five testimonies. The first out of the Gospell of *Iohn*, chapter 5. verse 43: *I am Iohn. 5. 43: come in my Fathers name, and you receive mee not: if another shall come in his owne name, him will you receive.* In which wordes *Bellarmino* vnderstandeth Christ to speake of Antichrist, as of

See lib. 1.
cap. 1. §. 4.

one singuler person: And that he would prooue by testimonies of the Fathers, and foure reasons. But *Bellarmino* and the rest of the Papists, which make this collection out of this place, either ignorantly mistake, or wilfully depraue this text. For first, whereas our Sauour Christ speaketh indefinitely, of any false teacher which should come vnto them in his owne name, that is, not sent of God, they expound him, as if he had spoken definitely of one singuler Antichrist. Secondly, whereas Christ speaketh not onely indefinitely, but also conditionally, *If another come*, they expound him, as if in a simple and proper axiome or proposition he had prophesied of the coming of Antichrist: as if he had said, that other counterfeite Messias, that is to say, that singuler Antichrist, shal come in his owne name, and him you will receiue. And thirdly, whereas Christ speaketh of those Iewes to whom he speaketh, they vnderstand him to speake of those which shalbe in the end of the world. But let vs consider his proofes. The Fathers, saith he, doe testifie that these words are spoken, *de uno Antichristo*, of one Antichrist. First I answer, that although diuers of the Fathers expound these words of Antichrist, yet none of them hath that word *Uno*, one: and therefore the Iesuites collection is absurde. The Fathers vnderstand this place of Antichrist, therefore Antichrist is one singuler person. For the Fathers also vnderstand that place *Mat. 24. 24.* of Antichrist, where our Sauour Christ speaketh in the plurall number, of false Christs, and false Prophets which should arise; and confer that place with this, And therefore they may seeme to vnderstand this speech of our Sauour, as if he had said: If another come in his owne name (as many indeed shall come) such will you receiue. And sure it is, that the Iewes haue receiued more then one of such as haue come in their owne name. And secondly I answer, that the Fathers had no reason to restraints these words vnto Antichrist alone, as though Christ had prophesied of the Iewes receiuing of Antichrist for their Messias, seeing his speech is neither simple nor definite, but conditionall and indefinite. Whereby our Sauour Christ would shew the vntoward disposition of the Iewes, who as they rejected him who was sent of God; so they would be ready to receiue any other that should come in his owne name, not sent of God. And so *Nomius* in his Paraphrase vpon this place, expoundeth these words. *Ei deus dicitur iussu, &c. But if any other come, &c.* And lastly, if these answers will

Mat. 24. 5.
24.

will not suffice, let the aduersary conclude his argument drawne from the authoritie of the fathers in a Syllogisme, and when he hath so done, let him prooue the proposition, which must be this: *whatsoever those fathers write concerning Antichrist is true*: and then the assumption, which is to this effect, *but this those fathers write that Christ speaketh those words, de uno Antichristo, of one singuler Antichrist, & then (which will neuer be) I will yeeld to the conclusion.*

2. But omitting his testimonies, let vs come to those arguments which he draweth out of the text, to proue that Christ in these words speaketh of one singuler Antichrist. First saith he, *Christ opposeth vnto himselfe another man*, that is, person to person, as appeareth by these words, *I, another, &c.* His reason is thus to be framed, where these two words, *I*, and *another*, are opposed one to the other, we are to vnderstand that as *I* signifieth one singuler person, so also *another*: but in this place, *I*, and *another* are opposed: therefore &c. I answer, where the other is taken definitely for that other, as *δααορ*, is vsed *Iohn 18. 16.* and *20. 2. 3. 4.* there the proposition may be true. But where it is vsed indefinitely, as *δααορ*, *another*, in this place, it is most false: for in such speeches, to a certaine and definite person, is opposed an indefinite and vncertaine. As for example *Iob. 31. 8.* *What I sowe, let another reape*, meaning any other. *1 Cor. 3. 10.* I haue laide the foundation & another buildeth thereon, but let euery one take heed how he buildeth thereon. Such examples are ordinary. As if I should say, this argument I call a childish reason, another would call it a dotage, and so let it passe. His second reason is this: *Whom the Iewes shall receiue for their Messias, he is but one particular man: Antichrist shall be receiued of the Iewes for their Messias, as Christ here saith: therefore Antichrist is but one singuler man.* Answer. Christ dooth not here foretell that Antichrist shalbe receiued of the Iewes for their Messias. For first, his speech is conditional, therefore not a prophetic. Neither doth he foretel what they were to do, but sheweth them what in respect of their present disposition they were ready to doe, if any false teacher should obtrude himselfe vnto them. Secondly, it is indefinite, and therefore not to be restrained to a certaine person. Thirdly, he doth not say, that they shall receiue another for their Messias coming in his owne name, but onely that they shall receiue him. Fourthly, those Iewes to whom & of whom our Sauour speaketh, were not to be aliue

at the coming of the great Antichrist, according to the opinion of the Papists themselves, therefore our Saviour speaketh not of the Jewes receiving of Antichrist, & much lesse of Antichrist as one particular person. Thirdly (saith he) *all false prophets come in the name of another, not in their owne name.* But Christ here speaketh of one that should come in his owne name, therefore he speaketh not of false prophets. He might as well have concluded against the Scriptures, that Antichrist is not a false prophet. For false prophets, saith Bellarmine, come not in their owne name, Antichrist cometh in his owne name: therefore if Bellarmines argument be good, Antichrist is not a false Prophet. But I answer, that Antichrist and all other false Prophets may be said to come both in their owne name, and also in the name of God. In their owne name because they are not sent of God, in which sense our Saviour Christ here speaketh, I am come, saith he, in my fathers name, sent from the bosome of my father who hath sealed and sent me to this worke of mediation, and you receive me not: If another shall come in his owne name, not sent from God, or as *Lyra* expoundeth those words, *in nomine suo, in his owne name*, that is, not having the aforesaid testimonies from God, whereby to warrant his calling from him, such will you receive. They are said also to come in the name of God and of Christ, because they pretend (although falsely) a calling and commission from God, *Ierem. 14. 14. 15. Mat. 24. 5.* For whereas Bellarmine expoundeth these words thus, in his owne name, that is, shall not acknowledge any God, but advance himselfe above all that is called God, and assigneth such a coming to the expected *Messias* of the Jewes, it is absurde. For the Jewes expect a *Messias* to be sent them from God. And therefore if any shall take vpon him to be their *Messias*, and be received of them, he will without doubt professe himselfe to be sent of God. And such a one may be said to come in his owne name, because he is not sent of God, and in Gods name, because he pretendeth a calling and commission from him. Fourthly (saith he) *if Christ had spoken of false Prophets, whereas many were to come, he would not have said, if another come, but many come: but the second is false, therefore the first.* I answer, if Christ had spoken simply and definitely, one other shall come, there had beene some shew of reason in the argumentation of the adversary. But seeing he doth not so

speake

speake as Bellarmine dreameth; but conditionally and indefinitely, if another shall come, there is not so much as any shew of reason in this argument.

3. The second place which Bellarmine produceth is 2. *The. 2. 3. 8.* Where the Apostle inveating of Antichrist, speaketh of one certaine and particular person, as appeareth by the Greeke article, *ὁ ἀρχαίος τῆς ἀμαρτίας, ὁ ὢν τῆς ἀνομίας, ὁ ἀνομος, the man of sinne, the sonne of perdition, the outlaw.* His reason is thus to be framed: Vnto whatsoeuer the Greeke article is prefixed, it is signified to be one certaine and singuler thing or person: vnto the Antichrist that man of sinne, the sonne of perdition, the outlaw, the Greeke article is prefixed: therefore the Antichrist is but one certaine and singuler person. The proposition he prooueth by the authority of Epiphanius, who saith *that the Greeke articles restraine the signification to one certaine thing, so que est* *that ἀρχαίος signifies man in general, but ὁ ἀρχαίος one singuler man. And therefore Bellarmine marvelleth greatly that none of vs who would fisme to have skill in the tongues hath obserued so much.* But it were more to bee marvelled that Bellarmine should in this waighey cause affirme that which he knoweth to be false, but that he hath Epiphanius vpon whom to the father this vnto; and yet Epiphanius doth not say that the addition of the article doth alwaies restraine the signification to one certaine and singuler thing, but that it signifieth *τὴν διακρίσιν τῶν ὁνομάτων, the discretio or difference of the name.* Howbeit that is not perpetual: For many times the article is added for ornament only and finelnes of speech, when as in respect of the sense *περίσσευσι, it is redundant or superfluous.* And hereof there be more examples then there be leaues euen in the new testament. And therefore both in the same and like sentences the article sometimes is vsed, sometimes omitted without any alteration of the sense. As *Lu. 4. 4. ἡ ἐν ἁγίῳ πνεύματι ζήσας ὁ ἀρχαίος.* But in *Matthew 4. 4.* where the same speech is recorded, *ἡ ἐν ἁγίῳ πνεύματι ζήσας ἀνθρώπος.* And againe where the article is vsed for difference sake, it doth not alwayes point out one certaine and singuler thing, but onely when it is vsed *ἀναμαρτυρῶν, for a demonstratiue particle,* as *Iohn 1. 29. ἰδοὺ ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, behold the Lambe of God. Iohn, 4. 29. μὴ τὸ ἐνός ἐστὶν ὁ χριστός; is not this that Christ?* For more usually it is vsed *διακρίτως, that is, for difference, when*

as it serueth not to signifie one speciall, but to distinguish the whole kinde. In which sense ὁ ἀνθρώπος καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ, is all one, as Philosophers say. As Marke 2. 27. the Sabbath was made διὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπου, for the man, not the man for the Sabbath. Iohn. 2. 25, he needed not that any should beare witness ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, of the man (meaning any man) for himselfe knew what was, ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ, in the man. So Num. 19. 11. (which is the law that Epiphanius misalledgeth) ὁ ἀνθρώπος τὸ πρῶτον τοῦ πόντος ἔρχεται ἀπὸ νεκροῦ, ἀνθρώπος ὅστις ἔφατ' ἡμέτερος: he that toucheth (that is, who soeuer toucheth) the dead body (that is, any dead body) of any man, he shalbe vncleane seuen dayes. Whereas Epiphanius therefore alledgeth it thus, ἐὰν τις ἀψήσῃ νεκρῶ, ἢ νεκρὸν ἑσθῇς ἐὰν ἐστὶ νεκρὸς, ἢ νεκρὸν ἑσθῇ, ἢ νεκρὸν ἑσθῇ: If any man touch the dead, he remaineth vncleane vntill the euening, and he shall be washed with water, and shall be clesed: and from the force of the article (which is not in the text as he alledgeth it, if there be not a fault in the print) prooueth that by the dead is to be meant not any dead man, but onely Christ: it is euident that his memory failed him. For the law which pronounceth a man vncleane vntill the euening for touching a dead body, is vnderstood of the dead bodies of beasts: but that which speaketh of the dead body of a man, pronounceth him vncleane seuen dayes, and is (as euen now you heard, vnderstood of the dead body of any man whatsoever. And the reason of this law is, first because a dead man is a spectacle both of our sinne, and of Gods curse for the same: and secondly, because the Lord would by the detestation of the bodily death teach the Israelites to abhorre the spirituall death of the soule in sinne. And therefore Epiphanius not vnworthily reprooueth the hypocrite of the Samaritans, who vnder pretence of this law, abhorred the dead bodies of men, when as themselves were dead in sinne. So when we say, the Pope, the Emperour, the king, the priest, the minister, the eye, the hand, we meane not one particular, but the whole kinde, as 1. Pet. 2. 17. ἡ δόξα καὶ τιμὴ, honour the king, not this king onely, but any who soeuer is king. 1. Tim. 3. 2. Ἀλλ' αὐτὸ ἡ ἐπίσκοπος ἀνέστη, ὡς ἐπὶ τὸν ἄνθρωπον, it behooueth therefore the Bishop (not this or that Bishop, but euery one that hath that calling) to be without reproofe. Mat. 6. 22. ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς τὸ πρῶτον ἐστὶν ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς. The light of the body is the eye. See 1. Cor. 12. 15. 16. Mat. 23. 34. &c. So when we say, the good man or the wicked man, we meane either generally al, or indefinitely any

any that be such, Mat. 12. 35. ὁ ἀγαθὸς ἀνθρώπος ἐκ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ θησαυροῦ τοῦ καρδίας ἐκβαλεῖ τὰ ἀγαθὰ, ὁ δὲ πονηρὸς ἀνθρώπος &c. The good man out of the good treasure of the hart, bringeth forth the good things; and the euill man, &c.

4. Sometimes againe the article is vsed ἐμφατικῶς, to signifie that which is most notable in that kinde, and therefore most worthily (or as we say κατ' ἐξοχήν) deserueth that name. And of this vic is Epiphanius his rule to be vnderstood, ὅπου γὰρ ἀπόρον ἐστὶν τίς ἐστιν ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ καὶ διαφανέτω, πῶς ἐστὶν ὁ ἀνθρώπος διὰ τὸ ἀπόρον, Where the article is added vnto some definite and notable thing, there is alwayes confirmation by the article, namely, that the word is not to be vnderstood indefinitely or indifferently of any: ἀλλ' αὐτὸ τὸ ἀπόρον ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἀόριστος ἐστὶν ἀόριστος, but without the article it is to be take of any one indefinitely. Which latter part of the rule, if it be true, prooueth that the speech of our Sauour, Iohn. 5. ἐὰν ἄλλος ἐλθῇ, if any other come is indefinite. But neither doth the article vsed ἐμφατικῶς, alwayes point out a certaine and singuler thing, though sometimes it doe. As ὁ θεὸς in a Christians mouth signifieth the true God onely, as Epiphanius saith. So when we say, the Apostle meaning Paul, the Poet meaning among the Greekes Homer; among the Latines Virgil; the Oratour, Demosthenes or Tullie; the wiseman, Salomon. But when we say, ὁ βασιλεὺς (which is another of Epiphanius his examples) and meane thereby not indifferently any king but by an Emphasis that Prince to whom we are subiect, we doe not alwayes nor for the most part vnderstand one certaine king, but all or any to whom the sovereignty of our countrey doth appertaine, whether he be king or Queene. As when we say, the king supreme gouernour of the church, no time prescribeth against the king, the kings high-way, the Princes lawes, &c. In like manner whē we say, ὁ ἀνθρώπος (which is Epiphanius his third example) or as the Apostle more distinctly speaketh, ὁ ἀνθρώπος τοῦ θεοῦ, the man of God: For although by this Emphasis not any man is meant but the minister of God, yet it signifieth not one certaine minister, but any one of that function called thereunto of God. And in this sense is the Pope called the Antichrist: & the Antichrist in the same sense is called the man of sinne, the sonne of perdition, the outlaw. But this prooueth not, that therefore the Antichrist is but one certaine and singuler man. For euen as the diuel, τὸ ἀκάθαρτον πνεῦμα, the vncleane spirit, although there

2. Tim. 3.
17.

Leu. 11. 34
be

be many wicked ones is called, *ἡ πόλις*, the euill, and yet there be many diuels, and as the Bishop of Rome since the time of *Boniface* the third, is called the Pope (whereas before, the name *Pope* was attributed to other Bishops) and yet there haue beene many Popes: so although al heretickes deserve to be called Antichrists; al profane men, men of sinne; all reprobates, sonnes of perdition; all sonnes of *Belial*, *ἀνέμοι*, or outlawes; yet not withstanding the Pope of Rome since the time of *Boniface* the third, deserveth to be called *ἡ πόλις* the Antichrist, the man of sinne, the sonne of perdition, the outlaw. Which as it doth not prooue that the Pope signifieth but one singular person, so neither doth it euince that the Antichrist signifieth one certaine man. For looke what they can say, of the *Antichrist* in this case; the same may be said of the *Pope*.

5. The third place is like to the second, and therefore a short answer may serue. *1. Iohn 2. 18.* *ἄνθρωποι ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἄντιχριστοὶ πολλοὶ ἔσονται*, You haue heard that the Antichrist cometh, and euen now there are many Antichrists: where the article is prefixed before Antichrist so properly called; but the name of Antichrist generally taken is vntied without an article, which most plainly sheweth that Antichrist properly taken is but one man, but generally taken it signifieth all heretickes. As if he had said, *Ὁ ἄντιχριστος*, signifieth but one certaine man, because the article is prefixed.

The Antichrist so properly called is *ὁ ἄντιχριστος*, therefore the Antichrist so properly called, is but one certaine man.

The prosyllogisme or prooue of the proposition I haue already prooued to be most false, when as I shewed that whereas there are four vses of the article at the least, *Bellarmines* obseruation holdeth onely in one, and that the least vsuall: namely, when the article is vntied *ἀνέμοις*, that is, for a demonstratiue particle. And that the article added to a word doth not alwaies signifie one certaine and singular thing, I will shew by some other examples, which will sterner the Papists. In *2. Thes. 2. 7.* *ὁ κρυπτός*, he that hindreth, is expounded by the fathers, and acknowledged by the Papists, to signifie the Emperour of Rome, not any one particular, but the state and succession of Emperours. Again *Mat. 16. 18.* where there is not onely the article, but also the pronounce demonstratiue, *ἐπὶ τῆς πέτρας*, upon this rocke, the Papists would haue vnderstood by that rocke, which *Pe-*

ter confessed, which is Christ, or faith in him; not onely *Peter* himselfe, but also (although most falsely) the whole succession of Popes. And therefore by their owne doctrine, the article doth not alwayes, no not when it is ioyned with a demonstratiue particle, signifie one certaine and particular thing or person. Thirdly, in the place before alledged, *ἡ πόλις ἡ ἐκκλῆσια*, the man of sinne, the son of perdition, is vnderstood by some to signifie not onely the head of the Antichristia body, but the whole multitude of those who ioyned with Antichrist. *Augustine* reciterh this opinion, and is so farre from misliking it, that *Bellarmines* alledgeth it as *Augustines*. Neither are we to thinke this interpretation to be dissonant from the manner of speech vsed in the Scriptures: seeing *ἡ πόλις*, the woman, *Ἀποκ. 12. 6.* signifieth the Church of Christ; and *ἡ πόλις*, the harlot, and *ἡ πόλις*, the woman *Apoc. 17. 1. 18.* the city & Church of Antichrist. And that I may come to the proposition it selfe, and omit other examples, *ἄντιχριστος*, sometimes signifieth the Antichristian body or company of Antichristian heretikes.

6. For better prooue whereoflet vs consider the acceptation of the word *ἄντιχριστος*, the Antichrist in the place alledged, and elsewhere in the Epistles of *Iohn*, in which onely it is vsed, and not elsewhere in the scriptures. In the place which *Bellarmines* citeth, the apostle seemeth to reason thus. When the Antichrist is come, it is the last houre. Now Antichrists are come; therefore now is the last houre. Where either the Antichrist and Antichrists signifie the same, or else there be foure termes in the Apostles argument, which *Bellarmines* dareth not auaunch: And afterwards *v. 22.* he plainly sheweth, that every one that denieth *Iesus* to be the Christ (as many Antichrists or heretickes did, of which he spake verse 18.) is *ὁ ἄντιχριστος*, the Antichrist. In the same Epistle Chapter. 4. he biddeth them try the spirits, that is, their teachers, because many false prophets were come into the world, and giueth them this note whereby to try them: Every spirit (saith he) which confesseth *Iesus Christ* to be come in the flesh, is of God, and every spirit which doth not confesse that *Iesus Christ* is come in the flesh is not of God. And this is the spirit of the Antichrist, which you heard was to come, and euen now already is in the world. Likewise in the second Epistle: Many deceiuers are come into the world which doe not confesse that *Iesus Christ*

Christ is come in the flesh, this is the deceiver and the Antichrist. By which testimonies it is evident, that *Antichristus*, doth not only signifie the head of the Antichristian body (which is not one singuler man, but is continued in a succession of many) but also sometimes any hereticke that oppugneth the natures or offices of Christ; and sometimes the whole body or company of hereticke opposed unto Christ. For *Iohn* plainly affirmeth that those many hereticke and deceivers of his time, are the Antichrist. And whereas *Paul* prophesieth of Antichrist: that he should come into the world, and should be destroyed at the second coming of Christ; *Iohn* affirmeth that Antichrist, of whom they had heard that he should come, was then already come into the world. From which places I argue thus. If *Antichristus* the Antichrist in the Epistles of *Iohn*, and *Antichristus* the man of sinne, *Antichristus* the outlaw, in the Epistle of *Paul* to the Thessalonians doe signifie one certaine and singuler man; as the Papists affirme; then it will follow necessarily, that one and the same man, who was come into the world in Saint *Iohn*'s time, shall be in the world at the second coming of Christ: for *Iohn* saith, that the Antichrist was come in his time, and *Paul* saith that the out-law shall be consumed with the spirit of Christs mouth, and destroyed at his glorious appearing. But the latter is incredible, for since the time of Saint *Iohn* there are already 1500. yeeres expired, and therefore the former (which is the assertion of the Papists) is absurde. *Antichristus* therefore signifieth sometimes the whole body of Hereticke from the ascension of Christ, untill his second coming: sometimes any hereticke which are limbs of that body: sometimes the ground antichrist, who is the head of that body, & is called *caput* the Antichrist. Wherefore in respect of those hereticke and limbs of Antichrist in the Apostles times; Antichrist is then said to haue entred, and as it were, to haue set his foote into the world. And accordingly the Apostle *Paul* saith, that euen in his time the mystery of iniquity, that is, Antichristianisme was working (namely by those which belonged to the body of Antichrist) although covertly and vnderhand, untill the head of that body was revealed as he was, after the Empire in the West was dissolued, and the Emperour which hindered was done out of the way; according to the propheticke of the Apostle; 2. Thessalonians. 2. 7. 8. And thus you see what a slender argument this

is taken from the article, although it be vsed as one of the principall demonstrations generally of all the Papists, that write of this argument, but more especially of *Bellarmino*, who thinking it too good to goe for one argument, hath deuised it into two.

7 His fourth testimonie is taken out of *Daniel*, chap. 7. 11. & 12. Where Antichrist is called a King, and not a Kingdome, who of the ten Kings which he shall smite in the worlde, shall take away three, and shall make the other fouen subject to himselfe. But I answer, that *Daniel* speaketh not of Antichrist at all, but of *Antiochus Epiphanes*, and therefore this allegation is impertinent. For the learned of our times haue made it euident, that the foure kingdomes whereof *Daniel* speaketh, were ended before the incarnation of Christ: and that the fourth kingdome which many haue taken to be the Monarchie of the Romanes, was the kingdome of the *Selencida* and *Lapida* in Syria and Egypt, so farre forth as the people of Iewrie was subject thereunto, and is therefore described as the most terrible of all the foure, because it was most troublesome to the Iewes. And that the ten hornes were ten Kings of Syria and Egypt, which successiue tyrannized ouer the people of the Iewes; *Antiochus Epiphanes* being the tenth and the last of those Kings which tyrannized ouer Iewrie. But because in outrageous cruelty and cursed hostility, not onely against the people, but also against the religion of the Iewes, he surpassed all that went before him; of him therefore *Daniel* speaketh so plainly and distinctly, that he hath seemed to some rather to write an Historie of him, then a Prophecie; as shall hereafter more fully be shewed, when as we shall also manifestly declare that this which *Bellarmino* addeth concerning Antichrists killing of three Kings, and subduing of the other seauen, is but a dreame, which is indeede so farre from all probability of truth, as that it cannot be verified of that party whom *Daniel* describeth. *Daniel* describeth him as the tenth; *Bellarmino* maketh him the eleventh, as if it were a beast of eleuen hornes. *Daniel* speaketh of ten Kings, which successiue ruled ouer the Iewes: *Bellarmino* maketh him speake of ten, who together with the eleventh, should be at one time in the world. Of those ten *Daniel* saith, that three were plucked vp before the tenth, & as it may seeme by his means, but of the other sixe, either all or the most were dead before he was borne: *Bellarmino* maketh him to kill three and subdue the other

Chap. 16.

seauen, which indeed liued not in his time, as shall be shewed hereafter out of the eleuenth of *Daniel*, where the succession of these ten Kings, and the affaires of the tenth, who can be no other but *Antiochus Epiphanes*, are particularly and fully described. This argument drawne from the miscontinuing of *Daniel*, *Bellarmino* although he knew it to be nothing worth, yet he was content to make a flourish with it, because he had some of the Fathers to father it vpon. Afterwards he cometh nearer to the purpose, and saith, that *Calius*, as some of the Fathers before him, to wit, *Cyprian* and *Ierome*, assigneth, and so doth *Bellarmino* himselfe else where, that *Daniel* speaketh of *Antiochus Epiphanes*, who was a type of Antichrist. Therefore leaving his former hold, he reasoneth thus: Such as is the type or figure, such is the thing figured: *Antiochus* the type was but one singular person, therefore Antichrist that is figured is but one. The proposition is to be understood of the proportion and likenesse onely in those things, in respect whereof the type is a figure; and not generally in all things. As for example, the High-priest was a type or figure of Christ, but therefore it doth not follow that there was but one High-priest, because Christ is one. The Papists holde that *Melchisedec*, who was but one, was a type of their Masse Priests, which are many. *Iesush*, *Dauid* and *Salamon*, were types of Christ, but therefore not like vnto him in all things. So *Antiochus* may not vnsafely be said to haue beene a type of Antichrist; because as *Pharaoh* was a type of other tyrants which oppressed the Church of God: so he in fallshood, deceit, pride, idolatry, cruelty, and persecuting of the Church of God, resembled Antichrist the man of sinne, which is an enemy, and is lifted vp aboue all that is called God, or that is worshipped. In which respects *Antiochus* was so fit a type of Antichrist, that *R. Leui Gerson* alledged by *Bellarmino* in the end of the 12. chap. applieth what *Isaiah* is spoken of him *Dan. 7. 25.* to the Pope of Rome. If therefore you vnderstand the proposition generally, it is false: if particularly, the whole argumentation is a fallacion.

8. His fifth testimonie is *Apoc. 13. 2. 17.* For these places are so be understood of Antichrist, as *Irenaeus* teacheth, and as it is plain by the likenesse of the words in *Daniel* and *Iohn*, &c. His reason is thus framed, If *Daniel* spoke of one King, then also *Iohn*: but the former is true, therefore the latter. The proposition, wherein there is indeed no coherence, be

he proueth by the similitude of their words: First, because both make mention of ten Kings, which shall be in the earth when Antichrist shall come. It is true that both make mention of ten hornes, but with such difference as that otherwise there is no likenesse. *Antiochus* in *Daniel*, by whom *Bellarmino* would haue vs to vnderstand Antichrist, is the last of the ten, & not one besides the ten; otherwise the fourth beast, were a beast of cleue hornes: Antichrist is one besides the ten hornes in the Reuelation, and of *Bellarmino* sometimes is called the eleuenth, *Bellarmino* Antichrist in *Daniel* is the little horne signifying indeed but one man, but the true Antichrist in the Reuelation is called not an horne, but the beast, whereby not one man, but a state is signified. The ten hornes in *Daniel* ate so many kings which succeed one another, in the kingdom vrsurped ouer the Iewes, before the coming of the *Messias*: the ten hornes in the Reuelation are so many rulers ouer diuers kingdoms, which receiue their kingdom together, not only after the incarnation of Christ, but also after the dissolution of the Roman Empire: So that in truth nothing is here alike, save that in both there is mention of ten hornes. Secondly saith *Bellarmino*, both of them foretell that the kingdom of Antichrist shall continue three yeeres and an halfe. But I answer, that neither of both assigne that time to Antichrist. For first *Daniel* assigneth a time, and times, and parcell of time, that is, three yeeres and ten daies, to the persecution vnder *Antiochus*, whereby the publick worship of God was for that time interrupted, viz. from the 15. day of the month Casleu in the 145. yeeres of the kingdom of the Seleucides. *1. Mac. 1. 37.* vnto the 25. of the month Casleu in the yeare 148. *1. Mac. 4. 32.* But of this more hereafter. Neither doth *Iohn* any where assigne three yeeres & an halfe to the raigne of Antichrist: but to the beast with seue heads & ten hornes, which signifieth the Roman state either generally as it is opposed vnto Christ, or particularly as it was gouerned by the sixth head, that is, the emperors, he assigneth forty two months, which are not literally to be vnderstood. Now Antichrist is not the beast with seue heads, but one head of the seue, & is described vnder the second beast as our aduersaries also confesse, which in plaine termes is called another beast. For how can he be that beast, if he be another? And of this also, I shall haue better occasiō to speake more fully hereafter. Lastly, he lieth to the authority of the fathers as his last refuge; but neither do these fathers expressly say, that Antichrist shall be but one man; neither if they did, can any sound argument be drawne

from their testimonies, unless *Bellarmino* be able to prooue, that whatsoever these fathers haue written concerning Antichrist, is true. And againe diuers of the Fathers, as *Irenaeus*, *Origen*, *Chrysostome*, *Le-rome*, *Ruffinus*, *Primasius*, *Augustine*, expounding that place *Math. 24. 24.* which speaketh of more then one, as spoken of Antichrist, they could not vnderstand Antichrist to be but one. Yea but the Fathers say, that Antichrist shall be a most choise instrument of the Diuell, that in him shall dwell all the fulnesse of diuellish malice bodily, euen as in the man Christ dwelleth the fulnesse of the diuinitie corporally. But although this allegation were true (as I will not thereof dispute,) yet is it impertinent: for the Pope (meaning the whole succession of Antichristian Popes) may be a notable instrument of the diuell, &c. and yet hereof it followeth not that there hath beene but one Pope: As touching the other assertion of *Antichriste* *raigne three yeeres and a halfe*, we are hereafter to increate.

Chap. 8.

1. *1. Th. 4. 3.*
2. *1. Th. 7.*
3. *1. Th. 2. 18*

9. Now that Antichrist is not one singular man, but a whole state and succession of men, it may appeare by these arguments. First by conference of *2. Th. 2.* with the Epistles of *John*; for *John* plainly saith, that *Antichrist*, of whom they had heard that he should come, was in his time. And of whom had they heard it, but of *Paul* in the *2. Th. 2.* where in like sort the Apostle saith, that euen in his time the myserie of iniquitie, that is, Antichristianisme was working: noting that Antichrist in some of his members was already come, although he were not revealed, vntill that which hindered was taken out of the way. Now as *Paul* and *John* doe both testifie, that the Antichrist was in their time; so *Paul* also sheweth that Antichrist shall remaine vnto the second coming of Christ, *2. Th. 2. 8.* for although he should be waisted and consumed before by the spirit of Christs mouth (that is, the ministry of the word) yet he should not be vtterly destroyed vntill the second coming of Christ. From hence therefore we reason thus: If Antichrist were in the Apostles time, and was to remaine vntill the second coming of Christ, then Antichrist is not one singular man, but a succession of men; vniuersally they will say, that one and the same man may liue vpon the earth from the Apostles time vntill the coming of Christ, of which time there be already about 1700. yeeres expired. But Antichrist was in the Apostles times, and is to continue vntill the second coming of Christ,

Christ, as the two Apostles *Paul* and *John* do plainly testifie, therefore Antichrist is not one singular man.

10. Of this syllogisme *Bellarmino* cannot deny either the proposition, or the assumption. Onely he distinguisheth of the former part of the assumption: viz. That Antichrist in the Apostles time was come indeede, but not in his owne person, but onely in his forerunners. And this he would prooue; first, by a similitude, which he might haue knowne from *Plato* to be a most slippery argument. At *Christ came in the beginning of the world not in his owne person, but in his forerunners the Patriarches and Prophets; so Antichrist came in the Apostles time not in his owne person, but in his forerunners the hereticks & persecutors of the church.* In which similitude there is no proportion, vniuersally that which is in question betaken for granted, namely that Antichrist is but one particular person, as Christ is. For if Antichrist be a succession of heretiques, then might he be said to come in the first of the ranke; although the chiefe of that order, which principally is called Antichrist, was not yet come. And secondly, the protasis or proposition of this similitude is vntrue. For although Christ might be said to be come from the beginning in respect both of the truth of the promise, and also of the efficacy of his merits, which is extended to all the faithfull from the beginning; yet we neuer reade, neither can it truly be said that he came in the Patriarches and Prophets: especially seeing the holy Ghost maketh a kinde of opposition betwix Gods sending of them, and the coming of Christ, who was not sent before the fulnesse of time came. Neither are the Prophets or Patriarches any where called the forerunners of Christ: For forerunners goe a little before, as *John Baptist* did, who therefore is worthily called *πρὸδρομος*, the forerunner. If any man object that as Christ spake in the Prophets; so Antichrist in the heretiques: I answer, that this latter is true not of Antichrist, but of the diuell, who is a lying spirit in the mouthes of all false Prophets. Thirdly, the reddition is contradictory to that which the Apostle *John* deliuereth. For he saith plainly that the Antichrist with the article prefixed, and that Antichrist whom they heard was to come, was already entred into the world, *1. John. 4. 3.* *2. John. 7.* and thence prooueth that therefore it is the last houre, because Antichrist was to come in the last houre, *1. John. 2. 18.* So that in this similitude nothing is found, no proportion

Heb. 1. 1.
Mat. 21. 37
Gal. 4. 4.

1. Pet. 3. 19

tion in the whole, no truth in the parts.

11. Wherefore by a new supply of arguments, he labourerth to make good this exposition. And as touching the place in *Paul*, he argueth first from the authority of the fathers & interpreters, whereof some vnderstand by the mystery of iniquity, the persecution vnder Nero: others the heretiques of those times which secretly seduced many. The former had no reason to call the open persecution of Nero a myserie: who also although he were an enemy, yet belonged not to the body of Antichrist, who is a disguised enemy and a pretended Christian. The latter exposition we doe embrace. For we holde Antichrist to be the whole body of heretiques in the last age of the world, who vnder the name and profession of Christ aduance themselves against Christ, first secretly, as in the Apostles times; afterwards more openly, when that which hindered, was taken out of the way. Of this body as euery member severally and all ioyntly is Antichrist (and therefore *Iohn* calleth the heretiques of his time Antichrists, and of them all saith that they are the Antichrist;) so especially the head of this body, which we haue prooued to be the Papacy, is κατ' εἶδος called Antichrist. Wherefore although Antichrist was after a sort come, and the myserie of iniquity wrought in the Apostles time, yet Antichrist was not reuealed vntill the head of this body appeared, that is, vntill the Pope became Antichrist, who since the yeare of the Lord 606. hath shewed himselfe in his colours; first by vsurping supreme authority ouer the vniuersall Church, & afterwards by claiming sovereignty ouer kings and Emperors, as we haue heretofore shewed. Seeing therefore the heretiques of whom the fathers speake, did belong to the body of Antichrist, it cannot be denied but that Antichrist, when they were in the world, was come in some of his members, and had as it were set his foote into the Church.

12. Secondly from our owne confession he would seeme to drine vs to great absurdity. For (saith he) if Antichrist were come in the Apostles times, and if Antichrist hath his seat in Rome, then it will follow that Peter & Paul were the true Antichrists, & Nero or Simon Magus the true Christ. For there were no other Bishops of Rome then, but Peter and Paul, with whom Nero and Simon Magus contended. I answere, that it cannot be prooued out of the Scripture, or by any sound argument; that Peter and Paul were Bishops of Rome; and although

although they were, it would not follow vpon our assertion, that therefore they were Antichrists, and much lesse that Nero or Simon Magus was Christ. For when we say that Antichrist was come in the Apostles time, we speake of the body of Antichrist with *S. Iohn*. When we say that Antichrist hath his seate in Rome, we speake of the head of this body, who especially is called Antichrist: whom we do with *Paul* acknowledge not to haue beene reuealed, vntill that which hindered was taken out of the way, that is, vntill the Romane Empire in the West was dissolved: but afterwards by degrees he was aduanced in the Papacie, aboue all that is called God; sitting in the temple of God, as if he were God, that is, ruling and raiging in the Church, as if he were a God vpon earth. And surely if the head of the Antichristian body was to be reuealed not long after the dissolution of the Romane Empire in the West, and was about the same time with the rulers of the Provinces, to attaine vnto his kingdome, as hath bin shewed; and lastly, if he shall continue in the world after he is reuealed, vntill the second coming of Christ: then it followeth necessarily that euen this head of the Antichristian body, cannot be any one singular man, but is continued by a succession of many from the time of his reuelation, vntill the end of the world: of which time there is almost a thousand yeares expired. But both in this argument, and in the former, *Bellarmino* sophistically beggeth the question. For in his arguments there is no consequence, vntill this be taken for grauted, that Antichrist is but one man, Antichrist came in the Heretiques in the Apostles time, therefore he came not in his owne person. A good argument, if Antichrist were but one man, which is the question. If Antichrist were in the Apostles time, and if Antichrist must sit at Rome, then he that was then Bishop of Rome, was Antichrist; a good argument if Antichrist were but one man, which is the question.

13. Now whereas *S. Iohn* saith, that Antichrist in his time was come, *Bellarmino* saith him to speake of Antichrist, as he saith, Our Saviour spake of Elias *Mat. 17. 11*. Elias indeed shall come (namely in his own person) but I say vnto you, Elias is already come in tuo simili, in his like, that is, *Iohn Baptist*. So *S. Iohn* speaketh of Antichrist, that he was indeed to come in his owne person, but now he was come in his type. You see to what silly shifts this worthy chāpion of the Pope is driven.

For first he fathereth vpon Christ that Iewish fable, which with the Iewes the Papists holde against Christ himselfe. For whereas *Malachie* had prophesied of the coming of *Elias* before the day of the Lord, meaning the first coming of Christ; our Saviour Christ plainlie auoucheth *Mat. 17. 14.* that *Iohn Baptist* was that *Elias*, who according to the Prophecie of *Malachie* was to come. Now *Iohn Baptist* was called *Elias*, because he came in the spirit and power of *Elias*, to turne the hearts of the fathers, &c. as the Angell also applyeth that prophecie, *Luke. 1. 17.* But suppose that Christ had spoken of *Elias* according to *Bellarmines* conceit; yet how dooth it follow that therefore *Iohn* speaketh of Antichrist after the same manner? No more then it followeth, that *Dauid* should long after his death be sent againe to gouerne the people of God: because it was prophesied by *Ezechiel*, that the Lord would raise vp a Pastor for his people, euen *Dauid* his seruant, &c. But as by the name of *Dauid* in *Ezechiel* is meant not *Dauid* himselfe, but Christ of whom *Dauid* was a type: so by the name of *Elias* in *Malachie*, is not meant *Elias* himselfe, but *Iohn Baptist*, who resembled *Elias* in spirit and power in reforming the Church of God.

Eze. 34. 23
24. 37.
35.
Iere. 30. 9.

14. Our second argument is this: That which in the Prophecies of the Scriptures, especially in the 7. and 11. of *Daniel*, and in *Apoec.* the 13. and 17. is described vnder the name and figure of a beast, is not one singular thing or person, but a whole state or succession: Antichrist is described in the *Apocalypse* 13. vnder the name and figure of a Beast, therefore Antichrist is not one singular person, but a whole state and succession. The proposition is prooued by induction of particular examples. As in the 7. of *Daniel*, by the Lion is figured the Kingdome of the *Assyrians* and *Babylonians*: by the Beate the *Medes* and *Persians*: by the Leopard the *Greekes* and *Macedonians*: by the beast with ten hornes the *Seleucids* and *Lapids*, and so *Chap. 8.* In the 13. of the *Apocalypse*, there are two Beasts described, the former signifying the state of the *Romane* Emperours: the second signifying the state of Antichrist. *Bellarmino* answereth, that *Daniel* as sometimes by the beasts he signifieth whole kingdomes; so sometimes also particular persons. As in the eighth Chapter, by the Ramme he vnderstandeth *Dauid* the last King of the *Persians*: by the Goate, *Alexander* the great. In which answer the

the vpright dealing of *Bellarmino* with the Scriptures appeareth. For in the 20. verse of the 8. Chapter, where that vision is expounded, the Angels words are these: The Ramme which thou sawest, hauing two hornes are was the King of the *Medes* and *Persians*. And the Goate is the King of *Iauan* or *Grecia* (meaning as before the Kings or Kingly estate, as appeareth plainly by the words that follow, and not as *Bellarmino* saith, *Alexander*) and the great horn which was broken, foure other eyes is the first King, namely *Alexander*, which being broken, foure other stand up in the stead thereof. As *Daniel* therefore by seuerall beasts meaneth not so many particular men, but whole states and orders of men; and as *Iohn* in the 13. of the *Apocalypse*, by the former beasts meaneth not any one Emperour, but the whole state and succession of Emperours at the least: so the holy Ghost in the same Chapter by the second beast describing Antichrist, meaneth not any one particular person, but the whole state and succession of Antichristian Popes, to whom (as heretofore hath bene shewed) that description wholly agreeth. And whereas *Bellarmino* addeth, that *Paul* when he entreatech of Antichrist, speaketh not of any one of the foure beasts in *Daniel*, but of the little horn mentioned in the 7. of *Daniel*, vers. 8. I answer, that the Apostle speaketh neither of the one nor of the other; and therefore the former part of *Bellarmines* speech is vaine, for no man saith so; and the latter is false. For the little horn is not Antichrist, but *Antiochus Epiphanes*, who liued about 200. yeares before the incarnation of Christ: who although he were but one man, might not vnjustly be called a type of Antichrist, who is a state or succession of men.

Dan. 8. 22.

Apo. 13. 18

15. Our third argument is taken from that Apostasie, which the Apostle foretellet 2. *Thes. 2.* For where he speaketh of a defection (whereof Antichrist is the head) without addition, we vnderstand a generall defection of the visible Church, which as it began to worke in the Apostles time; so was it to increase vntill the reuelation of Antichrist, and to continue more or lesse vntill his destruction. This Apostasie because it cannot be the worke of one man, or of a few yeares, evidently prooueth that Antichrist is not one singular man, but rather a state and succession of men. To this *Bellarmino* for want of one good answer, maketh many. First (saith he) by that Apostasie wee may very well (may he saith veltissimè) vnderstand

1. *Thes. 2. 3.*

2. *Thes. 2. 7.*

*Antichrist himselfe, as diuers of the fathers teach; and what will he inferre thereupon? that therefore Antichrist is but one man? Nay rather, the contrary is to be inferred. For if Apostasie be put by a metonymy of the adiunct for the subiect, or rather of the effect for the cause, that is, for the parties which doe reuolt: then it followeth, that Antichrist (who according to this interpretatiō is signified by Apostasie) doth not signifie one man, but the whole body and company of those that doe reuolt, that is, the whole body and kingdome of Antichrist, which we haue prooued to be the Apostaticall Church of Rome. And so Augustine whom Bellarmine alledgeth in the very same place which he citeth, reading in the coniecture, nisi uenerit refugia primum, vntil the Apostate first come, and expounding what is meant by the temple, not the temple at Ierusalem, but rather the Church of God, because the Apostle would not call the temple of the diuell, the temple of God, propoundeth the opinion of Ione which hee doth not mislike, *Vnde nonnulli non ipsum principem, &c. Whereupon some vnderstand in this place not the Prince himselfe, but his whole body as it were, that is, the company of men pertaining vnto him together with their Prince, to be Antichrist: and they thinke that it might more rightly be said in Latine as it is in the Greeke, that he sitteth (non in templo dei, sed in templum dei) not in the Temple of God, but as the Temple of God, as though he were the Temple of God which is the Church. Which as hath beene shewed, notably sitteth the Pope and Church of Rome. And here we are by the way to note, whereas Bellarmine saith that Antichrist shall be such a notable Apostate, as that he may be called the Apostasie it selfe, that seeing none can be an Apostate which hath not beene a Christian: by this assertion therefore of Bellarmine, Antichrist shall not be a Jew, but a backsliding and reuolted Christian.**

16. Secondly (he saith) by Apostasie we may vnderstand a reuolt from the *Romane Empire, as many of the Latin fathers doe expound.* To omit the diffension of the fathers, which prooueth that their exposition can be no good rule of interpreting the Scriptures, we doe confesse that before the manifest reuelation of Antichrist, there was to go, not onely a defection from the faith, but also a reuolt from the *Romane Empire.* But as the reuolting from earthly kingdomes is neuer in the Scriptures termed Apostasie: so is it not here signified; but as

the word elsewhere is vsed, and by the most and best writers here is expounded, *ἀποστασία*, signifieth a falling away from God, a defection or departure from the true faith, as heretofore I haue shewed. *Augustine* saith, *quem refugam vocat, vique a domino Deo, whom he collecteth a Lib. 20. cap. 19. §. 2.* *renunare, namely, from the Lord God.* Neither can it be denied but that this Apostasie is that which afterward the Apostle calleth the mystery of iniquity, which was working in and by the heretiques of those times, whom also *Bellarmino* collecteth the forerunners of Antichrist, because they perverted the faith, and therefore the defection caused by Antichrist is an Apostasie from the faith, according to the prophecies of the Apostle, that in these latter times diuers should make an Apostasie from the faith, and should turne away their hearing from the truth, and shalbe turned vnto fables.

17. Thirdly, although we should grant (saith he) that by Apostasie is to be vnderstood a defection or reuolt from the true faith and religion of Christ, yet it is not necessary that it should be an Apostasie of many yeeres. For it may be that the Apostle speaketh of one great Apostasie which shalbe onely in that most short time of Antichrist's raige, that is, of three yeeres and a halfe. But this bare ghesse of Bellarmine ought not to be of so great waight with vs, as the plaine speech of the Apostle compared with the euent. And therefore it is but vaine to tell vs what might be, seeing we haue seene the contrary to be, which the Apostle foretold should be. For as the Apostle tolde vs that there should be an Apostasie: so he saith, that the mystery of iniquity whereby many were seduced, shd worke al ready euen in his time, and insinuateth that it should worke vntill the full reuelation of Antichrist. And the euent hath shewed how by degrees this Apostasie hath bin wrought euen from the primitive Church, vntill it came to that height wherein it continued vntill Antichrist began to be acknowledged. And surely as this generall Apostasie could not grow at once, but by degrees: so can it not be abolished at once, but by degrees; and therefore was not like to be an Apostasie of three yeeres and an halfe onely. Neither is it credible that by one man the greatest part, not onely of Christians, but also of the Iewes should be seduced in three yeeres and an halfe: seeing Christ in the like space of time could not, as he was a man and minister of the circumcision, conuert many of the Iewes; notwithstanding that his doctrine was more effectually, and his miracles

miracles more admirable then those of Antichrist can be; yea the Apostles & some other of the disciples, who for so long time scarce went out of Jewry, were able to preuaile but with a few of the Jewes in comparison of those which reiected their doctrine: And shall wee thinke that Antichrist, who (as the Papists hold) shall be but one man, shall in three yeeres & an halfe, seduce the remnant of the Jewes, and all the visible Church of God dispersed into so many parts of the world? And whereas he alledgeth *Augustine* as a fauourer of this ghesse, therein he abuseth the authority of that learned father, to seduce the ignorant, who onely deliuereth the Iudgement of others concerning the mysterie of iniquity, & that to this effect. That the mysterie of iniquity worketh in euill men in the Church and counterfeit Christians, when as they reuolt from the truth, and that vnto this mysterie belongeth the reuolting of those of whom *S. Iohn* speaketh, They went out from vs, but were not of vs, &c. And that this mysterie should stil worke, that is, that vnfound men in the Church should more and more reuolt vntill they make a sufficient number for Antichrist. But there is neuer a word of this defection caused either by one man, or in so short a time, but rather the contrary, as hath bene shewed.

18. Fourthly he answereth, *that although it should be granted that this Apostasie is of many ages* (which he saith cannot well be denied, seeing the apostle saith it began to worke in his time) *yet it is not necessary that it should appertaine to one body under one head, neither that it appertaineth to the kingdome of Antichrist, but rather is a disposition therunto, happening in diuers dominions vpon sundry occasions, &c.* But this fourth answer is ouerthrowne by the first: wherein this Apostasie was made so proper to Antichrist, as that by it *Bellarmino* thought we might most fitly vnderstand Antichrist himselfe, or rather as we shewed the whole body and kingdome of Antichrist. And further we haue shewed heretofore that the whole body of Apostates and heretiques professing the name of Christ, is Antichrist, and after a more speciall manner the head of this body & Apostasie. And therefore it followeth, that all of this Apostasie professing the name of Christ, belong to this body and kingdome of Antichrist. And whereas hee saith, *that this Apostasie is onely a disposition to the kingdome of Antichrist, &c.* I answer that all the degrees of this Apostasie going before the reuelation of Antichrist, were a disposition not

to

to the being, but to the reuealing of Antichrist. For in the Apostasie Antichrist was, as *Iohn* plainly sheweth, neither could he be reuealed vntill he were. Whereupon *Theodoret* saith, *Defectionem appellat Antichristi presentiam, he calleth. Apostasie the presence or coming of Antichrist.* But is it not very likely thinke you that there hath bene a disposition or preparation already of more then 1500. yeares in most parts of the world, for the raigne of one man three yeeres and an halfe?

19. Fifthly and lastly, although we should grant (saith he) *that a generall Apostasie from the faith haue now continued many yeares, is the kingdome of Antichrist: yet it would not follow that therefore the Pope is Antichrist.* For it is not yet decided who haue made this defection, they or we. And is were more easie to proue that they haue made this defection, for they haue reuolted from that Church and religion wherof their fathers were, which we haue not done, &c. In the foure former answers *Bellarmino* turned backe vpon vs, hoping thereby to repell the force of our argument, but those being spent, in this he turneth his backe vpon vs & betaketh himselfe to his seete and leauing the defence of the question in hand, runneth to his chiefe hold. For whereas we proue that Antichrist is not one man, contrary to their assertion, by this argument among others, because that generall Apostasie of the visible Church continuing for many ages, wherof Antichrist is the head, cannot be the worke of one man or of a few yeares: *Bellarmino* answereth thus in effect, that although your argument be very good to proue that Antichrist is not one man; yet notwithstanding hereof it followeth not, that the Pope is Antichrist. Why, neuer any of vs vsed this argument; Antichrist is not one man, therefore the Pope is Antichrist. But in this assertion of ours, we answer your chiefe demonstration wherby you would proue that the Pope is not Antichrist, and wherein especially you please your selues, reasoning as hath bene hard, after this manner: Antichrist is but one man, therefore the Pope is not Antichrist. And after you haue proued this by many voyshippfull demonstrations, and stoutly denied our contrary arguments; now in the end you make this cowardes bragge: Although this should be granted which you say to proue that Antichrist is not one man, yet it doth not follow that the Pope is Antichrist.

20. But let vs pursue the Iesuite in his flight. Although this should be granted, saith he, &c. It is followeth not that therefore the Pope is

Antichrist.

Antichrist. For the question yet is, who hath made this Apostasie, we ask you. Well then, let vs ioyne in this issue. If the Apostasie be on our side, let vs be thought to belong to Antichrist; if this Apostasie be in the Church of Rome, whereof the Pope is head; then let it be acknowledged, that the Pope is the head of this Apostasie, and consequently Antichrist. But you (saith the Iesuite) have reuolted from the Church and religion of your forefathers, that is, from the Church of Rome and Latin religion. And therefore when you read, vnlesse there come a reuolt, &c. it is a wonder that you doe not apply that prophesie to your selues. The Apostasie whereof the Apostle speaketh, is not a separation from the Church of Rome that now is, nor a forsaking of Romish or Popish religion; but a reuoluing from God, a departure from the true faith and religion of Christ, vnto Antichristianisme and idolatry. We in forsaking the Church of Rome, haue come out of Babylon according to Gods commaundement, and in reuoluing from the Pope haue returned to God: and therefore this Apostasie toucheth not vs. But you, say I to the Papists, haue reuolted from the true faith and religion of Christ vnto Antichristianisme and Idolatry: as besides the infinite particulars wherein your Apostasie doeth consist, may briefly appeare by these notes. First, the Apostle speaking of the same Apostasie in another place, hath these words,


1. Tim. 4. 1. The spirit speaketh plainly, that in the latter times some shall make an Apostasie from the faith, attending to erroneous spirits and doctrines of diuels, speaking lyes in hypocrisie and hauing their owne conscience seared. Now who these are that make this Apostasie, the Apostle further describeth by specifying two of those doctrines of diuels, as certaine notes whereby to know them. Forbidding to marry, and commaunding to abstain from meates, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving, &c. But as I haue shewed heretofore these notes touch not vs, and properly agree to the Papists; therefore this Apostasie is among them. Secondlie, this Apostasie is among those who are fallen from the true religion and worship of God, into idolatry and superstition. For the Apostasie Church is the Idolatrous Church signified by the whore of Babylon, the mother of fornications. But the Church of Rome is straggellie addicted to idolatry and superstition, and for the same defectiue

to be called the whore of Babylon; where as we through the mercie of God are free from idolatry; and therefore the Apostasie is with them and not with vs. For the Apostasie is of them that are made drunke with the cuppe of the whore of Babels fornications, as the Papists are, and wee are not, who haue come out of Babylon. Thirdlie, the Apostasie is of those that receiue the name and make of the beast as the Papists doe, and not of those that refuse it as wee doe. The fourth note or touchstone as it were, to trie who haue made this Apostasie, is the word of God: For that is the true faith and the true religion which is containd, and prescribed in the written word of God. Now our desire is, that the Scriptures may be acknowledged the onely rule of faith and manners: vnto the Scriptures we appeale in all controuersies, and desire to be iudged by them: vnto the reading of the Scriptures we exhort our people, that they may be further edified and confirmed in that truth which we doe teach and professe. The Papists contrariwise not daring to stand to the Scriptures, flie to their vnwritten verities, traditions, decretals, doctrines and authorities of men both besides and against the Scriptures: and in a word, that the prophesie of the Apostle foretelling this Apostasie, might be verified in them, they haue auerted their hearing from the truth, and are conuicted vnto fables. They cannot abide to heare that the Scripture should be the onely rule of faith and manners: they cannot endure to see any of their people to read the Scriptures, and therefore desire to keepe it from them in an unknowne language. The foundation of their truth is the authority of their Church; and in the Church, of their Pope, whom they say, cannot erre. But if the Pope teach doctrines of diuels, and speake lyes in hypocrisie (as the Apostle hath prophesied especially of them) then is there in that Church little soundness of truth, that is built vpon so vnsoond a foundation. Thus therefore I reason. The head of the generall Apostasie is Antichrist: The Pope is the head of the generall or catholick Apostasie; therefore he is Antichrist.

21. To the three former arguments, a fourth may be added. The seven heades of that beast which signifieth the Romane state, are not so many persons, but so many heades or states of gouernement; whereby the common wealth of the Romanes, hath bene at diuerse times gouerned: the sixt head was the state of emperours: the seuenth Antichrist, as the Papiſts confesse: the eight (which also is one of the seuen) the state of Emperours renewed. Whereby it evidently appeareth, not onely that Antichrist is not one man, but also that the Pope (who is the seuenth head) is Antichrist.

CHAP. 3.

Concerning the time of Antichrist his comming.

1.  O withdraw our minds from beholding Antichrist in the See of Rome, and to make vs looke for the expected *Messias* of the Iewes that neuer shall come, the Papiſts labour by might and maine to perfwade vs that Antichrist is not yet come. For euen as the learned of the Iewes, when Christ was among them, contrary to their one perswasion, for worldly respects refused the true *Messias*, and made the people expect another which neuer shall be: So the learned among the Papiſts hauing Antichrist among them, for worldly respects cannot endure that he should be acknowledged; but teach the people that he is not yet come, and describe vnto them such an Antichrist as themſelues may well know shall neuer come, as by the grace of God shall appeare in the particulars. Now as touching the time of Antichristes comming, Bellarmine first reciteth diuers false and erroneous opinions as hee calleth them: and afterwarde setteth downe sixe solemne demonstrations to proue that he is not yet come. In the sixtmes he spendeth a good long chapter, sticking vpon diuers opinions both of the fathers in former ages, and also of heretiques as hee calleth them; in latter times, mingling the truth with errors, that the credit of both might be alike. As touching the fathers, because he taketh it for granted (which is the question) that Antichrist is not to come before the

the end of the world, which we deny according to the Scriptures: he would make their opinion concerning the approaching of Antichrist, which they held according to the Prophecies of the Scripture compared with the event, of no better credit then their conceit of Christs approaching vnto judgement, grounded not so much vpon the Scriptures, as vpon their owne conjecture. For to omit their conjectures concerning Christs comming confuted by experience, what can Bellarmine answer to the sound argument either of S. Ierome or Gregorie, concerning the comming of Antichrist, confirmed by experience, alledged by Bellarmine himſelfe. Ierome applying the Propheſie of Paul *2. Theſ. 2. 6. 7. 8.* that Antichrist should appeare, when he that hindereth (meaning the Romane Emperour) was taken out of the way, to his time, wherein not onely the imperiall seat had bene removed from Rome (which was the first degree of taking out of the way that which hindered) but also Rome it ſelfe in distresse, being taken of the Gothes, and the Empire in decay: *Quis tuncbat (saith he) de medio sit, & non intelligimus Antichristum appropinquare? He which did holde, is taken out of the way; and do we not vnderstand that Antichrist dooth approach? And likewise Gregorie, Omnia que predicta sunt, sunt: Rex superbia prop̄ est. All things which were foretold doe come to passe: the King of pride is at hand.* Which arguments alledged also by vs, Bellarmine because he could not answer, he thoughte to discredit by reckoning them among erroneous conceits.

2. But let vs come to his heretiques: Who although they all agree in this, that Antichrist is come, and that it is the Pope: yet saith Bellarmine, they are denided into sixe opinions. The first opinion, viz. of the *Samosatians* in *Hungarie* and *Transylvania*, is not worth the mentioning, being of such heretiques as deny the Trinity, and also the diuinity of Christ, with whom though we haue as little to doe as the Papiſts, sauing that some of our men haue foundly confuted their heresies, whiles the Papiſts held their peace: yet he numbrell our opinion with theirs, as Christ was numbred among the wicked; that by this mixture of truth with falshood, he might discredit the truth. As for the rest, it is easie to shew, that all Protestants almost that haue written in

this argument, and namely those whom *Bellarmino* alledgeth, doe agree in the substance concerning the coming of Antichrist: And that there is no such difference among them, as *Bellarmino* would beare vs in hand. For concerning this matter, this is the received opinion of our Churches. When with *Iohn* in his Epistles we speake of Antichrist, meaning the whole bodie of Heretiques and Antichrists, we hold with *Iohn* that euen in the Apostles times Antichrist had as it were set his foote in the Church, and that from that time the mysterie of iniquitie, that is, Antichristianisme, did more and more worke, vntill the head of this body the man of sinne was revealed: Which with *Paul* we hold to haue beene done, after that which hindered was remooued out of the way. But when we speake of the head of this body, who *κάρ' ὅψιν* is called the Antichrist, figured by the second beast, *Apoc. 13.* of whom also the Apostle treateth: *2. Thes. 2.* the constant opinion of the learned is this: that of the reuealing or manifest appearing of Antichrist, there were two principall degrees. The first about the yeare 607, when *Boniface* the third obtained the supremacie ouer the vniuersall Church. The second after the yeare 1000. when he claimed and vsurped both swords, that is, a soueraigne and vniuersall authoritie, not onely ecclesiasticall ouer the Clergie, but also temporall ouer Kings and Emperours. Vnto which second soueraigntie they had long aspired, but neuer attained, vntill the time of *Gregorie* the seauenth. We holde then, that Antichrist was come and shewed himselfe in *Boniface* the third: and that after this his birth as it were, he grew by degrees, vntill he came to his *ἀκμή*, or full growth in *Gregorie* the seauenth: in whose time and in all ages since, the Pope hath been by some acknowledged to be that Antichrist.

3. Now as touching his coming or birth, which is the chiefe matter in question, all agree. *Illyricus* and the other writers of the Centuries, as *Bellarmino* cōfesseth, hold, that about the yeare 606. Antichrist was borne, when *Phocas* granted to the Bishop of Rome, that he should be called the head of the whole Church. Of the same judgement is *Chytrius*. For although he confesseth, that the smoake of false doctrine, ascending out of the bottom-

bottomlesse pitte, began sooner to obscure and darken the truth: yet he saith, that in the yeare 607, *Boniface* the third was by *Phocas* ordained the Angell of the bottomlesse pit, meaning thereby Antichrist, when he receiued from him the title of eccumenicall Bishop. *Luther* perceiuing that the Papacie consisteth of the two swords, teacheth that there is a two-fold coming of Antichrist: the first with the spirituall sworde after the yeare 600. when *Phocas* gaue him the Antichristian title: the latter, with the temporall sworde, after the yeare 1000. *Bullinger* doth not say, as *Bellarmino* falsely chargeth him, that Antichrist first appeared Anno 763. for he aboue all others most plainly and distinctly hath deliuered that truth which we doe hold. *Pomiferus Romanus* (saith he) *initium quidem domusj jecit sub Phoca: sub regibus Francorum fundauit regnum: amplauit autem sub Henricis et Fridericis: confirmauit denum sub sequentibus aliquot regibus: regnat nostro seculo ac precedentibus aliquot.* The Pope of Rome laide the beginning of his dominion vnder *Phocas*: vnder the French Kings he founded his kingdom: vnder the *Henries* and *Fredericks* he enlarged it: vnder some other Kings which followed he confirmed it: he reigneth in our and some former ages. *Musculus*, whom he nameth in the sixt place, dooth not say, that Antichrist came about the yeare 1200: but by the tyrannie of the Popes, and vsurped dominion ouer the Church, by their shamelesse symony, by their excessiue riote, and diuellish pride, by their abominable lusts and uncleannesse, he concludeth that the Church of Rome is *Babylon*, and the seat of Antichrist: and addeth that *Bernard* was of the same minde. Who seemeth to haue signified that Antichrist was then come, and that onely it remained that the man of sinne should be reuealed (that is, acknowledged and detected, as *Musculus* vnderstandeth him) which discouerie of Antichrist, saith he, hath followed in our age. And thus you see a notable consent of all our writers whom he alledgeth in the maine point, concerning the time of the coming of Antichrist.

4. Now let vs see what he objecteth against this received truth. Concerning the time of his coming with the spirituall sword, he objecteth that *Phocas* did not giue the title of vniuersall

De Supput.
annorum
Mundi.

In Apoc.
23.

6.

See lib. 1.
cap. 3.

In Apoc. 9


to the Pope, but called him the head of the Churches, as Iustinian be-
fore him had done, and also the counsell of Chalcedon: And there-
fore no reason, why the coming of Antichrist should be placed in the
time of Phocas. As touching the title, good authours affirme,
that he received from Phocas both the title of the head of the
Church, and also of vniuersall or oecumenicall Bishop. And no
doubt he sought for, and by suite obtained that which John of
Constantinople had before claimed. Neither is there any great
difference betwixt these two titles, as they are now given to the
Pope, saue that to be the head of the vniuersall Church, is
the more Antichristian stile. And although titles of honour
and preheminence were sometimes given to the Church of
Rome, as the chiefe or head of the Churches, the mystery
of iniquitie working before the reuelation thereof in the Pa-
pacie: yet before this graunt of Phocas, which was obtained
with much adoe and contention, the Church of Rome had the
preheminence and superioritie ouer all other Churches excep-
ting that of Constantinople, not in respect of authoritie and ju-
risdiction (which after this graunt, it more and more practised)
but in respect of order and dignitie: And that for this cause espe-
cially, because Rome whereof he was Bishop, was the chiefe
citic, as it is specified in the counsell of Chalcedon, *ὁ ἀρχιεπίσκοπος
ῥώμης ἐκείνου*: and in the counsell of Constantinople, *ὁ ἀρχιεπίσκοπος
ῥώμης ἐκείνου πάτερ*. And for the same cause was the Pa-
triarch of Constantinople sometimes* matched with him, some-
times li preferred aboue him: because Constantinople (which
they called new Rome) was become the imperial seat. Yea
and the Bishops of *Rauienna*, because their city was the chiefe in
the exarchate of *Rauienna*, whereunto Rome was for a time sub-
iect, stroue with the Bishop of Rome in the time of the exarches
for superioritie. Seeing therefore that now the Pope of Rome
had with great contention and ambition obtained the suprema-
cie and soveraigntie ouer the vniuersall church; and now intul-
led himselfe the head of the vniuersall Church (a title peculiar
vnto Christ) the head I say, not onely in respect of excellencie
and dignitie, as a chiefe member of the Church (as he had beene
in former times by some acknowledged, because he was the
Bishop

* Concil.
Chalced.
Tempore
Maaritii

Bishop of the chiefe citie; but also in respect of authoritie and
Jurisdiction, as beeing the prince and supreme gouernour of
the Church vniuersall: we doe therefore worthily call this sove-
raigne dominion challenged ouer the vniuersall Church, the first
reuelation or open coming of Antichrist.

5. Concerning the coming of Antichrist with the tempo-
rall sworde after the yeare 1000. he obiecteth, that from the 700.
yeare the Pope had receiued temporall dominion, & that about the yeare
715. he excommunicated the Greeke Emperours. &c. But Bellarmine
knoweth well enough that we speake not so much of the Popes
temporall dominion ouer those parts which they call the patri-
monie of Saint Peter; but of that which they call and challenge
to themselves, *Viriusque potestatis temporalis & spiritualis Mo-
narchiam*, The Monarchie of both powers, temporall and spirituall.
I answer therefore, that the Pope indeed had a temporall do-
minion before, but not generall: and that he had long ende-
uoured to get the superioritie ouer the Emperours, but neuer
so fully attained vnto it, as in the times of Gregorie the seauenth,
and afterwards. For Gregorie the seauenth, as Auentinus saith,
Primus imperium pontificium condidit, &c. First founded the Pa-
pall Empire, which his successors (saith he, reckoning vnto his
owne times) for these 450. yeares, in spite of the world, and
maugre the Emperours, haue so held, that they haue brought all he-
aueith and hell into subjection. From this time forward the Em-
perours is nothing but a bare title, without substance, &c. And thus
haue I answered what soeuer is in his third Chapter, pertinent to
the matter in hand, omitting (as my maner is) his other wrang-
lings, as being either altogether impertinent, or merely per-
sonall.

The 4. Chapter: maintaining against Bellarmine
his first demonstration, that Antichrist is
come.

1.  O prooue that Antichrist is not yet come; and consequently that the Pope is not Antichrist, he bringeth sixe slender conjectures from sixe signes, which, as shall be shewed, are neither proper nor necessarie. And these by a strange kinde of Logicke, he calleth forsooth sixe demonstrations. For so haue I read of some troubled with melancholie, who haue thought euery Strawe or small Reed in their hands, to haue beene so many Speares. We must know (saith he) that the holy Ghost in the Scriptures, hath giuen vs sixe certaine signes of the comming of Antichrist. Whereof two goe before, viz. the preaching of the Gospell throughout the whole world: and the desolation of the Romane Empire. Two accompanie Antichrist, to wit, the preaching of Enoch and Elias: and the most grieuous persecution of the church, insomuch that the publicke seruice of God must wholly cease. Two come after, namely the ruine of Antichrist after three yeares and a halfe: and the end of the world. Of which signes, none (saith he) is yet fulfilled. We hold the contrary, namely, that all those signes, which the holy Ghost hath giuen concerning the comming of Antichrist, are fulfilled: and that those which are not yet fulfilled, are none of those signes which the holy Ghost hath assigned. For I will not stand now to tell you how filie he maketh the death of Antichrist, and the end of the world, which according to Bellarmines conceit followeth after his death, to be two signes of his comming.

2. The first signe which goeth before the comming of Antichrist, is the Preaching of the Gospell throughout the world. From whence he reasoneth thus: If the Gospell hath not as yet beene preached throughout the world, then is not Antichrist as yet come:

come: But the Gospell hath not as yet beene preached throughout the world, therefore Antichrist is not yet come. But in this argument nothing is sound: no necessitie of consequence in the proposition, nor truth in the assumption. The proposition, notwithstanding he would prooue, because our Saviour Christ maketh this vniuersall preaching of the Gospell a fore-runner of Antichrist, *Mat. 24. 14. This Gospell of the kingdome shalbe preached in all the world, for a testimony vnto all nations.* But our Saviour Christ doth not say that the Gospell shall be preached throughout the world before the comming of Antichrist, but before the end, as it followeth in the very same verse; *and then the end shall come.* Whereby we are to vnderstand either the destruction of Ierusalem, which is most like, or the end and consummation of the world, as Bellarmine expoundeth it. And therefore vniuersally he take it for granted, that the comming of Antichrist shall not be before the very end of the world, which we do constantly denie, as being the matter in question betwixt vs, there is not so much as any shew of reason in this allegation, being vnderstood according to his owne exposition, which also is false. Neither is it the purpose of our Saviour Christ to signifie vnto his Disciples the time of Antichrists comming, but by way of answer to the question propounded by his Disciples verse 3. to shew them when Ierusalem should be destroyed, as also to giue them some signes of his comming, and of the end of the world. But because the former part of this Chapter is diuersly abused by the Papiſts in this matter concerning Antichrist, I thinke it needfull by way of a short analysis to giue you the true meaning thereof; that by one labour all their cauls may be refuted.

3. Whereas therefore our Saviour Christ had foretolde his Disciples the vtter desolation of Ierusalem, and destruction of the temple: they being perswaded that the temple and citie of Ierusalem should not haue an end before the end of the world; demand therefore of our Saviour Christ when should be the end of both. Tell vs (say they verse 3.) when these things shalbe: that is, when the temple shall be destroyed, & what shalbe the signe of thy cōming, & of the end of the world, Which question hauing

two parts, receiveth an answer to both. To the former, concerning the destruction of Ierusalem, from the 4. vers. to the 23. To the latter, concerning the coming of Christ, and the end of the world, from thence to the 42. As touching the former: our Saviour prophesieth, first of the calamities and troubles which should go before the destruction of Ierusalem vnto the 15. verse. And secondly of the destruction it selfe, and the greivousness thereof, vnto the 23. The troubles and calamities which were the forerunners of the destruction of Ierusalem, were either temporall or spirituall. The temporall either publique and common; or peculiar to the disciples of Christ among the Iewes. The publique, warres, and rumors of warres, famine, pestilence, earthquakes, which were but the beginning, *aditum*, of sorrowes in the land of Iewry, being about to be deliuered of her inhabitants, verse. 6. 7. 8. The peculiar troubles to the Christians, persecution and hatred for Christs sake; and the effects thereof in the vnsound, falling away, and betraying and hating one another, verse 9. 10. The spirituall, in the teachers spiries of errour and heresie, vers 11. In the hearers, seduction by false Prophets and falling away, verse 11. 12. Now vnto this Prophesie are admixed both admonitions and consolations. Admonitions, that they should take heed of false Prophets, verse 4. that they should not be troubled or dismayed with rumors of warres, verse 6. Consolations grounded vpon a two-folde promise, first of saluation to those, who, notwithstanding these temptations, shall persevere to the end, verse 13. Secondly, of the successe of their Ministry, that before the desolation of Ierusalem, the Gospel should be preached throughout the world for a testimonie to all nations, verse. 14. And therefore that they should not feare, least together with Ierusalem his Church should bee overthrowne. For before the destruction of Ierusalem he would by their Preaching to all nations, both Iewes and Gentiles, plant his Church in many nations of the world. And for asmuch as the Temple and Citie of Ierusalem were types and figures of the Church of Christ, which were to be abolished when the church of Christ should be established: therefore he addeth, that vpon the planting of his church by their ministry should the end and destruction

destruction of Ierusalem come. And these were the calamities which went before the destruction of Ierusalem. The destruction it selfe is described partly by the efficient, foretold by *Daniel* chap. 9. 27. that is to say, the Romane armies besieging Ierusalem *Luke. 21. 20.* which because they were Idolators are called abominable, and because of the desolation which they were to bring vpon Ierusalem are called desolators, and by a metonymy, *Mat. 24. 15.* the abomination of desolation, and by a *Synecdochic* *Dan. 9. 27.* abominable wings (that is armies) bringing desolation: partly by the greivousness of the destruction verse 21. To this prophesie also he admixeth counsel and consolation. Counsel, that they which shall be in Iewry provide for their selues by flight, verse 16. 17. 18. in respect whereof he both pitieth the women and such as giue sucke, and biddeth them pray that their flight be not in winter, nor on the Sabbath day, verse. 19. 20. His consolation is, that for the elects sake the time of the siege shall be shortened: for otherwise none of the Iewes could escape, as *Chrysostome* also expoundeth, verse. 22. This exposition is plainly confirmed by conference of this Chapter of *Matthew* with *Luke. 21.* where the same question being propounded, verse. 7. concerning the end of Ierusalem alone, receiveth an answer peculiar to the destruction of Ierusalem, vnto the 25. verse. And whereas *Mat. 24. 15.* Christ vseth these words, when you shall see the abomination of desolation which in *Daniel* is called the abominable wings bringing desolation, standing in the holy place, this in *Luke* is thus expounded, When you see Ierusalem *Luke 21 20* besieged with armies (which *Daniel* foretold should bring desolation vpon it) then understand that the desolation thereof is neare, and therefore he aduiseeth them which shall be in Iewry to flee so soone as Ierusalem shall be besieged, &c. Because there shall be great affliction in those dayes, namely in Iewry *in τῇ ἀσπὶ* and Ierusalem, as *Luke* restraineth it. For there shall be great distress in the land, and wrath in this people, and they shall fall on the *τῆς γῆς.* edge of the sword, and shall be carried away captiue into all nations, *Luke. 21. 23* and Ierusalem shall be troden under foot of the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled, and then shall be the end of the world, the figures whereof be addeth in the next words. *24.*

4. By this analysis of the text & conference with *Luke*, it evidently appeareth that all these predictions from the 6. ver. to the 23. in *Mat.* & in the 21. of *Luke* frō the 7. ver. to the 29. concerne the destruction of Ierusalem, which hapned within forty yeares after this prophetic was deliuered. Neither may we thinke that our sauour Christ would intermingle the prophecies concerning the destruction of Ierusalem and the end of the world, thereby to nourish the aforesaid errour of his disciples, who imagined that the end of Ierusalem should not be before the end of the world, as appeareth by their question. For euen afterward ver. 34. where seemeth the greatest mixture, our Sauour Christ speaketh distinctly. For whereas our Sauour had spoken first of the end of Ierusalem, and then of the end of the world feuerally, & had giuen signes of both, whereby they might know the approaching of eyther, as by the budding of the fig tree they gather summer to be neare, he defineth the time of the one, & the other he leaueh indefinite: Verily I say vnto you, this generatio shall not passe, vntil al those things (saith he, pointing as it seemeth towards Ierusalem as he sat in the mount Oliuet) be fulfilled. And as touching the end of the world, he noteth both the certainty thereof, & the vncertainty of the time: of the former he saith, Heauē & earth shal passe away (& that with a noise, as *Peter* saith) but my words shall not passe away, howbeit of that day & houre (namely, wherein the sonne of man shal come, and wherein the heauens shal passe away) none knoweth, no nor the Angels of heauē, but the father only. Whatfoeuer the Papists therefore alledge out of the former part of the Chapter, as fauouring any of their fancies concerning Antichrist, as namely the preaching of the Gospel before the coming of Antichrist, the abomination of desolation, & the most greuous tribulation in the time of Antichrist, &c. may easily be answered.

5 But if these prophecies be compared with the history and euent, we shall finde this truth to be more euident, seeing all these predictions had their complement at or before the destruction of Ierusalem. For (to omit the rest) the Apostle testifieth *Colos.* 1. 6. 23. *Rom.* 1. 8. & 10. 18. that the Gospel was in his time preached in all the world; and therefore before the desolation of Ierusalem, which hapned about two yeare after his death. From whence also evidently appeareth, how false *Bellar-*

2. Pet. 3. 10

Euseb. lib. 3

mines assumption is, as being contradictory both to the prophetic of Christ in this place, as also to the testimony of the Apostle testifying the fulfilling thereof in his time, according to the commission giuen to the Apostles, that they should goe into all the world and teach all nations, *Mat.* 28. 19. *Mar.* 16. 15. which was accordingly performed, *Mar.* 16. 20. And thus *Hamit. in Chrysostome* also expoundeth this place, that before the end, that is, the destruction of Ierusalem, the Gospel was to be preached throughout the world, and prooueth by the same testimonies of *Paul*, that this prophetic was fulfilled before the taking of Ierusalem. But if it seeme incredible vnto any that the Gospel should be preached throughout the world in so short a time: he must consider, first, that by the whole world is not to be vnderstood euery small corner and vsknowne part of the world: but by a *Synecdoche*, the greatest part of the world then knowne and inhabited, as *Luke* 2. 1. And by all nations, not all and euery nation, but all sorts, that is, both Iewes and Gentiles. For both here and elsewhere there seemeth to be an opposition made betwixt the whole world and the land of Iewry: betwixt all nations and the Iewes. For whereas before the Church was contained in Iewry, & the word preached to the Iewes, our Sauour sheweth that before the desolation of Ierusalem, the Gospel should be preached commonly in all parts of the world, & not only in Iewry; & indifferently to all other nations, & not peculiarly to the Iewes. Secondly, he is to consider, both the multitude of the preachers & dispersets of the Gospel, and also the infinit power of Gods spirit, and miraculous efficacie of his word preached, in that it could in so short a time spread it selfe so far as it did. Thirdly a distinction is to be made betwixt preaching the Gospel and receiving it: For it was preached in all the world, but not received euery where. And that our Sauour signifieth where he saith, it should be preached in all the world for a testimony to all nations, to leaue those which embrace it not, without excuse. If then the preaching of the Gospel throughout the world be not made by Christ our Sauour a signe of Antichrists coming, and yet notwithstanding it be most true, that according to the prophetic of Christ, the Gospel was preached in all the world

world before the defolation of Ierusalem: what shew of reason is there in this demonstration? And this is all that I thinke worth the answering in his fourth Chapter.

6. For to what purpose should I tell you of his argument, which notwithstanding he saith it was now no time to prooue, to wit, that before the comming of Antichrist the Gospell should be preached throughout the world, because the cruel persecutio of Antichrist should hinder al publicke exercises of true religion: & therefore was to be preached generally throughout the world either before the time of Antichrist, or not at al: which we shall in part finde time to answer in his fourth demonstration. In the mean time we answer first, that the greivous tribulation, before which our Sauour saith the Gospell was to be preached in al the world, is not the persecution vnder Antichrist, but the affliction of the Iewes at and before the destruction of Ierusalem by the Romanes, as I haue manifestly prooued. And secondly, that if the generall preaching of the Gospell were made a signe of Antichrists comming, as it is not, but of the end; yet is it not necessary that it should be preached generally throughout the world at one time: for it might suffice that in one age it were preached to one nation, and in another age, to another people: And therefore although during the persecution of Antichrist the Gospell were not preached generally and at once to all nations, yet in that time it might be preached to some nations, where it had not formerly bene preached, and therefore might be preached to all nations before the destruction of Antichrist, though it were not before his comming. Or to what end should I spend any time in answering the testimonies of the fathers, who supposed that the Gospell should be preached in all the world before the comming of Antichrist, seeing according to the meaning of our Sauour Christ, it was to be preached in al the world, before the destruction of Ierusalem? Or what account should we make of his objections, wherein he alledgeth that the Gospell hath not as yet bene preached throughout the world, seeing our Sauour who cannot lie hath prophesied, and the Apostle by the same spirit of truth hath testified, that before the destruction of Ierusalem, the

the Gospell of the kingdome was preached in all the world. And therefore the Papists in this point, whilles they study to contradict vs, are not astraide to giue the lye to our Sauour Christ. Neither are his cauillations, wherby he endeavourerh to auoide & elude those testimonies of Scripture, which doe testifie that the Gospell was in the Apostles times preached in all the world, worth the mentioning. For as betwixt Paul saith, *No doubt their sound went out through all the earth, & their words into the ends of the world*: Basilarme cauilleth that the Apostle vseth the time past, instead of the future, as if he had said, *no doubt their sound shal goe through all the earth*. But (say I) the Apostle prooueth that the Iewes had heard the Gospell, because the sound of the Preachers thereof was gone through all the earth: and therefore they from whom the Gospell proceeded to other nations, could not be ignorant thereof. And againe, wherens the same Apostle saith, that the Gospell in his time was in all the world, and addeth that it did bring forth fruite euen as it did among the *Colossians*: Basilarme answereth that the Apostle would not say that it was actually, but virtually, as they say, in all the world. But how could it bring forth fruite, vntill it were actually? and besides, the Apostle in the same Chapter saith, the Gospell had been preached to euery creature vnder heauē, which is a more large speech then this prophesie of our Sauour; *Mat. 24. 14.* To conclude, if by the end in that place it is to be vnderstood the end of the world; as Basilarme will needs haue it contrary to the text, yet the Gospell before the end might be preached throughout the world, and yet not before the comming of Antichrist. If by the end it is to be vnderstood the end of Ierusalem, as I haue manifestly prooued; then according to our Sauours prophesie, the Gospell was preached in all the world, in the Apostles times. But that the generall preaching of the Gospell should be a signe of Antichrists comming, the Scripture hath neuer a word.

Rom. 10. 18

Col. 1. 6.

omnium xpi-
vniuersum
quod agit,
est non so-
lum actu
primo, sed
etiam actu
secundo.
Col. 1. 23.

The 5. Chapter : maintaining against Bellarmine his second demonstration, that Antichrist is already come.



He second signe going before Antichrist is, as Bellarmine saith, the utter desolation of the Romane Empire. From whence this demonstration is raised: If the Roman Empire be not yet utterly destroyed, then is not yet Antichrist come for the utter desolation of the Romane Empire is a certaine signe going before his coming: But the Roman Empire is not yet utterly destroyed therefore Antichrist is not yet come. We confesse that before antichrist could be revealed by exercising a souveraigne dominion in Rome, it was necessary that the Emperour, so farre forth as he hindered this reuelation of Antichrist, should be taken out of the way: But that there should be such an utter desolation of the Empire, as that there should not remaine so much as the name of the Emperour or king of the Romans, that we doe utterly deny. He that hindered was taken out of the way, partly when the imperiall state was remooved from Rome to Constantinople, and that to this end (as they haue set downe in the donation of Constantine) that the City of Rome might be left to the Pope: but especially when as after the diuision of the Empire into two parts, the Empire in the West (which properly was the Empire of Rome) was dissolved, and lay voyde for many yeares: All which was accomplished before Boniface 3. attained to the Antichristian title. Neither doth the reuiuing of the Westerne Empire in Charlemaine, after it had bin voyde 325. yeares; hinder the reuelation or dominio of Antichrist; but rather proueth that Antichrist was then come. For this new Empire, erected by the Popes meanes, it is the image of the beast (that is, of the old Empire) which Antichrist the second beast caused to be made, & putteth life therein. It is the beast wheron the whore of Babylon sitteth, & therefore is so far frō hindring Antichrist, that it supporteth him. This beast which was an imperiall state, but is not indeed, though in title it be, as being but an image of the old Empire, is said to be the eighth head of the beast, & yet one of the seuen: whereas Antichrist by the confessio of papists is the seventh. Wherefore although the

Apoc. 13.

Apoc. 17.

the old Empire in the West (which hindered) was done out of the way, and indeed dissolved before the reuelation of Antichrist; yet euen with and vnder Antichrist, there was to be an imperiall state in name and title, which is the beast wheron the whore of Babylon sitteth, as I haue heretofore proued.

Lib. 2. cap.

3. 6. 3.

2. But let vs come to his argumentes. The first whereof is this: If before Antichrist coming the Romane Empire is to be diuided into ten kingdome, whereof none shall be called king of the Romanes; then is not Antichrist yet come, for yet there is a king of the Romanes: but the first is true, but of so the last. The proposition he taketh for granted, although it cannot be denied but that vpon the dissolution of the empire in the West, it was diuided among ten kingdome at the least; who although they had the prouinces of the Empire, yet none of them was called the king of the Romanes. The proposition therefore is false, and the reason may be returned vpon our aduersary. For seeing these ten kingdome had not receiued their kingly power in the Apostles time, but were to receiue it either after the beast (which is Antichrist,) as some reade; or with the beast as others: it is euident therefore, that when the ten rulers of the prouinces had receiued authority as kings, then Antichrist was come. But many hundred yeeres since, the rulers of the prouinces ceased to be deputies vnder the Emperour, & obtained power as souveraigne kings, diuiding among them the westerne Empire, therefore many hundred yeeres since was Antichrist come. The assumption he proueth out of Daniel chap. 2. Where (saith he) he described the successio of the chiefe kingdomes vnto the end of the world by a certaine image, the golden head whereof signifieth the kingdome of the Assyrians; the Breast of silver, the kingdome of the Persians; the Bellie of Brasse, the kingdome of the Grecians; the Legs of Iron, the kingdome of the Romans diuided into two parts, &c. And in the 7. chap. the same kingdomes are signified: the last which hath ten hornes being the kingdome of the Romanes. Now (saith he) as the two Legs haue ten toes Subtilly, which are not legs, & as the ten hornes are not the beast: so the Roman Empire shall be diuided into ten kingdome, whereof none is the king of the Romanes. Answer. 1. This argumentation of Bellarmine implicth a contradiction. For if there be in Daniel described a succession of kingdomes which shall continue to the end of the world, whereof the Romane is the last: then the Romane Empire

Apo. 17. 12.

Ierem. 51. 63.

Ierem. 51. 63.

Ierem. 51. 63.

Empire shall not utterly be destroyed before the coming of Antichrist, which goeth before the end of the world. But howsoever the common opinion hath bin, that the fourth kingdom mentioned in those chapters is the Romane Empire; yet by the learned, especially of these latter times, it hath bene most clearly proved, that by it is understood that kingdom of the *Seleucida* & *Lagide*, which tyrannized over the people of Jewry. For the *Seleucida* who were Kings of Syria, and the *Lagide* who were Kings of Egypt, were the two legs of the image, & were also the fourth beast: the ten kings of these two kingdoms, which successively usurped dominion over the Jews, were the ten hornes of the beast; which being most true as hereafter also shall be shewed, it appeareth evidently, that this whole argumentation is impertinent. But suppose that *Daniel* had spoken in those places of the Romane Empire, yet would not that follow which *Bellarmine* would inferre thereof. For by the beast is signified the kingdom it selfe, and by the hornes the severall kings, who although they be not the kingdom it selfe signified by the beast, no more then the hornes are the beast, yet are they so many kings of that kingdom, which is signified by the beast. As for example: *Seleucus*, *Antiochus*, and the rest of the ten kings signified by the ten hornes, and as *Bellarmino* speaketh, by the ten toes, though they were not the kingdom of Syria & Egypt it selfe; yet were they kings of that kingdom, and therefore this argument of *Bellarmino* is very frivolous.

3. His second proove is out of *Apocal. 17.* Where John describeth a beast with seven heads and ten hornes, upon which beast a certaine woman sitteth, which he expoundeth to be the great citie sitting on seven hills, that is to say, Rome. The seven heads as they signifie seven hills, so also seven kings, by which number (saith he) all the Romane Emperors are understood: the ten hornes are ten kings, which shall raigne together. And least we should thinke that this shall be Romane kings, he addeth, that these kings shall hate the whore, and make her desolate, because they shall so divide the Romane Empire among them, that they shall utterly destroy it. Here *Bellarmino*, as you see, confesseth, that Rome is the whore of Babylon, and consequently the seat of Antichrist, and not Rome under the olde Emperors, but Rome after the dissolution

tion of the Empire. And that the ten hornes are so many kings, among whom the Romane Empire should be divided, and that these ten Kings were to receive their kingdom together; and consequently that these are not the same ten hornes whereof *Daniel* speaketh, which reigned successively, *Dan. 11.* And whereas *Bellarmino* saith, the 7. heads signifie all the Emperours, it is untrue. For the holy Ghost nameth seven, because they were seven indeed, and therefore numbred them. Five are fallen, the sixth is, and the seventh is not yet come. But all this is besides the present purpose. How then doth he proove, that before Antichrist cometh, the Romane Empire shall be so utterly destroyed, as that not the name of a Romane Emperour or king of the Romanes should remaine? because the Empire shall be divided among ten kings, which are not Romane kings. But that proveth not that the name shall not remaine: for he that is none of those ten kings, may have the name of the Emperour or king of the Romanes, as namely the beast which was, and is not, though it be, which is the eighth head, and is one of the seven, that is to say, the Emperour erected by the Pope. And why may none of these be called the king of the Romanes? First forsooth, because they shall hate Rome, and make her desolate: As though he that hath the title of the King of the Romanes, may not hate Rome notwithstanding that title, as indeed some of the Emperours have done. Secondly, because they shall so divide among them the Romane Empire, as that they shall utterly destroy it. Where you see by a circular disputation, the question brought to prove his argument, & yet experience sheweth, that although the Empire is dissolved, and also divided among the beast (that is Antichrist) & ten kings, there doth notwithstanding remaine the name and title of the Emperour or king of the Romas. And so much now shall suffice to have spoken of that place, from whence I have heretofore proved, both that antichrist is already come, & that the Pope is antichrist.

4. His third proove is out of 2. Thes. 2. And now what hindereth you know, that he may be revealed in due time, onely he which holdeth must holde, untill he be done out of the way, and then that wicked man shall be revealed. That this is to be understood of the Romane Empire, he not onely affirmeth, but also confirmeth by the testi-

monies of diuers of the Fathers, the which we are so farre from denying, that from hence, as one especiall argument, we prooue the Pope to be Antichrist. But neither the Apostle nor any of the Fathers (excepting *Lactantius*, whose Prophecie in this point the Papists themselves do thinke to be erroneous) doth say, that the Empire of Rome shall so vterly be abolished, as that not so much as the name of the Emperour or King of the Romanes shall remaine; which *Bellarmino* should haue prooued. For otherwise that the Empire was indeed dissolved before the reuelation of Antichrist, the holy Ghost prophesied, the euenghath prooued, and we doe willingly confesse: *Qui tenebat, de medio fit*, (saith *Ierome* in his time) *& non intelligimus Antichristum appropinquare? He which held, is taken away, and doe we not vnderstand that Antichrist is at hand? Yea but* (saith *Bellarmino*) *the Romane Empire is not yet vterly destroyed, and therefore Antichrist is not yet come.* Neither is it necessary: it is sufficient, that he which hindered the reuelation of Antichrist, was clone out of the way, which was done first by remoouing the Imperiall seate from Rome, which was to be the seate of Antichrist, as hath beene prooued: secondly, by the dissolution of the Empire in the West. As for the Empire renewed by the Pope, that hindereth not Antichrist, but rather furthereth, as hath beene shewed; and therefore there is no necessitie that it should be taken away. Neither is there now an Emperour of the Romanes indeed, but onely in title, without the thing it selfe, as enjoying neither the citie of Rome it selfe, nor yet the Prouinces. And therefore either vnskillfully or sophistically are these Emperours, which haue no imperiall authoritie either in the citie or the prouinces, compared with those ancient Emperours, who although they had the Empire, wanted Rome it selfe.

5. And hereby appeareth the error of our aduersaries, who thinke that Antichrist cometh not before the vter desolation of the Romane Empire: whereas neither of the Apostles *Paul* or *Iohn* do say so, but rather the contrary, as hath bin shewed. For to omit the rest before alledged, *Iohn* saith, *Apoc. 13.* That one head of the beast, meaning the state of the emperours, had indeed receiued a deadly wound, both in respect of Rome the head city,

C

and

and of the Emperours in the West, but was cured, therefore not vterly destroyed: and cured by the Pope, both in respect of the city, and in regard of the Emperours. And therefore the Pope is Antichrist, as some of our writers infer, because this wound was to be cured by the second beast, which figureth Antichrist. And *Ambrose* saith vpon *2. Thes. 2.* That Antichrist shall restore libertie to the Romans, but in his owne name. *Bellarmino* answereth, That he readeth no where in *Iohn*, that the beast, which signifieth the Romane Empire, was to be cured by antichrist. Yea but this he might haue read, that the second beast, which is Antichrist, causeth the image of the beast (that is, the new Empire) to be made, and putteth life vnto it. For by this renewing of the Empire, *Bellarmino* elsewhere professeth, that the Romane Empire was restored; to the same estate, wherein it was before *Augustinus*. But what hath *Bellarmino* read in *Iohn*? Forsooth, That one of the heads of the beast should dye, and shortly after rise againe by the helpe of the diuell; which the Ancient expound of Antichrist, who shall saue himselfe to be dead, and by diuillish art rise againe, that so by resembling the true death and resurrection of Christ, he might seduce many. First, it is euident that the former beast figureth not Antichrist, but the Romane state, and that vnder the Romane Emperours especially. Secondly, it is not said, that one of the heads did saue it selfe dead, and by the helpe of the diuell did rise againe (which needed not, if the death were counterfeited) but that one of the heads had receiued a deadly wound, & was cured againe. The head was the state of the Emperours, to wit, the first head, which receiued a deadly wound in *Augustinus*, after whom the Empire in the West lay void 325. yeares. But this head was cured after a sort in *Charlemaine* & his successours, in whom there was an image of the former Emperours erected by the Pope. And therefore this state of Emperours renewed in *Charlemaine* and his successours, is said to be the eighth head of the beast, & yet is one of the seven, So that the sixth head which before was wounded to death, was cured, & after a sort repaired in the. This in substance is confessed by *Bellarmino* himself in this chapt. where vnderstanding by the two legs of the image in *Daniel*, the Westerne and Easterne Empire, he saith, That the Westerne, which was the one leg, failed, namely, in *Augustulus*,

D 2

and

Ad Geron-
siam de Mo-
nogramia.De translat.
imperij. lib.
2. c. 4.

Quod est

and was after erected in *Charlemaine*, and that (as else where he boasteth) by the Pope. Now whereas *Bellarmine* labourerh to proue, that this head which was wounded to death and reuiued againe, is not *Charles* the great, he sheweth himselfe ridiculous in fighting with his owne shadow. For by the head is not meant any one man, but the state and succession of Emperours, which was interrupted and cut off in *Aufustulus*, & renewed in *Charles* the great, and his successors. And that which is added concerning the vniuersallitie either of worship, or of rule, is not spoken of the head which was reuiued, but of the beast, which was to haue one of his seauen heads wounded to death & cured againe.

Apoc. 13.
7.8.

The sixth Chapter: answering his third demonstration, concerning Enoch and Elias.



Now we are to come to those signes, which in *Bellarmines* conceit are to accompany Antichrist, the former wherof is the coming of *Enoch* and *Elias* in the flesh, to oppose themselves against Antichrist, and to conuert the Iewes. From whence *Bellarmino* reasoneth thus. If *Enoch* and *Elias* be not yet come againe in the flesh, then Antichrist is not yet come: But *Enoch* and *Elias* are not yet come againe in the flesh; and therefore Antichrist is not yet come. To the proposition I answer; first, that if *Enoch* and *Elias* were to come in their owne persons before the second coming of Christ, as some of the Ancient haue thought; and that to oppose themselves against Antichrist, as the Papists dreame: yet it followeth not that therefore Antichrist should first be come before their coming. It is sufficient that they come before his overthrowe, and the second coming of Christ. And therefore if they were indeed to come, their coming might yet be expected, notwithstanding the truth of our assertion, that Antichrist is already come. But if *Enoch* and *Elias* be not to come againe in their owne persons before the end of the world; to fight against Antichrist, what force of argument is there in this worthy demonstration? This therefore *Bellarmino* maketh

maketh the question, which he goeth about to proue. First, by testimonies of Scripture. Secondly, by consent of the fathers. Thirdly, by reason.

2. There be foure Scriptures (saith *Bellarmino*) to proue that *Enoch* and *Elias* in their owne persons shall come against Antichrist. Howbeit this is a manifest vniuersity; for no place of Scripture speaketh of *Enoch* his returne. The first *Malach. 4. 5. Behold I will send vnto you Elias the Prophet, before the great and terrible day of the Lord come, and he shall turne the hearts of the fathers vnto the children, and the hearts of the children vnto their fathers.* This place maketh no mention of *Enoch*, but onely of *Elias*: and by *Elias* is meant not *Elias* the Thesbite; but *Iohn* the Baptist: who (as the Angel applying to him this prophecy saith) should go before the Lord *Iesus* in the spirit and power of *Elias*, that he may turne the hearts of the fathers vnto the children, &c. And our saviour Christ most plainly affirmeth, that *Iohn Baptist* is that *Elias* who was to come, and if you will receiue (saith he) that is, if you will giue credit to my speech, this is that *Elias* who was to come. And addeth, *he that hath eares to heare, let him heare.* Which sheweth that the Papists neither haue hearts to beleue Christ, nor eares to heare him; but haue open both hearts to receiue and eares to heare the fables of the Iewes: who as they yet looke for their Messias, so they looke also for *Elias* to be his forerunner. For as *Ierome* writeth vpon this place of *Malachy*, the Iewes and Iudaizing hereticks thinke that before their Messias, *Elias* shall come, and restore all things. Hence it is, that vnto Christ this question is propounded in the Gospels: What is that which the Pharisees say, that *Elias* shall come? to whom he answered: *Elias* indeed shall come: and if you will beleue, he is already come, by *Elias* meaning *Iohn*. And therefore in *Ieromes* iudgement it is but the opinion of a Iudaizing hereticke to expect the coming againe of *Elias* in his owne person. Yea but (saith *Bellarmino*) this place cannot be vnderstood of *Iohn Baptist*, but of *Elias* onely. For *Malachy* speaketh of the second coming of Christ which shall be vnto iudgement: For so he saith, before the great & terrible day of the Lord come; for his first coming is not called great and terrible, but the acceptable time & day of saluation. Whereupon it is also added, least when I come, I strike the earth with a curse. But

Luke. 1. 17.

Mat. 11. 14

Christ in his first coming came not to judge, but to be judged.

3. *Ans.* Bellarmine must giue vs leaue to beleue the Angell of God, and our Saviour Christ, rather then himselfe, who is not affraid, as it seemeth, to giue the lie to the spirit of God speaking in both. Neither can he proue that *Malachie* speaketh of the second coming of Christ: for therein the Papists erre worse then the Jewes. For both the text it selfe, & also the application thereof by the Angell and our Saviour Christ; do proue, that *Elias* was to come before the first coming of Christ, which is great to the godly, and terrible to the wicked. And therefore in the beginning of the third Chapter, the Prophet speaking most plainly of the first coming of Christ, before which the Lord promiseth to send his messenger, that is, *Iohn Baptist*, to prepare the way before him, signifieth, that this coming is great and fearefull, verse 2. *But who may abide the day of his coming? and who shall endure when he appeareth? for he is like a purging fire, and like Fullers Sope, and he shall sit downe to trie and fine the silver.* Of the same coming he speaketh in the beginning of the fourth Chapter. *Behold the day cometh that shall burne as an Oven, &c.* shewing how terrible it shall be to the wicked. *But unto you that feare my name* (saith the Lord, verse 2.) *shall the sunne of righteousness arise, and health shall be under his wings, &c.* And before this great day cometh, he promiseth them to send them *Elias*, that is, *Iohn Baptist*, to whom our Saviour applieth the Prophecie of *Malachie*, both Chapter 3. 1. and Chapter 4. 5. In like sort, *Iohn Baptist* himselfe describeth the first coming of Christ as terrible in respect of the wicked. *Now* (saith he) *is the Axe laid to the roots of the trees, &c.* Math. 3. 10. and verse 11. and 12. *He that cometh after me is mightier then I: he will Baptize you with the holy Ghost and with fire, which bath his Faune in his hand, (vsing) the like similitude that Malachie did) and will purge his Floor, and gather his Wheate into his Garne, but will burne up the Chaffe with unquenchable fire.* Symeon also saith of our Saviour, that he was appointed both for the fall of the wicked, and rising of the godly. And elsewhere he is called a *stumbling stone*, and a *Rock of offence*, upon which stone, whosoever falleth, he shall be broken in peeces: but on whomsoever it shall fall, it shall all

is grind him. If notwithstanding all this which hath bene alledged, any man shall thinke the first coming of the Lord, not so fitly to be called terrible: I further answer, that the Hebrew word *Norah*, signifieth also reuerend, to be feared, or had in reuerence, as Gen. 28. 17. Deut. 7. 21. and so is translated by *Tremulus* and *Iupius* in this place of *Malachie*. And thus both that word, and others of the same roote are used in the signification of reuerence, or filiall feare. And whereas it is added, that *Elias* should be sent to conuert the people, *Least when I come* (saith the Lord) *I should strike the earth with a curse*: the meaning is, that the Lord would send his messenger to prepare the way before him, that some of the people at the least, might be ready to receiue our Saviour Christ, least if all should reject him, he should be prouoked to strike the land: for at his second coming, he shall without peradventure strike the earth. And in this exposition of *Malachie* besides others, *Arias Montanus* the most learned writer among the Papists, doth wholly agree with vs; expounding this Prophecie of *Iohn Baptist*, whom he calleth another *Elias*, and of the first coming of Christ. Thus therefore I answer: First that *Malachie* speaketh not of *Enoch*, but of *Elias* onely: and secondly, of *Elias* his coming, not with Antichrist, but before Christ; thirdly, & that before the first coming of Christ: fourthly and consequently, not of *Elias* literally, but of *Iohn Baptist*, who came in the spirit and power of *Elias*.

4. The second place is, *Ezechias* 48. 10. & 44. 16. In the former place it is said of *Elias*, That he was appointed to reprove in due season, and to pacifie the anger of the Lords judgement proceeding to sinne, and to turne the hearts of the sakers vnto the children, and to set up the Tribes of Jacob. In the latter it is said of *Enoch*, as Bellarmine readeth, That he pleased God, and was translated into Paradise, that he might giue penance vnto the Gentiles. First I answer to both places, that although this booke of the sonne of Sirach be very commendable; yet it is not of Canonically authoritie, being but a humane writing, as appeareth not onely by the former place alledged, but also by that erroneous conceit concerning *Samuel*, chapter 46. 23. Secondly, in neither place is it said, that either of them should come to oppose themselves

against Antichrist; that from hence their returne into the world, should be made a signe of the comming of Antichrist. But as touching the former place, severally I answer with *Iansenius* one of the best writers among the Papists (howsoever *Bellarmino* wondereth at him, that hee should consent with vs in the truth; beeing a Popish Bishop) that although the ancient writers haue thought that *Elias* was to come againe, yet it cannot be euinced out of this place. For we may say that *Ecclesiasticus* did write this according to the received opinion of his time, grounded (as they thought) vpon the words of *Malachie*, that *Elias* was truly to come in his owne person before the Messias: when as that was not to be fulfilled in his owne person, but in him that was to come in the spirit and power of *Elias*. True indeed it is, that not onely the authour of that booke, as it seemeth, but the Iewes in generall, vnderstanding the words of *Malachie* literally, did expect that *Elias* in his owne person should returne before the comming of the Messias. But our Sauour Christ reformeth this error, applying the Prophecie to *Iohn Baptist*. And secondly I answer, that if *Bellarmino* will argue out of *Ecclesiasticus*, according to his meaning, he must prooue that *Elias* was to come in his owne person, before the first comming of the Messias, of which *Malachie* speaketh; and before which this authour as all the rest of the Iewes, doe holde that *Elias* was to come: And therefore the Papists might aswell with the Iewes, looke for their Messias, as for *Elias*. Now as touching the other place, it is a wonder that *Bellarmino* would alledge it for this purpose. But that hauing nothing to say to the purpose, he is desirous to say some thing to blear the eyes of the simple. The ori-

Eccles. 4:16 ginal Text hath these words, *Ενωχ ιμπεριον ενεχεν δεσ, και πορευθη εδουλαγμια υπακουσας ταις εντολαις*, that is, *Enoch pleased the Lord God, and was translated for an example of repentance to the generations*: that is, that the generations present and to come, might be moued by his example, to turne vnto the Lord and to walke before him, knowing by his example that there is a reward laid vp for those that turne vnto the Lord, and walke before him as *Enoch* did. But will *Bellarmino*

whence conclude, that therefore *Enoch* is to come againe in the flesh, to oppose himselfe to Antichrist?

5. The third place is, *Math. 17. 11. Elias indeed shall come, and shall restore all things*. Which words, saith *Bellarmino*, are plainly to be vnderstood, not of *Iohn*, but of the true *Elias*. For *Iohn* was already come, and had finished his course, and yet the Lord saith in the future, *Elias shall come*. I answer, that by the Evangelist *Marke*, who speaketh in the present tense, *Elias indeed comming first restoreth all things*: the meaning of our Sauour Christ appeareth to haue beene this. *Elias quidem venturus fuit primum, & restitutus omnia*; *Elias* indeed was to come first, and was to restore all things, but I tell you that *Elias* is already come, and they haue done vnto him what they listed, as it is written of him, meaning *Iohn Baptist*. As if he had said, The Prophecie indeed concerning *Elias* is true, but I tell you it is already fulfilled. For as he saith in another place; *Iohn Baptist is that Elias who was to come*, then which, what could be spoken more plainelie? *Bellarmino* answereth, That *Iohn Baptist* was the promised *Elias*, not literally, but allegorically. So we asseme also, and further adde, that *Elias* was not promised literally. For our Sauour Christ plainly assemeth, that *Iohn Baptist* is that *Elias* which was promised. And both he and the Angell vnderstand that Prophecie of *Malachie* chapter 4. 5. not literally of *Elias* the *Thesbite*, but allegorically of *Iohn Baptist*, who was, as it were, another *Elias*. Yea bilit the Disciples, saith *Bellarmino*, who had seene the transfiguration, when they asked Christ, what is that which the Scribes say, that *Elias* must first come, speake of the same *Elias*, whom they had seene with Christ in the Mount: and therefore Christ making answer to them, that *Elias* indeed shall come, speaketh of the same *Elias*. It followeth not: for the Disciples speake according to the erroneous opinion of the Scribes, who vnderstanding *Malachie* literally, thought that *Elias* was to come in his owne person, and thereupon (as it is thought) inserted, that Christ was not the true Messias, because *Elias* came not before him. But Christ answereth them according to the true meaning of *Malachie*, applying

Mark. 9. 12
13.
Mat. 17. 13

Mat. 11. 14

applying his prophecies to *John Baptist*, who is figuratively called *Elias*. Yea but it cannot truly be said that *John Baptist* restored all things: for to restore all things, is to call all the *Jewes* and *heretiques*, and perhaps some of the seduced *Catholicks* to the true faith, as *Beilarmine* objecteth. This is indeede the *Papish* conceit, that *Enoch* and *Elias* shall preach against *Antichrist* 1260. daies at the end whereof they shall be put to death by *Antichrist*, and after three daies and an halfe, shall rise againe. Within a moneth after their death, *Antichrist* shall be destroyed in *mount Oliuet*: and 45. daies after that, *Christ* shall come to iudgement. In the meane time so effectually shall be the preaching of *Enoch* and *Elias*, that they shall restore all things, that is, they shall call all the *Jewes* and *hereticks*, and perhaps the seduced *Catholicks*. But how doth this agree with the prophecies of our Saviour *Christ*, concerning the want of faith at his coming, and the vncertainty of the time of his appearing? As touching the former he saith, the sonne of man when he cometh, shall he finde faith upon the earth? And as touching the other, he hath foretold that the end of the world shall be suddaine and vnlooked for, euen as it was in the daies of *Noah* and *Lot*. But if this conceit of the *Papists* be true, there shall be more true belecuers at the end of the world, then euer had bene at one time before: and the day of *Christ*s coming, after the reuelation of *Antichrist*, but especially after his death, shall be precisely knowne, & accordingly looked for. Now whereas he saith, that *John* did not restore all things, which (as *Christ* saith) *Elias* should doe: I answer, that *Christ* speaketh according to their vnderstanding, and therefore that *John Baptist* did restore all things in that sense that *Elias* was, according to their conceit, to restore all things. But by restitution in this place, we are to vnderstand the reformation of the people and Church of the *Jewes* (to whom the messenger and forerunner is promised, & not to hereticks and seduced catholicks) wherein *John Baptist* was another *Elias*. Neither is this restitution ascribed to the *Baptist*, as though it had bene perfected by him, but because he began that, which *Christ* was to bring to perfection. So that *John Baptist* may truly be said to haue made this restitution *Inchoatim*.

Luk. 18. 8.

Mat. 24. 39
Luk. 17. 26
18.

6. The fourth place is *Apoc. 11. 3. 7. will give to my two witnesses and they shall prophesie 1260. daies.* Which words he affirmeth (but without all reason) are to be vnderstood of *Enoch* and *Elias*, who are not once mentioned in al that chapter. Neither can those two witnesses signifie *Enoch* & *Elias*: because they are to be killed by the beast, and their bodies shall lie dead in the streets of the great Citie three daies and an halfe: For *Enoch* and *Elias* they were taken vp into heauen: where in soule at the least they enjoy the glorious presence of God. For otherwise their estate were worse then of the rest of the faithfull departed: and so their translation should rather haue bin a punishment then a blessing or prerogative vnto them: without question therefore their soules at the least are in heauen. But whether they be there in soule alone, or in soule & body, there may be some question: but if they be there in body, it cannot be that their body is mortall (as the *Papists* would haue it) & subiect to death. For how can corruption inherit incorruption? or how can it be truly said, that *Enoch* was translated: that he should not see death, if notwithstanding his translation, he shall suffer death? If therefore their bodies be in heauen, vndoubtedly they were in the translation changed, and by that change became immortal, as the bodies of them shall, who shall be aliue vpon the earth at the second coming of *Christ*. If their soules alone be in heauen, their bodies being dissolved and returned into dust, then either they must come in their owne bodies, or in others. If in others, then must we hold the *puritan* doctrine, of flitting of soules into diuers bodies: if in their owne, then shall they not onely rise before the resurrection, but also after their resurrection die againe. All which absurdities plainly shew, that the *Papish* opinion concerning the coming of *Enoch* and *Elias* is a mere fable, whereby men are kept in security: that they should not with vigilancie waite for the coming of *Christ*, because as yet forsooth, *Enoch* and *Elias* are not returned. The two witnesses therefore cannot signifie *Elias* and *Enoch*. But I should add, that *Beilarmine* is not prone that this place increaseth of *Antichrist*, but rather of the beast with 7. Heads arising out of the sea, that is, the Roman state either generally, or especially vnder the Emperours, as may be gathered by comparing verse 2.

1. Cor. 15.
50.1. Cor. 15.
52. 53.
1. Thes. 4.

2nd. 7. of the 11. chap. with the 1. and 5. of the 13. I would then know to what purpose he alledgeth this text to, prooue, that *Enoch* and *Elias* shall come against Antichrist, if neither the one nor the other be here meant.

7. Vnto these testimonies of Scripture, he addeth the consent of the fathers, who hold that *Enoch* & *Elias* shal in their own persons come in the time of antichrist. And to this purpose he nameth many, but yet among al the ancient which he citeth, only *Gregory* is alledged to the purpose, who in his morals expounding the words of *Balaad* the *Sabius* as spoke of Antichrist, testifieth, that in his time *Enoch* and *Elias* shal come, which is as true, as that *Balaad* spake of Antichrist. Of the rest, some speake of the returne of *Elias* only, and that to conuert the Iewes (without mention of his resisting Antichrist) being deceived by the corrupt translatiō of the 72. who in *Malachy* 4. v. 5. read *Elias* the *Therbite*, and thereby gaue occasion to the readers to expōd those words of *Elias* literally; whereas in the Hebrew, & also in other translations we read *Elias* the Prophet, which may truly be applied to *Iohn*, who was a Prophet; & by the testimony of our saviour Christ, more then a Prophet. Others, who besides *Elias* mention the coming of another, agree not among themselves. *Vistorinus* refuting the opinion of some who thought the two witnesses to be *Elias* & *Elihu*, or *Elias* & *Moses*, saith, all our Ancestours by tradition haue deliuered that it is *Elias* and *Ieremie*. *Hilary* refelling those which thought the two witnesses to be *Elias* & *Enoch*, or *Elias* and *Ieremy*, contendeth that they must be *Moses* and *Elias*. *Hippolytus* to *Enoch* & *Elias*, addeth *Iohn* the Diuine, who (as he saith) shal come with the before the coming of Christ. All which opinions of the fathers giue vs a sufficient prooffe, Into what vncertainties ment are carried, whē they will be wise about that which is written. For seeing the holy Ghost hath not named these two witnesses, it is hard especially for them, who liued (as themselves thought) before the fulfilling of this prophecie, to decide whether by these two witnesses is not meant a sufficient, though a smal number of Gods witnesses, whom he shall raise to testifie his truth euen in the hottest persecution of the beast; or if they be two and no more, to determine particularly, and by name, who they are.

8. Vnto

8. Vnto these testimonies in the last place he addeth a reason, to make vp this demonstration, which may thus be concluded: If *Enoch* & *Elias* were taken up before their death; & yet live in mortall bodies wherein once they shall die; then shall they come in the time of Antichrist to see themselves against him. But *Enoch* and *Elias* being taken up before death doe yet live in mortall bodies, wherein they are once to die; therefore they shall come in the time of Antichrist to see themselves against him. The proposition is vnecessary, and the assumptiō vntrue. For though we should grant that they yet live in mortall bodies, and that their death is yet deferred; yet how doth this follow, that they live to resist Antichrist and to be slaine of him? Yea but saith *Bellarmino*; bre come vnder other reason be giue. Of their translation, there is this reason; that there might be euident examples of reward and happinesse laid vp both for the vp-right in *Enoch*, and for the zealous in *Elias*. Of their yet living in mortall bodies, if they did so according to the opinion of some of the fathers, that reason might be giuen, which they alledge, to wit, to conuert the Iewes. But the assumptiō also is false. For it is vntrue that they live in mortall bodies, or that they shall euer dye. For where I beseech you doe they live in mortall bodies, in the earthly Paradise, or in the heauenly? In the earthly, say the Papiſts; but that was defaced either at or before the flood: so that although the place remaine, yet no Paradise remaineth, as *Bellarmino* elsewhere confesseth. And if they were living in the earthly Paradise, how is it said, they were taken vp, as it is plainly said of *Elias*, that he was taken vp into heauen? Or what priuiledge or reward haue they aboue others, if all this while they haue wanted Gods glorious presence which others enioy; and hereafter are to be slaine of Antichrist? Or how was *Enoch* translated that he should not see death, if notwithstanding his translation, he must dye the death? If in the celeſtiall Paradise, that is the third heauen as *Paul* speaketh, it may first be doubted; whether they be there in body; because it may be thought that Christ was the first that in body ascended into heauen; or if their bodies be there, we must hold that in the translation they were changed into immortal and incorruptible bodies, as theirs shall, who shall be found living vpon the earth as

Lib. 1. de
Sanctis. be-
atitud. c. 3

2. Kim. 3. 17


1. Cor. 13.

the second coming of Christ, and shalbe rapt vp into the aire. For this I say with Paule, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of heauen, neither doth corruption inherit incorruption.

9. But will you see vnder one view, how farre this slender coniecture taken from the coming of Enosh and Elias, is from being a demonstratiue prooffe. First, he cannot prouoe necessarily that they are yet in their bodies. Secondly, if they be in their bodies, he cannot proue that their bodies are mortall. Thirdly, if their bodies be mortall, it is not necessary that they should returne into the world and die, because at the end of the world they might be changed with the rest that then shalbe liuing, as some also haue thought. Fourthly, if they should returne into the world and dye, there is no necessity that they should come in the time of Antichrist. Fifthly, if it should be granted that they are to come against Antichrist, yet it would not follow that therefore Antichrist is not yet come: but this only would follow, that Antichrist is not yet destroyed, which we doe not deny. And this was his third demonstration, whereby he proueth that Antichrist is not yet come, and consequently that the Pope is not Antichrist. To conclude therefore, must not this needs be a good cause, that by so learned a man is so stoutly proued?

1. Cor. 15.
54.
1. Thes. 4.
17.
1. Cor. 15.
50.
1. Tim. 4.
8.
ad orib.
doctos.

The 7. Chapter: answering his fourth demonstration, concerning the most greuous persecution vnder Antichrist.

1.  He second signe accompanying Antichrist, from whence Bellarmine draweth his fourth demonstration, is the most greuous & notorious persecutio of the Church, in so much that the publicke seruice of God shall wholly cease. His demonstration is thus to be framed. When Antichrist is come there shalbe the most greuous and manifest persecution that euer was, inso much that the publicke seruice of God shal wholly cease: But as yet there hath bin no such persecution, neither hath the

the publicke seruice of God wholly ceased, therefore Antichrist is not yet come. Of his third argument, and consequently of the proposition and assumption, there are three partes, which severally are to be considered, that the persecution vnder Antichrist is, 1. Most greuous, 2. Most manifest, 3. Such as shall cause all Gods worship to cease. As touching the first, he reasoneth thus: Vnder Antichrist shalbe the most greuous persecution; as yet this most greuous persecution hath not bin, especially vnder the Pope; therefore Antichrist is not yet come, neither is the Pope Antichrist. The proposition, namely, that the most greuous persecution is vnder Antichrist, he proueth by two testimonies. The first, *Mat. 24. 21. And then shalbe great tribulation, such as hath not bin since the beginning of the world, neither shalbe.* The other, *Apoc. 17. 6. Then shall Satan be let loose, namely, after the thousand yeeres are expired.* Answer. We doubt not but that the persecution vnder Antichrist was to be very greuous, because the holy Ghost testifieth so much *Apoc. 17. 6.* Where the whore of Babylon is said to be drunke with the blood of the Saints, and with the blood of the Martyrs of Iesus. But his proofes are not to the purpose. For the place in *Matth. 24.* as heretofore hath bene shewed, and as appeareth by the text it selfe, is to be vnderstood of the calamities, which at the destruction of Ierusalem by the Romanes, the Iewes sustained. For when you see (saith our Saviour Christ) the abominacion of desolation spoken of by Daniel the Prophet standing in the holy place, that is, as Luke expoundeth, when you see Ierusalem compassed about with armies (which Daniel calleth the abominable wings of desolation) then let those which are in Jewry flye vnto the mountaines, &c. And his reason is, because then there shalbe great affliction, such as hath not bene from the beginning of the world vntill now, neither shalbe. Which Luke expresseth thus, for there shall be great distresse in the Land, and wrath is ready to be, in this people, and they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be carried captiue into all nations, and Ierusalem shall be troden vnder foot of the Gentiles, vntill the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled.

2. As touching the thousand yeeres mentioned, *Apoc. 20.* After which Satan was to be loosed; although the expiration of them

Mat. 24. 21

Luk. 21. 20

Dan. 9. 27

Mat. 24. 22

Luk. 21. 23

them sal in Antichrists raigne, yet we are not to begin his raigne thereat, as appeareth plainly *Apoc. 20. v. 4.* Neither is that letting loose of Sathan to be vnderstood of the persecution onely vnder Antichrist: for it is manifest by the text, that within those thousand yeares, many many were put to death by Antichrist for refusing to receiue his marke, and that the greatest part lay dead in Antichristian errors and superstition, verse 4. & 5. and by the 8. verse, that Satan was let loose not onely to stirre vp persecution against the faithfull, but also and that principally to stirre vp vniuersall wars betwixt the nations of the world, betwixt *Gog* and *Magog*, that is, as some expound, the *Papists* and *Mahometans*. Now I would gladly know of *Bellarmino* when these thousand yeares began, and when they expired: for hereof there be diuers opinions, but I wil touch the principall, 1. That these thousand yeeres begin with the incarnation of Christ, and determine accordingly, when as *Siluester* the second had obtained the Papacie by the helpe of the diuell: after whom followed in the Antichristian seat a succession of notable forerers. 2. That the thousand yeeres begin about the 73. yeare of Christ: at which time the people of the Iewes being destroyed, and the Church of Christ of a particular became catholick & dispersed throughout all nations, the diuell as it is in the end of the 12. Chap. seeketh by all means to ouerthrow the seede borne of the Church of the Iewes, that is, the Churches of Christ begotten vnto God by the ministry of the Apostles and Disciples of Christ. Whereupon it is said Chap. 20. (where the former story, as some thinke is continued) the Angell bindeth Satan for a thousand yeares, which end in the yeare 1073. which being expired, the diuell is loosed, and *Gregory 7.* alias *Hildebrand* (a notable forerer, and murderer, in whom Antichrist came to his full growth) was installed in the Papacie. *Augustine* beginneth this account much about this time. 3. That these 1000. yeares take their beginning from the time of the reuelation, which was about the yeare of our Lord, 96. and consequently ended about the yeare 1096: in which yeare those vniuersall wars were raised for the recovery of Ierusalem and the holy land out of the hand of the *Saracens*, which the holy Ghost here seemeth to speake of betwixt the

*Apoc. 12.**De ciuit.
Dii. Lib. 10
cap. 8.*

the nations of the earth. In this expedition there met at Ierusalem 600000. footmen, and 100000. horsemen out of Christendome, besides eight or nine other expeditions afterwards, for the recouerie forsooth of the holy land. 4. Others begin this account at the beginning of *Constantines* reigne, which happened not long after the yeere 300. who being the first Christian Emperour, gaue peace to the Church of God, and according to this account the thousand yeeres expired about the yeere 1300. in which yeere the Turkish Empire began in *Ottoman*; and Pope *Boniface* the eight most insolently and Antichristianlie challenged, especially in that his yeere of Iubilee, an vniuersall dominion ouer the world, both spirituall and temporall. All which opinions being severally probable, it is more then probable, that those 1000. yeeres are already expired: and consequently that Antichrist is already come. For as *Bellarmino* teacheth, the diuell was to be loosed in the time of Antichrist, and the Text plainly sheweth, that before the expiration of the thousand yeares, and loosing of the diuell, many were slaine by Antichrist. So that the testimonies which he alledgeth are against his purpose. For the great tribulation whereof Christ speaketh is already past, and the thousand yeeres whereof *Iohn* speaketh, already expired: and therefore if *Bellarmines* allegations be to the purpose, then Antichrist is come.

3. But supposing his proposition to be thus farre true, that the persecution of the church vnder Antichrist, shalbe very great and grievous (for that vnder him shalbe the greatest tribulation that euer was or shalbe, I dare not auousch, because our Saviour hath said, that the calamities of the Iewes at the destruction of Ierusalem, were the greatest that euer were or shalbe to the end of the world:) let vs come to his assumption, and consider whether there hath not bin great and grievous persecution of the church, vnder the Pope, *Bellarmino* confesseth, that many of our religion haue bin put to death by them: but he maketh it a matter of nothing. First, because this persecution if it were so to be called, is not comparable with the persecutions vnder the Heathenish Emperours, and especially vnder *Dioclesian*, by whose authority 17000. Christians were slaine in one month. And secondly, because many of them haue borne

slaine by Protestants in France and Flanders within 10. or 15. yeeres before Bellarmine read these controuersies, which was Anno. 1577, then had beene burnt of our men by the Inquisitioners in an hundred yeeres: and thirdly, if there hath bene any persecution in these latter times, the Catholicks haue suffered it rather then the Protestants. To which I answer, that I cannot tell whether the Papists in persecuting the faithfull, haue bene more cruell and barbarous, or he in cloaking their cruelty, shamelesse. For to omit the spirituall calamities inflicted by the Pope, and fearefull hauck of mens soules, wherein he taketh such libertie to himselfe, that if he cary whole troopes of soules into hell, no man may say vnto him, sir, why do you so? omitting, I say, these spirituall calamities which are most greuous, and in respect whereof the tribulation of Christian people hath bin more grievous vnder the Pope, then vnder any Heathenish tyrants, and to speake onely of outward troubles: why are not the persecutions of the Protestants vnder the Pope, comparable with those in the Primitiue church? For durance, they haue bene longer and more continuall: for number, more slaine in France alone vnder the name of *Albigenses*, *Waldenses*, & *Engenotes*, for refusing the marke of the beast, then were slaine in any one of the ten persecutions throughout the world: besides infinite more, as *Saunders* confesseth in other countries, on whom the Papists haue practised most sauage cruelty. The Duke of *Alba* in the Low-countries alone, cauled within a very few yeeres 36000. to be executed. Yea but in *Diolesian* time (saith Bellarmine) there were in one moneth 17000. Christians martyred. Yea but in France alone, say I, vnder *Charles* the ninth, within one moneth were slaughtered in the Massacre at *Paris* & *Lyons*, & some other places, as some say, 40000. as others, about thirty thousand, that is to say, twise as many as in *Diolesian* moneth, without all order of law, but with most perfidious treachery, and barbarous cruelty. And this bloody Massacre applauded by the Pope and his Cardinals, was committed within five or six yeeres before Bellarmine read these controuersies concerning the Pope, that is to say, Anno. 1572. And yet this cruell Cardinal of the purpled harlot the church of Rome, which is embred, and as it were died redde with the blood of the Saints and Martyrs of Iesū,

Iesū, is not ashamed to say, that within 10. or 15. yeeres there haue bin slaine more Catholicks in France and Flanders, then had bin burnt by the Inquisitioners these 100. yeeres. As touching the Inquisitioners, they can kill but all that they finde of the religion, and that I am sure they spare not to doe. *Vergerius*, who could well tell, witnesse, that within the space of 30. yeeres, there were put to diuers fearfull deaths by the bloody Inquisition, a hundred & fiftie thousand Christians. But we speake not onely of those which haue bin burnt, or by other more exquisite toiments martyred by their meanes (although the number of them in all countries cannot be reckoned) but we speake also of those that haue bene in great multitudes by outrageous Massacres most butcherly murdered.

4. But what Catholicks, I beseech you, haue bin put to death by protestants for their religion? Bellarmine answereth that many of them haue died in the ciuill warres in France & Flanders. It may be that the Protestants in these ciuill waies vnder-taken for their owne defence, that they might be free from such outrages, haue slaine in lawfull battaile many of the Papists, as contrariwise many of themselves haue bene slaine. But what is this to the purpose? Thus many in the armies of *Antiochus Epiphanius*, the most cruell persecutor of the Church of the Jewes, were slaine in Iewrie in the time of the *Maccabees*, as well as they had slaine many of the Jewes. But I say againe, what Catholicks (as they call them) haue bene put to death for religion? As for those fewe that haue bene executed among vs, what one was put to death, that was not found guiltie eyther of treason or rebellion, or some such capitall crime? And yet the Papists report, and in Bookes doe publish, that I cannot tell how many of them are martyred here in England for their religion. Neither are they ashamed to write, and in Rome to publish that some of them haue bene put into Beares skinned and baited with Dogges, which also they haue set out in tables. But compare I beseech you with those many that were martyred in *Queene Maries* five yeeres, those few that haue bene executed in *Queene Elizabeths* fortie five yeeres. Compare the causes, which make persecution in the agents

I. del. de
ab. Pontif.
sc.

Ecclie
Anglic.
Trophæa.
Printed at
Rome An.
1584. cum
privilegio
Gregor. 13

and martyrdom in the patients. What one put to death of those which were burnt in *Q. Maries* time for any crime, but onely for religion, which they call heresie? what one of the Catholicks, as they call them, in *Q. Elizabeths* time executed, who was not found guiltie of some capitall crime? Compare the estate of Papists liuing among Protestants at this day, as namely in England, with the estate of Protestants liuing among Papists, as namely in Spaine. Is any one suffered to liue among them, that is but once suspected to be of our religion? Is not euery such a one either privately murdered, or publickly brought to the stake? Among vs who is not suffered to liue, although he be knowne to be of the Romish religion? To liue, did I say? Nay, God be mercifull vnto vs that suffer them so to liue as they doe, to the encouragement and infection of others. I speake not onely of ordinarie Papists, and those that are at liberty, but of the ring-leaders also that be in custodie: whose life hath bene more easie and pleasant, and maintenance more plentifull, then of the most students or ministers among vs. Yea but there is cause (will they say) that we should deale worse with you, then you with vs. Nothing lesse. They object to vs onely heresie, and that as truly as the Iewes did to *Paul*, which we doe truly object vnto them, and in regarde thereof, might, nay should doe to the children of Babylon, as they haue done to vs. But besides many grosse and capitall heresies, which race the foundation, we truly object vnto them, that their religion bringeth with it, treason against the Prince, and rebellion against God. Treason against the Prince, not onely because of their confederacie with the chiefe enemies of our state, the Pope and Spaniard, in regard whereof those Iesuites and Priests, which come among vs from beyond-Seas, as also those which harbour them, are worthy of death: but also because more generally they holding the Popes supremacie and authoritie to depose Princes, and withall, beleeuing that the Pope in his definitiue sentence cannot erre: they cannot but approoue the Bull of excommunication, wherein *Pius* the fift, (as much as was in him) deposed our Queene of famous memory, and absolved her subjects from all allegiance to her. Rebellion against God, because

Let the
Castlet of
Wimwich,
and Fre-
mingham
be witness.

Apo. 18. 6

it

It perswadeth an Apostasie and falling away from God, into grosse and palpable idolatrie. Of which fault whosoener are found guiltie, that is, to perswade others to idolatrie, by the law of God they ought not be suffered to liue, because they haue perswaded an Apostasie from God, *Deut. 13.* All this notwithstanding, we deale too remissely with them, and they most barbarously with vs. And yet forsooth, if there be, or hath bene, any persecution in the Church in these latter times, the Catholicks are they which suffer it, and not the Protestants. Alas poore Wollues, how cruelly they haue bene handled among the sheepe of Christ!

Deut. 13.
5. 8. 9.

5. But to proceed: As the persecution under Antichrist, saith *Bellarmino*, shall be most grievous; so shall it be most manifest. For thus he reasoneth: The persecution under Antichrist shall be most manifest: this under the Pope is not manifest; therefore this is not the persecution of Antichrist. The proposition is prooued, because then all the wicked shall apertly mate, oppugne the whole church: and not onely those that be Infidels and open sinners, but the hypocrites also and false brethren, shall then joyne themselves to Antichrist, and discounting themselves, openly assault the Church. And is not this well gessed thinke you, contrary to the word of truth, uttered by our Saviour Christ? For whereas our Saviour hath said, that the good and bad shall growe together like Wheate and Tares, vntill the day of the great haruest: *Bellarmino* telleth vs, that when Antichrist commeth, there shall such a separation be made, that there shall not an hypocrite be left in the Church: but all the wicked without exception, shall be together in Antichrists hostie; and shall openly oppugne the whole Church of the Saints. But such separation is not to be looked for, vntill Christ shall seuer the Lambes from the Goates. And therefore if we must not beleue that Antichrist is come, vntill such a separation be made: assuredly Christ will come vpon vs to iudgement, whiles we looke for Antichrist. Yea but *Augustine* saith, That now there be many false brethren in the Church, As tunc erumpent omnes (inquie *Augustinus*) in apertam persecutionem ex huiusmodi odiorum. But then all shall burst forth, saith *Augustine*, out of their covert haired, into open persecution.

*Omnes
proflus im-
pios simul
futuros in
exercitu
Antichri-
sti.*

*De ciuit.
Dei lib. 20.
c. 11.*

If *Augustine* had said so, we might well haue esteemed his speech to haue beene but a humane conjecture, rather then a Prophecie diuine. But *Bellarmino* without all shame falsifieth his words. For *Augustine* in that place speaking of those words, *Apoc. 20. 7. Soluetur Suanas de custodia sua & exibit seducendas nationes, Satan shall be let loose out of his wards, and shall goe forth to seduce the nations: Exibit autem dictum est* (saith he) *in apertam persecutionem, de latibris erumpet odiorum*: Now it is said that he shall goe forth, viz. into open persecution; he shall breake forth of the coverts of hatred, speaking of the diuell alone, and not of all the wicked. And thus was his proposition doughtily prooued, being neuerlesse according to his sense, repugnant to the Scriptures, which describe Antichrist, not as an open enemy, but as a secret; and decipher antichristianisme, not as a professed hostility, but as a myserie of iniquitie, as hath beene shewed.

6. Come we to his assumption, This manifest persecution hath not bin, neither is, as yet, & why? First, because there are now so many false brethren in the church as neuer were more; speaking of the church of Rome, wherein it is hard indeed to finde a true christiā. But shal not Antichrist come whiles there are false brethren in the church? or rather shall we not thinke, that the Apostasie of false brethren in the church of Rome & pretended Christians, wherof Antichrist is the head, is a good argument of his comming? Secondly, because no man can tell when this persecution began. That, if it were true, doth not disprooue the greatnesse of the persecution, but argue the length, Yea but vnder Nero, Domitian, & the rest of the persecuting Emperours, it was well knowne when the persecutions began, and when they ended. That happened because there was some intermission of those persecutions: but these persecutions vnder Antichrist they haue no end, nor yet intermissiō, except it be when they haue none to persecute. But how doth it appeare that none know when these persecutions of Antichrist began? Forsooth, because some of vs say, that Antichrist came in the yeere 200, others in 606, others in 773, others in 1000, others in 1200. The vanity of which objection, which now like a twice-boude Colewurt he setteth before vs againe, hath bin shewed before. For of these opinions, onely two belong to vs, and those not dissident. For we hold, that as the whole soueraignie and tyranny of

of the Pope consisteth in his two swords, which he did not attaine at once, but by degrees: so we make two degrees of Antichrist his comming: first with the spirituall sword in the yeere 607. secondly, with the temporall, after the yeere 1000. which was more fully obtained then before, in *Gregorie* the teuenth: In whom, as hath bin said, Antichrist was come to his full growth. Since which time, he hath been more and more reuealed, and by some acknowledged. Vpon which acknowledgment there hath followed separation from him, according to the comendement of God, and refusall of his marke: whereupon persecution hath ensued, and neuer hath ceased where any such haue been found, where the Pope hath to do. Neither are we with *Bellarmino* ignorantly to confound the time of his comming, with the beginning of his persecution. For he began not to persecute, vntill men began to forsake him: and men did not forsake him vntill he was discouered what he was, and acknowledged: neither was he acknowledged, vntill he came to his full growth.

7. And thus the two first parts of this demonstration, concerning the persecution of Antichrist, how great and manifest it should be, are already answered, although in truth not worth the answering. The third part is concerning the publike seruice of God and ceremonies of the church, which (he saith) in the time of Antichrist by reason of that grievous persecution shall wholly cease. His reason is thus framed. When Antichrist is come, the publike seruice of God, and daily sacrifice of Christians (meaning the sacrifice of the Masse) shall cease: but as yet the publike seruice of God, and daily sacrifice of Christians, hath not ceased; therefore as yet Antichrist is not come. To the proposition I answer, that Antichrist being an hypocrite and pretended Christian (as hath bin prooued) shall not abolish all worship of God, & much lesse at his first coming. For *Bellarmino* maketh this interruption of Gods seruice, a fruite of his greatest persecutiō: his persecutiō (as I said) is a consequent of mens forsaking him; and that of his acknowledgement: and that, of his shewing himselfe in his colours, when he was come to his full growth, whereunto he attained not at the first, but by degrees. But this proposition is prooued, saith *Bellarmino*, out of *Daniel*, chap. 12, verse 11. From the time when the daily sacrifice shall be taken away, are dayes 1290. Where (saith he) *Daniel* speaketh of

the time of Antichrist. For the exposition of this place, we need not with *Bellarmino* run to the Fathers, seeing by conference thereof with some other places in *Daniel*, whereunto it hath reference, it may most plainly be shewed, who it is that taketh away this daily sacrifice, and what that sacrifice is. In the eight chap. vers. 11. and chap. 11. vers. 31. it is affirmed, that by *Antiochus Epiphanes*, and his armies, the daily worship of God should be taken away. When as therefore *Daniel* asked when there should be an end of these things? the Holy-ghost answereth, that from the time that the daily sacrifice was taken away, and the abomination of desolation placed, whereof he had spoken, chap. 11. 31. there should be 1290. dayes. For of the restitution of Gods service, and deliverie of the Jewes from the tyranny of *Antiochus*, there are foretold diuers degrees at diuers times, which agreeably to these Prophecies of *Daniel*, are noted in the histories of *Iosephus*, and of the *Maccabees*: for from the interruption of Gods service, to the first restitution thereof by *Judas Maccabeus*, were three yeeres and ten daies, namely from the 15. of the moneth *Cassiu*, in the 145. yeere of the *Seleucida*, 1. *Maccab.* 1. 57. vnto the 25. of the moneth *Cassiu*, in the yeere 148. 1. *Maccab.* 4. 52. which terme *Daniel* calleth, chap. 7. 25. a time, and times, and parcell of time. Vnto the victorie obtained by the *Maccabees*, whereby the forces of *Antiochus* were expelled out of Iewry, and thereby the restitution before begun, established, were three yeeres and a halfe, as *Iosephus* testifieth, which *Daniel*, cha. 12. 7. calleth a time & times, & halfe a time, vnto the time that *Antiochus* being stricken with the hand of God, after his discomfure and flight from *Perspolis*, promised to restore the religion of the Jewes, & what else they desired, were 1290. dayes; vnto the time of his death 1335. And that these are Prophecies concerning *Antiochus*, I will hereafter shew more at large. In the meane time to the present objection I answer, that by the daily worship or sacrifice here mentioned, we are to vnderstand, not the sacrifice of Christians to be taken away by Antichrist, but the daily sacrifice of the Jewes, which was interrupted and taken away by *Antiochus Epiphanes*. It was the custome of the Jewes (saith *Chrysostome*) to offer a sacrifice to God every morning and evening, which they called *iswaxopon*, which sacrifice was taken away by *Antiochus*; and the same

same is testified by *Iosephus* and the author of the first booke of the *Maccabees*.


8. To this place of *Daniel* although nothing at all to his purpose, *Bellarmino* trusteth so much, that vpon base were his groundes worke he buildeth three conclusions, as you shall heare after we haue also considered of his assumption: The assumption he proposeth by experience; as though it did testify that the publicke service of God had not beene taken away: vnder the Pope upon the sacrifice of Christians ceased: But if by the publicke seruice of God he meaneth his true worship and seruice in spirit and truth: assuredly it hath beene taken away in the Papacy, except will-worship, superstition, and Idolatry be the true worship of God. As touching Christian sacrifices, we acknowledge the sacrifice of praise, the sacrifice of a broken and contrite heart, the sacrifice of obedience wherein we offer our selues, the sacrifice of almes whereby we offer our goods; these sacrifices, no Antichrist can wholly take away. As for the sacrifice of the masse, we holde it to be a monstrous abomination, wherein the holy sacrament of the Lords supper, is turned into an abominable Idoll. Seeing therefore there is no soundnesse of truth either in the proposition or assumption, must we not needes thinke that the question in hand is soundly concluded? And yet vpon these grounds *Bellarmino* doth not only infer the question in hand, but two more also. From hence saith he, three things may be gathered. First, that Antichrist is not as yet come, because the daily sacrifice yet continueth. He might as well haue concluded with the Jewes that Christ is not yet come: for he was to abolish the daylie sacrifice, *Dan.* 9. 27. partly by his owne sacrifice, vnto which the shadowes of the Law were to giue place; and partly by the overthrow of the temple, in which and not elsewhere it was to be offered. His second conclusion is, that the Pope of Rome is not Antichrist, but rather an aduersary vnto him; seeing he doth adore and maintaine this sacrifice, which Antichrist is to abolish. Nay rather by ordaining this propitiatory sacrifice, and erecting a new priesthood to offer the same, the Pope sheweth himselfe to be Antichrist. For by this Priesthood Christ is denyed to bee our onely Priest: by this Sacrifice,

In memorie
herof the
Encaenia,
that is, the
feast of the
dedication,
John 10. 22.
was celebrated
on the 25.
of Cassiu.
1. Maccab. 4.
19.

Chap. 16.

his sacrifice on the Crosse is supposed not to be sufficient: in this sacrifice the humanity of Christ (as hath beene showed) is overthrowne, and a God of bread set vp in his roome to be worshipped and adored. In this sacrifice Christ after a sort is made inferior to every masse-monger, who as they can make their court by breathing out a few words (*hoc est corpus meum*) so when they haue made him in their conceit, they offer him vp to God, to be a sacrifice propitiatory both for the quicke and the dead. His third conclusion is; *that the heretickes of this time about all others are forerunners of Antichrist, because they desire nothing more, then the overthrow of this sacrifice of the masse.* Nay rather as appeareth by the former answer, they shew themselves the limmes of Antichrist, who overthrowing the sacrament of the Lords supper (which we haue reduced to the first institution) seeke to vphold this masse and heape of all abominations and sacrilegious Idolatry. And how are all these things proued? forsooth because *Daniel* hath prophesied that *Antiochus* was to take away for a time the daily sacrifice of the Iewes; therefore Antichrist is not yet come, therefore the Pope is not Antichrist, therefore those that milike the masse are forerunners of Antichrist. And so with these three conclusions, as it were so many roapes of sand, he knitteth vp his fourth demonstration.

Chapter. 8. Answering his fift demonstration concerning the terme of Antichrists raigne, viz. 3. yeeres and a halfe.

1.  Here remaine two demonstrations (as he calleth them) prouing that Antichrist is not yet come, taken from those signes which follow Antichrist, to wit, the death of Antichrist after three yeeres & an halfe, and the end of the world. Where *Bellarmino* teacheth vs not to looke for Antichrist, vntill he be gone; nor to expect his coming, vntill the world haue an end. For if these be signes that Antichrist is not yet come (as *Bellarmino* maketh them) then may we argue
now,

now, and so may argue euen vntill the end of the world: *Vntill Antichrist be dead and the world haue an end, Antichrist commeth: not; but as yet (may we say now, and so may say vntill the end) Antichrist is not dead, neither as yet hath the world an end; therefore as yet Antichrist is not come.* By this argument therefore you see, how fitly these two signes are made the ground of two demonstrations, that Antichrist is not yet come. Now as touching the former, *Bellarmino* reasoneth thus. *The fift demonstration (viz. to proue that Antichrist is not yet come) is taken from the continuance of Antichrist. Antichrist shall not raigne but three yeeres and a halfe. But the Pope hath raigned spiritually in the Church about 1300. yeeres, neither can any be assigned that hath bene taken for Antichrist, who hath raigned precisely three yeeres and a halfe: The Pope therefore is not Antichrist. Wherefore Antichrist is not yet come.* His reason is thus to be resolved, *If neither the Pope be Antichrist, nor any other, who hitherto hath bene taken for Antichrist; then is not Antichrist as yet come: But neither the Pope is Antichrist, nor any that hitherto hath bene taken for Antichrist; therefore as yet Antichrist is not come.* Where you see by a circular disputatio, the Jesuit for want of better arguments, bringeth the maine question (namely whether the Pope be Antichrist) as an argument to proue, that Antichrist is not yet come, and consequently that the Pope is not Antichrist. The Pope is not Antichrist; why? because Antichrist is not yet come; and why is not Antichrist yet come? because the Pope is not Antichrist. He may as well goe on, for there is no end in a circle: and why is not the Pope Antichrist? because Antichrist is not yet come: and why is not Antichrist yet come? because the Pope is not Antichrist. And thus *Bellarmino*, as you see, danceth in a round.

2. But to come to the purpose, how doth he proue, that neither the Pope is Antichrist, nor any other that hath bene taken for Antichrist? by this syllogisme: *Antichrist shall raigne but three yeeres and a halfe precisely: but neither the Pope, nor any other that hath bene taken for Antichrist, hath raigned three yeeres and a halfe precisely: therefore neither the Pope is Antichrist, nor any other that as yet hath bene taken for Antichrist.* The assumption, which he might haue proued by a truth, he chooseth to proue
by

termes mentioned, chap. 11. and 12. of time and times and halfe a time, and of dayes, 1260. be the same with the 42. moneths; as *Bellarmino* will needes haue it; then by them is not signified Antichrists raigne, neither are they to be vnderstood literally, no more then the 42. moneths: but in the 11. chap. the time of the two witnesses preaching, during the time of the aforesaid persecution; and chap. 12. the womans, that is, the Churches living in the desert during the said time. Howbeit the speech of time and times and halfe a time may rather be vnderstood (according to *Daniels* phrase) of three yeeres and a halfe, wherein the Church of Christ which was at Ierusalem, after it was admonished by a voyce out of the sanctuary to depart, & accordingly removed to *Pella*, was sustained there. For in that place it is plaine, that the holy Ghost speaketh not of Antichrist nor yet of the beast, but of the Serpent the diuell, who seeketh the overthrow of the Church of Christ among the Iewes, & afterwards turneth his anger towards the rest of her seed, that is, the faithful among the Gentiles, and to that end standeth on the sea shore, from whence he raiseth the beast with seauen heads, &c.

2. 4. And further I ad, that if these times mentioned in those places which *Bellarmino* alledge, did signifie the terme of Antichrists raigne precisely, & were to be vnderstood literally; the it wold follow, that after antichrist is once reuealed, al me that be acquainted with the Scriptures, may precisely define before had, the very day of Christs coming vnto iudgement: which the Lord notwithstanding will not haue known (*Mat. 13. 32*), as *Bellarmino* himself must needs grant, seeing he vseth this as the chiefe argument against those which by 1260. dayes vnderstand so many yeeres.

3. Again it is incredible, if not impossible, that so many & so great things as they assigne to Antichrist, should be effected & brought to passe in so short a time; as *Hensenius* a learned Papist doth confesse, and as hath bin shewed heretofore. For this is an errour depending vpon the former, concerning the person of Antichrist, & presupposing that Antichrist is but one man. And therefore when we proued that Antichrist is not any one man alone, but a whole state and succession of men, we proued this by consequence, that his raigne was not to continue only three yeeres and a halfe. And

In presat.
translat.
Arithm.

again Antichrist, according to the conceit of the Papists, is to raigne before the preaching of the two witnesses, and as *Bellarmino* saith, is to continue one moneth after their death. Seeing then the two witnesses preach 1260. dayes, which, as *Bellarmino* also saith, make three yeeres & a halfe precisely, how can the terme of Antichrists raigne be three yeeres and a halfe precisely? Lastly the Scriptures plainly testifie, that the Antichrist which is to be destroyed at the second coming of Christ, was come euen in the Apostles time, although he was not reuealed by exercising openly a soueraine & vniuersal dominion, vntill that which hindered, that is, the Roman Empire was taken out of the way. But after the Empire was once dissolved in the West, and the Emperor of the East had lost his right in Italy and Rome, that is, when that which hindered was taken out of the way, then according to the propheticie, 2. *Thes. 2. 8*. was Antichrist reuealed, succeeding the Emperor in the government of Rome, and claiming an vniuersall authority, first spirituall, ouer the whole Church in the yeere 607. & after temporal, ouer the whole world, & aduancing himselfe above all that is called Gods: all which we haue heretofore proued to haue bin done in the Papacie, about three yeeres and a halfe agoe, yea about so many hundred yeeres agoe; so that we shall not need to expect another Antichrist, who is to raigne three yeeres and a halfe. And thus you haue heard not only *Bellarmines* allegations answered, but also his assertion confuted.

3. Now let vs see what *Bellarmino* can reply either against our assertion in general, or against the exposition of some protestants in particular. For whereas we generally affirme, notwithstanding his allegations aforesaid, that Antichrist hath already ruled in the Church almost a thousand yeeres, *Bellarmino* besides the slender coniectures of diuers of the fathers grounded on such prophecies of Scriptures as they could not vnderstand, which are his first argument, he produceth six other reasons, no lesse easie to be answered. His second argument is, because the scriptures say that the time of the diuels loosing, and Antichrists raigning is *breuissimum*, very short, or most short: But how can that be true if Antichrist shall raigne a thousand yeeres or more? For that which he speaketh of 1260. yeeres, is the private opinion of some

some of which shall be touched afterwards. I answer, that the Scriptures no where say that Antichrists raigne, or that the time of the diuell loosed is *Brevissimum*, that is, most short, but onely that it is short or small, which we doe acknowledge. Let vs then weigh his argumēt, which may be resolved into two syllogismes: the former, *A thousand yeeres or more is not a short time: Antichrists raigne is a short time: therefore Antichrists raigne is not a thousand yeeres or more.* First to the proposition I answer, that a thousand yeeres vnto the Lord (who speaketh in the Scriptures) is a short time. The Apostle Peter expressly saith, that a thousand yeeres with the Lord are but as one day. Yea, and the whole time from the ascension of Christ vntill his coming to iudgement, is often noted in the Scriptures to be a short time, and in one place it is called the last houre. And likewise about 1500. yeeres agoe, it was promised, that the prophecies concerning the destruction of Antichrist, the second coming of Christ, & end of the world, should within a short time be fulfilled. To the assumption I answer, that although the time of Antichrists tyranny seeme to be long to them that are exercised thereby; yet it is but short in comparisō of that time which they shall raigne with Christ, and is so called; *Apoc. 17. 10.* But yet nothing so short as *Bellarmino* imagineth. This therefore he proueth in the second Syllogisme: *The time of Sathan loosed is very short: the terme of Antichrists raigne is the time of Sathan loosed: therefore the terme of Antichrists raigne is very short.* The proposition he proueth by two places in the Apocalypse, which affirme his time to be short, but yet nothing so short as the Papists imagine: for in the former place, Chap. 12. 12. he is said to haue but a short time, before he persecuted the Church of Christ among the Iewes, which was about 1500. yeeres agoe. And in the latter place, Chap. 20. 3. it is said that he should be let loose for a small time: but this small time beginneth at the expiration of the thousand yeeres wherein he had beene bound, and continueth vntill the time that he shall be cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, in the end of the world. Now the thousand yeeres were expired many hundred yeeres agoe, as hath beene shewed. But although the time of Antichrists raigne be called short, yet is it not so short as the time of Sathan loosed: and therefore the assumption

assumption is false: For howsoever the thousand yeeres expire in the time of Antichrists raigne, yet we are not to beginne the raigne of Antichrist with the loosing of Sathan. For within the thousand yeeres of Sathans imprisonment, Antichrist not onely was, but also persecuted those that refused his marke: and yet we are not to confound the time of his persecution, much lesse of his hottest persecutiō, with the time of his continuance. Now the time of the diuell loosed, as the Papists teach, is the time of Antichrists most greuous persecution, which was a consequent of mens resisting his marke, & that a fruit of his discouerie & acknowledgement: but he was not acknowledged vntill he came to his full growth, whereunto he attained not at the first. And it is to be thought that the heate of his persecutiō wilbe slaked before his end, himselfe being consumed and wasted by the spirit of Christs mouth, & his See impouerished, if not ouerthrowne by the kings of the earth, which before the end of the world, shall not onely hate the whore of Baby: (the Popes concubine) but also shall make her desolate & naked, & shall eat her flesh, & her they shall burne with fire.

6. Thirdly, he argueth from *Math. 24. 21.* mistaken by some of the fathers, that *untill those daies* (meaning of Antichrists persecution) should be shortened, and consequently the persecution very short, no flesh could be saved: but how can it be very short if it shall continue a thousand yeeres? I answer, first, that the tribulation there spoken of, isto be vnderstoode of the calamities of the Iewes in the siege of Ierusalem, as I haue manifestly proued: And secondly, that we are to distinguish betwixt the time of Antichrists continuance, and the time of his hottest persecution, which *Bellarmino* confoundeth; the latter notwithstanding being much shorter then the former. Fourthly (saith he) *Christ preached onely three yeeres and a halfe, therefore decetiam, is also fit, that Antichrist be suffered to preach no longer.* Answer, 1. In this argument *Bellarmino* presupposeth that Antichrist is but one man, as Christ is, which we haue proued to be most false. 2. he taketh vpon him to be the Lords counsaillour, auouching that it is not fit that Antichrist should preach longer then Christ did: he might haue added that it was not fit, or to speake more fully, not like that Antichrist in the same time should be able to preuaile with

more then Christ did, & much lesse to peruert almost the whole world in three yeeres and a halfe; whereas Christ as he was man, could conuert but a few of the Iewes, &c. 3. Although Christ in his owne person preached but a few yeeres; yet he being the eternall word and wisdom of his father, hath euer since the beginning spoken by the mouth of his Prophets & ministers, by whose ministerie also as it were the breath of his mouth, he shall waste and consume Antichrist. 4. Neither can it be prooued by any shew of reason, that Antichrist is to preach just so many yeeres, as Christ our Saviour did: Or that he shall in three yeeres and an halfe subdue by force, I know not how many kingdomes, & conuert by preaching, & gather to himselfe the remnant of the Iewes, and all counterfeite Christians, dispersed through so many nations, as a man cannot travell through in three yeeres and a halfe: not to speake of his repairing Ierusalem, & erecting the temple, and many good morrowes, which by many poiticall fictions the Papists assigne to their deuised Antichrist. His fift and sixt reasons are not worth the mentioning. For the time and times, and halfe a time, as hath bin shewed, belong not to Antichrists raigne, and

therby we vnderstand 3. yeeres & a halfe, as also by the 7. times, in the 4. of *Daniel*, 7. yeeres, according to the interpretation of the holy Ghost (expounding, as it seemeth) times by yeeres. *Dan. 11. 13.*

7. In the last place he labourerth to take away the exceptions which some particular man, as namely, *Chytraus*, *Bullinger*, & the authors of the Centuries, make against his former allegations out of *Daniel* & the *Apocalypsi*, but fearely toucheth any one of the 6 exceptions before mentioned. For whereas *Chytraus* answereth, that the 42. moneths in the 11. and 13. of the *Apoc.* may not be vnderstood literally for three yeeres and a halfe, because it is contrary to experience; and besides the Apostle affirmeth that Antichrist shall continue vntill Christs comming. *Bellarmino* replieth, that he beggeth the question. But I answer againe as before, that experience sheweth that the persecutions vnder the beast with 7 heads, continued longer then three yeeres and a halfe: & when as *Iohn* affirmeth that the Antichrist was come in his time, & *Paul* foretelleth, that he should after a sort continue (though at the last in a kind of consumption) vnto the second comming of Christ,

surely

surely their meaning was, that he should continue about three yeeres and a halfe. 2. He findeth fault with him & *Bullinger*, who thought that the holy ghost mentioning 42. moneths & 1260. daies, by a certaine time, meant an vncertaine; replying that the number which is meant, is certaine, when it consisteth of great & small numbers mixed. But they speake of the time, and he of the number, and therefore his reprehension is vnjust. For although the holy ghost do meane no other number then 42, and 1260, yet by the certaine time mentioned, that is, moneths & daies, he meaneth an vncertaine, which may be as some thinke 42. sabbathes of yeeres, and 1260 yeeres. And thirdly, whereas *Silycius*, and the other authors of the Centuries by 1260. daies, vnderstand so many yeeres, *Bellarmino* denieth that daies are put for yeeres any where in the scripture, and yet cannot deny, but that by 390. daies in *Ezechiel*, is meant 390. yeeres, and by 40. daies so many yeeres, a day for a yeere, as the holy ghost speaketh. And likewise *Apoc. 2. 10.* by ten daies is meant 10. yeeres, as some of the learned thinke. Indeed if any shall by 1260. daies, vnderstand (as *Bellarmino* doth) the just time of Antichrists reigne, and withall expound them either by 1260. yeeres, as *Bellarmino* chargeth some, or by three yeeres and a halfe, as the Papists do; they may be refuted by the reason before alledged, because after the reuelation of Antichrist the speciall time of Christs comming may according to this exposition be foretold, which notwithstanding shall not come by obseruation, but suddenly, neither shall precisely be foreknowne, as being knowne onely to the Lord.

The 9. Chapter: answering his sixth demonstration concerning the end of the world.

HE sixt and last demonstration, to proue that Antichrist is not yet come, is taken from the end of the world. But because *Bellarmino* saw that this could not be made a signe of Antichrists comming without absurdity (for it is absurd thus to reason, the world hath not yet an end, therefore Antichrist is not yet come) therefore he changeth the question. For whereas he propounded this question to be concluded, that

Antichrist is not yet come, he concludeth that he came not long since. So that for all this demonstration Antichrist may already be come, although perhaps not so long since, as some doe imagine: But let vs see how he proueth that he was not come long since. If Antichrist were come long since, then also the world long since should haue had an end: but the world hath not yet an end, therefore Antichrist was not come long since. The proposition he proueth, because Antichrist commeth a very little while before the end of the world, and as it were immediately before the second coming of Christ. But this whole demonstration may easily be refuted by this one distinction: for we must distinguish betwixt the coming of Antichrist and his death, betwixt his beginning and his end. Antichrist indeed is not vterly to be destroyed before the second coming of Christ: but this doth not proue that therefore he was not come long since. The Apostle Paul doth tell vs that Antichrist is to be destroyed at the second coming of Christ: notwithstanding both he doth insinuate and John plainly professeth that the Antichrist which they had heard was to come in the last hour, was already come in his time: and thereupon inferreth that even then was the last hour or age of the world, which the holy ghost calleth an hour, that we should not thinke it long.

2. Now al the testimonies which *Bellarmino* alledgeth, if they were to be vnderstood of Antichrist (as indeede few of them are) do serue to proue, that the destruction of Antichrist shalbe in the end of the world, which we doe freely confesse. But of these places, as some make not for him, so the rest are against him. The 7. of *Daniel* verse. 8. 9. 26. *Apos.* 20. 4. *Mat.* 24. 14. are altogether impertinent. For *Daniel* speaketh not of Antichrist or the last iudgement, but of *Antiochus* and Gods iudgements on the *Seleucides*; *John* speaketh not of the coming of Antichrist or last iudgement, but of the binding and loosing of Satan, and seats of iudgement erected for the faithfull, as *Augustine* also expoundeth: Christ in that place of *Mat.* speaketh not a worde of Antichrist: coming or of the end of the world, but of the preaching of the gospel before the destruction of Ierusalem. The rest of the places make against him, & as he alledgeth them, against

De ciuit.
De lib. 20.
cap. 2

the truth, For first *Daniel* 12. 12. Where *Daniel* (saith *Bellarmino*) after he had said that the kingdome of Antichrist should continue 1290. dayes, addeth, Blessed is he that expecteth and commeth to 1335. dayes. From whence the Papists would inferre, that Antichrist having reigned three yeeres & a halfe, should be destroyed forty five dayes before the day of iudgement. This place as I haue proued, is to be vnderstood of *Antiochus*. But suppose it spake of Antichrists reigne, and end of the world, see what would follow thereof. First, that the reigne of Antichrist is not three yeeres and a halfe precisely, or 1260. dayes; but 1290. dayes. Secondly, that Antichrist shalbe destroyed before the end of the world, whereas *Paul* telleth vs, that Christ shall destroy him at his appearing, 2. *Thes.* 2. 1. and not 45. dayes before. Thirdly, then so soone as Antichrist is reuealed, men shalbe able certainly and distinctly to foretell the very day of iudgement, to wit, the 1335. after Antichrists coming, and 45. after his death: which Christ denieth *Mat.* 24. 36. And lastly, if this were true, then after the coming, or at least after the death of Antichrist, all men would be in expectation of Christs second coming. And therefore those dayes will not be (as Christ saith) like the daies of *Noah*: neither wil his coming be suddaine & vnlooked for, as himselfe saith *Mat.* 24. 38. 39. if the very day of his coming be knowne before hand, & accordingly looked for. But let Christ be true, and all Papists liars.

3. 2. *Mat.* 24. 29. Shortly after the tribulation of those dayes, the sunne shall be darkened, &c. In this chapter of *Mathew* our Saviour speaketh not at all of Antichrist vntill the 23. & 24. verse, which diuers of the Fathers, yea and the Papists themselves vnderstand as spoken of Antichrist. There shall arise false Christs, and false Prophets, and they shall worke great signes & wonders, &c. From whence it appeareth, that Antichrist is not one onely man, as *Bellarmino* saith, & that the signes of Christs coming are to follow the tribulations vnder Antichrist, which we do confesse. 3. 2. *Thes.* 2. 8. And then shall that out-law be reuealed, whom the Lord Iesus shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, &c. Whence *Bellarmino* would proue that the second coming of Christ shall follow very shortly after the coming of Antichrist. But we must distinguish betwixt the first coming of Antichrist, and his reuelation and acknowledgement. And it cannot be denied, but that there is a

great distance betwixt his reuelation, and destruction. For he was to be reuealed as the Apostle saith, when that which hindered was taken out of the way, which we haue proued to haue beene done many hundred yeeres since: and consequently that Antichrist appeared long since, howsoeuer he shall not vterly be destroyed vntill the second comming of Christ. And lastly, we are to distinguish betwixt Christs consuming him with the spirit of his mouth, and his vter destroying him at his glorious appearance. There are therefore these degrees to be noted betwixt the first comming of Antichrist and his destruction. For after he is come, he sheweth himselfe in his colours, and that by degrees, more & more aduancing himselfe, vntill he come to his full pitch & height of his Antichristian pride. After he is come to his height, he is acknowledged, and that by degrees: after he is acknowledged, Christ consumeth him by the spirit of his mouth, that is, by the preaching of the euerglasting gospel, *Apo. 14. 6. 7.* After which followeth the destruction of Babylon, that is, Rome, *Apo. 14. 8.* effected and brought to passe by the Kings of the earth, who assailed the beast vntill Christ laid him open & consumed him with the breath of his mouth: & after that in the last place followeth the vter destruction of Antichrist at the second coming of Christ.

4. Lastly, *1. Ioh. 2. 18.* Children, this is the last hour, and as you haue heard that Antichrist cometh, &c. Where *Bellarmino* maketh the Apostle reason thus, *We know Antichrist shall come in the end of the world, and now we see many pisse Antichrists, as it were his fore-runners: therefore we know that this is the last hour and age of the world.* But if this reason of *Bellarmino*s framing were good, we might vpon his former grounds conclude thus. At the fullnesse of time, Christ was to come: But euer since the beginning there haue bin Patriarchs & Prophets, which *Bellarmino* calleth the fore-runners of Christ; therefore the fullnesse of time hath bin euer since the beginning. But whether shall we say that *Bellarmino* is so ignorant that he knoweth not how to make a syllogisme, or so shamelesse as to make the Apostle argue sophistically. The Apostles reason is this, *When the Antichrist cometh it is the last hour: Now (saith he) Antichrists are come,* (meaning by Antichrists the same with the antichrist, which else where he affirmeth was the entered into the world; or else there are 4. termini, four termes in th Apostles argu-

2. Ioh. 4. 3.
3. Ioh. 7.

ment) therefore now is the last hour. And if then were the hour of Antichrist his coming, what reason haue the Papists to restrain his coming, vntill three yeeres & a halfe before the end of the world? And thus, as you see, *Bellarmino*s allegations are either altogether impertinent, or else against himselfe.

4. But as I said before, suppose they all spake of the day of judgement, & end of the world following vpon Antichrist: yet none of them joineth the end of the world with his coming & birth, but with his death & destruction. And the like may be said of his allegation fro the common consent of the fathers & confession of his aduersaries, *For our aduersaries (saith he) confesse, that Antichrist shall raigne (we say he shall continue) vnto the end of the world: & therefore shortly after his death shall be the end of the world.* Yea we further confesse, that his destruction shall concur with the consumation of the world: for Christ at his coming shall destroy him. But this proueth not that his coming shall be within three yeeres & a halfe before the end of the world. For *Iohn* saith, He was come in his time, & *Paul* saith, he should be reuealed, when that which hindered was done out of the way, which was done many hundred yeeres ago. Therefore though his end concur with the end of the world, yet there shall be a greater distance then *Bellarmino* imagineth, betwixt his coming and the end of the world. This *Bellarmino* foreceleing, perceiued very well, that in this demonstration by it selfe alone, there is no force at all. And therefore he joyneth it with the fist, of both which together he saith, an vnanswerable demonstration may be made, to prooue that Antichrist is not yet come, & that the Pope is not Antichrist. For, saith he, if presently after the death of Antichrist the world shall haue an end, and Antichrist shall dye, after he hath raigned but three yeeres & a halfe; then it followeth that Antichrist shall not appeare nor begin to raigne till within 3. yeeres & a halfe before the end of the world. But the Pope hath raigned longer then 3. yeeres & a halfe, and yet the world continueth, therefore the Pope is not antichrist. The vanity of the former demonstratio which is made the ground of the last, I haue sufficiently shewed before: & therefore that which is said of two ciphers in ciphering, the same may be said of these two demonstrations ioyned together, that naught to naught makes naught.

For now I will not stand to tell you, how the three yeares and a halfe which in the former demonstration were 1260. dayes precisely, are now growne to 1335. dayes. For Antichrist shall not begin to reigne, saith *Bellarmino*, vntill within three yeares and a halfe before the end, and yet from the beginning of his reigne, vntill the end of the world, shall be 1335. dayes; so that in *Bellarmino* precise account of halfe a yeare, 75. dayes, that is 10. weekes, and 5. dayes are nothing.

Thus haue we answered these sixe demonstrations, which we haue shewed to haue beene farre from proouing demonstratiuely, either that Antichrist is not yet come, or that the Pope is not Antichrist. Wherefore to conclude, if the Papiists demonstrations in so weighty a cause, whereupon all Poperie dependeth, be such tising trumpeterie, as is scarce worth the answering, what shall we thinke be their ordinary arguments in other causes of lesse importance. And this was his third principall argument, wherein he hath spent seauen whole chapters.

The 10. Chapter: Concerning the name of Antichrist.



Now followeth his fourth disputation concerning the name & marke of Antichrist. From the name he fetcheth this *vnanswerable argument*, as he calleth it. If the name of Antichrist spoken of *Apoc. 13.* be yet vnkowne, then is not Antichrist as yet come; and consequently the Pope is not Antichrist. But Antichrist name spoken of *Apoc. 13.* is yet vnkowne: therefore Antichrist is not yet come, &c. Of this vnanswerable argument, there is no part sound, as shall appeare. The proposition he proueth, because when Antichrist is once come, his name shall be commonly knowne. Which he prooueth first by a similitude: As Christ's name before his coming was vnkowne, although the Prophets had foretold many things concerning Christ, and Sibylla had prophesied that his name should containe 888. but after he was once come, all men know that his name is Iesus: so although before Antichrist

Insolubile argument.

Refutation.

christ's coming his name be vnkowne, yet after he is once come there will be no more question what his name is, then of the name of Christ, which all euen Turks and Iewes and Pagans know to be Iesus. Secondly, from a common adiunct of all prophecies, to be doubtful and obscure, vntill they be fulfilled, as *Irenaeus* teacheth and proueth, Lib. 4. Chap. 43. For answer, first I deny the proposition, and the Hypothesis whereupon it is grounded, & contrariwise assure that the name of Antichrist, meaning the name which Antichrist shall impose vpon men, spoken of *Apoc. 13.* might be vnkowne for a time, yea was to be vnkowne for a long time after his coming. For the name of Antichrist cannot be knowne as the name of Antichrist, vntill Antichrist himselfe be knowne and acknowledged. But Antichrist himselfe was not commonly to be knowne & acknowledged at his first coming: For then he could not be able to seduce many, few or none being so desperately madde as to follow him whom they know to be Antichrist. First therefore the mystrie of iniquity was to worke secretly to the seducing of many: afterwards, Antichrist was to be reuealed, first, by his manifest appearing and shewing himselfe more plainly and openly; after by his acknowledgedgement: whereof also there are degrees; first by some particularly; secondly, by whole Churches generally; and yet neuer in this world to be acknowledged of those, that receiue and retaine his marke. Again, the name of Antichrist is a mystrie, & Antichristianisme is a mystrie of iniquity. In the whole of *Babylons* forehead is written a mystrie. And so far is it fro the vnderstanding of all to tell the name of the beast, that the holy Ghost speaking of this name, saith, *Here is wisdom, he that hath vnderstanding, let him reckon the number of the beast, meaning the number of his name.*

2. In the similitude taken from Christ, there is no like shewbeit *Bellarmino* taketh great felicity in comparing Christ with Antichrist. Christ as he was one particular man, so at the time of his circumcision a proper name was giuen vnto him: Antichrist as he is not one particular person (as hath bin proued) but a state, could not haue a proper name giuen vnto him. And accordingly it is said to be the name of the beast, which beast as hath bin shewed, signifieth not one particular man, but a whole state. Again, Christ

In Apoc. 17.

Apoc. 13. 18.

Ezek. 2. 12.

Lib. 8.

De ciuit.

dei lib. 18.

Chap. 23.

comming to saue, his name *Iesus*, the name of the Sauour was to be made knowne, that he might the rather be embraced: Antichrist comming to deceiue & to destroy, was (according to his diuellish pollicie) to concale that name whereby he should be known to be Antichrist, least being knowne he should be forsaken of all. And as touching *Sibylla*, she did not only foretel that the name of Christ should containe the number 888. as indeede the name *Iesus*, *Iesus* doth: but also setteeth downe certaine Actolliches, that is, yerles, the first letters whereof containe this sentence, *Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς Θεοῦ υἱός ἐστιν*, *Iesus Christ the sonne of God the Saniour*, which are also cited by *Augustine*. But of antichrist he speaketh nothing so plainly. Howbeit she plainly calleth Rome *Babyl*, as *Iohn* doth and in the 8. booke describing antichrist, as Iohn thinke, she saith,

Βασις ἀνὰ πολίχμους ἔχει πλὴν δυνάμει πέντε. &c. that is:

There shall be a Prince with many heads (which is to be vnderstood either by a metonymy for his triple crowne, or by a Synecdoche for the successiō of Popes) *having a name nere to Pōi*, that is, *Pōi-fex* the Pope. But to returne to my purpose. By this which hath bin said, you plainly see that there is no similitude betwixt Christ and antichrist in this behalfe, Christ hauing a proper name; but Antichrist hauing none, & withal you haue heard reasons why Christs name should be wel known, whereas Antichrists was to be obscure and for a long time vnknown, or at the least not acknowledged.

3 His other prooffe touching the obscurity of prophecies before they are fulfilled, proueth nothing for him, vnlesse he ad, that as before their fulfilling they are very obscure, so also after their fulfilling they are very plaine: which after indeede he addeth in the end of the chapter, *Siquidem omnia uaticinia* (saith he) *cum impleta sunt, clarissima efficiuntur*, for all prophecies when they are fulfilled become most cleare. I answer, that although they become more cleare after then before, yet many times they remaine darke & obscure to very many. As appeareth in the prophecies of the scripture fulfilled in Christ, but not yet vnderstood of the Iewes, nor acknowledged to haue bin verified in Christ. And euen as the prophecies concerning Christ are by true Christians easily vnderstood; howbeit to Iewes & infidels they remaine darke & obscure, because the God of this world hath blinded their eyes, that they should not see the shining light of the Gospel: so also the prophecies concerning

concerning Antichrist, which already are fulfilled in the Papacy, howsoeuer many of them are plainly vnderstood of the true professors; yet to the followers of Antichrist, who God hath giuen ouer to strong illusions, that they may beleue lies, they seeme to be darke & obscure, and not as yet fulfilled. Notwithstanding the former part of his assertion we do embrace: that prophecies vntill they be fulfilled are (for the most part) darke and ambiguous, and herein with *Bellarmino* we approue *Irenaeus* his iudgement. But hereupon we infer, that therefore the writings of the fathers, who living before the reuelatiō of Antichrist, & expounding the prophecies concerning Antichrist, were most vncertaine ghesles (as *Bellarmino* euen in this chapter cōfesseth) the prophecies being to them darke and ambiguous, which now since the fulfilling thereof haue bin more plaine and perspicuous: & therefore that it is no arrogancy in vs which see the euent agreeing with the prophecy, to take vpon vs to expound diuers prophecies concerning Antichrist, the true vnderstanding whereof was hid from the fathers. For if God would haue had them plainly known before their fulfilling, surely he would haue made the knowne by those his seruants th'apostles by who they were deliuered. And so *Irenaeus* saith, that he would not take vpon him certainly to define what this name should be, *Scientes* (saith he) *quoniam si oporteret manifeste praesenti tempore pronunciari nomen eius, per ipsum utiq; editū fuisset, qui et Apocalypsin uiderat*, Knowing that if this name ought in this time to be published, it should no doubt haue bin declared by him, to who the reuelation was giuen. Likewise *Andreas* the Bishop of *Casarea*, The exact account (saith he) and computation of the number, and likewise all other things which are written of Antichrist, opportunity of time and experience shall make manifest to them that are vigilant. For as some of the doctors say, if it were necessary that this name should manifestly be knowne before hand, it should haue bene reuealed by *Iohn* himselfe.

4. Now let vs come to his assumption, where he affirmeth that Antichrists name is yet vnknown. We confesse that in the Church of Rome this name is either not known as of the ignorant, or not acknowledged as of the obstinate: But in the true Church of God, as Antichrist himselfe is known, so is this name acknowledged. But let vs heare *Bellarmines* disputation prouing this assumption.

Falsum

Sed nec isti patres uoluerunt sententias illis suas, alio loco haberi, quam suspitionum & coniecturarum. Bellarmine. Lib. 5.

Apud. v. c. than in Apocalyp.

Apoc. 13.
16. 17. 18.

Fateatur omnes (saith he in the beginning of the chapter) *perit-
nere omnia ad Antichristum verba illa Ioannis, Apoc. 13. All
vien doe confesse that those words of Iohn Apoc. 13. doe wholly belong
to Antichrist. And he shall make all both small and great, rich and
poore, free and bond, to receiue from him a marke in their right hand
or in their forehead; and that none should buy or sell, vntlesse he haue
the marke or name of the beast or number of his name. Here is wis-
dome: he that hath vnderstand let him reckon the number of the
beast, for it is the number of a man, and his number is 666. Now
concerning this number saith he, there are many opinions. The first of
those who thinke that by this number is signified the time of Anti-
christ's coming, &c. But this opinion we doe with Bellarmine re-
iect, because it is called the number of his name, and not of the
time; and also because Antichrist shall compell all sorts of men
to take his name, and the number of his name; which cannot
be vnderstood of the time. Thirdly, because *Irenaus* reporteth
from those who had seene *Iohn* face to face, that the name of the
beast shall according to the computation of the Greeces by let-
ters which are in it, containe 666. The second opinion is of
those who thinke Antichrist's name to be *ΛΑΤΙΝΟΣ* or *ΛΑΤΙΝ*, of
which we will speake anon in his due place. The third opinion
is of many Papists who thinke that his name shalbe *ΑΡΡΑΒΩ*,
thereby vnderstanding an aduersary, but that is not a name that
he shall assume to himselfe, or impose vpon others, but a name
rather giuen him of his aduersaries. Neither is it the name of the
beast here spoken of. The fourth of *Rupertus*, who imagined
that by this threefold number 666. is signified, the threefold
preuocation of Sathan: first in himselfe; secondly, in our first pa-
rents; thirdly in Antichrist. The fift of *Beda*, who supposeth that
it is a number of perfection, which Antichrist shall challenge vn-
to himselfe. But these three opinions Bellarmine reiecteth, and
that worthily. For first, the holy Ghost saith it is the number of
the name of the beast: and secondly, this name & number of it, An-
tichrist causeth men to take vpon them. The sixt opinion, wherein
he resteth as the most true, is theirs which confesse their igno-
rance, and professe that this name is not yet knowne.*

5. To these opinions many more might be added, but to
make

make short worke: the last of these opinions is Bellarmine's: the
second is ours: therefore let vs consider how he proueth his
owne opinion, and disproueth ours. That this name is vn-
knowne, Bellarmine would proue by the authority of *Irenaus*,
as if he should haue said, This name was not certainly
knowne in *Irenaus* his time; therefore not in our time. I deny the
consequence, *Irenaus* liued before the fulfilling of this prophetic,
as himselfe professeth & as the truth is: for he liued about 1400. *Non ante
multum
temporis,
prius sub
nostro secto-
lo. Iren.
Lib. 5.*
yeeres agoe: and as himselfe saith, the reuelation was giuen to
Iohn but a little before his age. For it was giuen in the end of the
first Century, and he liued in the second, and therefore it is more
safe (saith he) to waite for the fulfilling of this prophetic, then
before hand to determine any thing. For If the Lord would
haue had this name knowne in *Irenaus* his time, he would haue
made it knowne by *Iohn* himselfe, to whom the reuelation was
giuen. But as before the fulfilling of this prophetic, he saith, this
name was very obscure; so he signifyeth, that after the fulfilling
it should be more plaine. And therefore that which he could but
ghesse at in his time, we may now define, time hauing reuealed
that truerh, which vntill the prophetic was cleared by the euent
lay hidde: other wise it shall be lawfull for men to reason from
the authority of *Irenaus*, as Bellarmine doth, even vnto the
end of the world. But may we then reason thus: this name
was not knowne in *Irenaus* his time, therefore it shall neuer
be knowne? to what end was this prophetic giuen, if it shall
neuer be vnderstood? Whereas therefore he vseth the arguments
whereby *Irenaus* proueth, that this name could not be knowne
in his time, to proue that it cannot be knowne in our time,
he is ridiculous. There are many names, saith *Irenaus*, that haue
this number, therefore it is heard before hand to tell which is
this name. Again, if in *Irenaus* his time God would haue
this knowne, he would haue reuealed it by *Iohn*. 3. It is dange-
rous to define before hand his name; for missing of his name
we shall not know him when he cometh, and therefore
shall be in the more danger to be deceived by him. All this
we grant. But will Bellarmine needs be so ridiculous, as to
con-

conclude: In Irenæus his time men were not able to tell which of those names that containe the number 666 is the name of the beast, therefore 1400. yeres after none shall be able to tell. God would not have it knowne in Irenæus his time, therefore he will not have it knowne now. It was dangerous then before the fulfilling of the propheticie, to define what this name should be: therefore it is dangerous now, when the propheticie is expounded by the want, to apply the one to the other? And what doth he inferre hereupon? Therefore no doubt the Protestants, who thinke the Pope to be Antichrist, shall be deceived of the true Antichrist, when he cometh. But blessed be God that hath already revealed vnto vs the true Antichrist, that knowing him we might auoyde him: whereas vpon the Papists he hath sent strong illusions, that they may beleue lyes, because they loued not the truth that they might be saued, 2. Thes. 2. 11.

6. Again he prooueth this name not to be knowne, because there is great controuersie about it, what it should be. But by the same reason he may conclude that few points of religion are yet knowne, because there be few concerning which there is no controuersie. Notwithstanding as in other controuersies, the truth is knowne of those which are Orthodoxall, howsoever others will not acknowledge it: so I doubt not, but that the truth in this matter is knowne, although some cannot, and others will not, as yet see it. For seeing the hardest matter in this mystery is knowne, it is not to be thought that the easier is hid or vnkowne, especially seeing the knowledge of the one maketh the other euident. The chiefe thing here to be considered is, what this beast is. For if the beast be knowne, it will not be hard to tell what his name is, especially if the number of the name be 666. The beast, as appeareth by the whole context, is, as I have shewed, the former beast, which without doubt figureth the Romane or Latine state. The name of this beast is Romane or Latine. If therefore this name in the learned tongues containe the number 666. and be such a name, as he to whom all other notes of Antichrist doe agree, shall enforce men to take vpon them; then without doubt this is the name whereof

whereof the holy Ghost speaketh: but these properties agree to the name Latine or Romane. For *Latini* in Hebrew (signifying Romane) *Λατίνος* in Greeke, signifying Latine, and *Romanus* in Hebrew Characters, doe containe the iust number 666. and are besides such names as Antichrist compelleth all men to take vpon them, as hath beene shewed heretofore.

7. But let vs see what *Bellarmin* objecteth, against this truth. Of those many reasons which we doe vse, *Bellarmin* maketh choise of two, as being the easiest to answer, as his maner is; and against them he argueth, namely, the conjecture of *Irenæus*, and the agreement of the number. But besides these, we produce three other arguments, as you haue heard, which together with these make the matter euident. It is true indeede that *Irenæus* besides *Latinus*, produceth two other names, *Eudbas*, &c. *tercely*, and seemeth to prefer the latter of these before *Λατίνος*. But we build not vpon *Irenæus* his authority, but vpon those reasons, whereon his conjecture is grounded, which are two: the one, because it is the name of that kingdome which is figured vnder the former beast *Apoc. 13. 7.* whose authority Antichrist was to vsurpe: the other, because it containeth 666: his words be these. But the name *Λατίνος* also comprehendeth the number 666. et valde verisimile est, and it is very likely. For it is the name of that which most truly is called the kingdome. For they are the Latines that now raigene. Which in effect is as much as if he had said, this name is very likely, because it is a name containing 666, and is the name of the former beast, spoken of *Apoc. 13. 1.* which figureth *verissimum regnum*, that kingdome which most truly is called a kingdome, that is the Latine or Roman state. Yea but this coniecture saith *Bellarmin*, which in *Irenæus* his time was of some force, now it is nothing worth: for then the Latines bare the sway, now they doe not. For Antichrist as he shall be *Potentissimus Rex*, a most mighty king; so without doubt he shall seize vpon the most mighty kingdome. Whereas therefore the kingdome of the Latines was in those times most mighty, but now otherwise; there was some likelihood then, that he might by subduing them be called *Latins*, but now there is no such probability. I answer, the name whereof *Iohn* speaketh is not the name of Antichrist properly the second beast, but the name of the former beast; which

See. Lib. 1.
Chap. 8.

Lib. 1. c. 7.

which name of the former beast, Antichrist the second beast causeth men to take vpon them. And so Latinus, is not the name of Antichrist properly, but of the beast, that is, the Latine or Romane state. Neither was it *Irenaus* his meaning, that the name of the beast is *λατίνος*, because Antichrist was to subdue the Latines, but because the Latines then had *Verissimum regnum*, the most true and soueraigne kingdom: and therefore most truly were the beast described *Apoc. 13. 7*. If therefore the Latines then had the greatest kingdom, and were the beast whose authority the second beast, that is, Antichrist was to take vpon him, *Apoc. 13. 12*. this coniecture that the name of the beast is *λατίνος*, which was probable before the prophetic was fulfilled, is now more then probable, the prophetic being verified in the event. And the decay or rather dissolution of the Latine or Romane Empire, before which Antichrist was not to be reuealed, is so farre from making this coniecture lesse probable, that it rather confirmeth it. Neither doe we read in the Scriptures that Antichrist should be a *most mighty King*, or should seafe vpon the most mighty kingdomes: only this we read, that he should exercise the power of the former beast, which most fully agreeth to the Pope.

2 As touching the agreement of the number 666. *Bellarmino* objecteth, first, that the number agreeth not with the names propounded: and secondly, although it did, yet it followeth not, that any of these is the name of the beast. That the number agreeth not he sheweth, because *λατίνος*, if it be written with a simple Iota as is ought to be, it wanteth five of that number. I answered, that the ancient Latines vsed to write and pronounce i long by ei diphthong; and the Græcians vsually expresse i long by ei. And it is to be obserued, that *Irenaus* setting downe these two names *λατίνος* and *τετράς* as containing the number 666, taketh it for granted, that *λατίνος* may so be writte: whereas of *τετράς* he saith, that it maketh that number, if it be written with a diphthong. Against the name *μονα*, that is, *Romane*, he objecteth, that it is not masculine, vntill the last letter signifying 400. be taken away. I answered that collective names in Hebrew are indiffer-

ently expressed in either gender. And suppose the name were feminine, yet that hindereth not, but that it may be the name here spoken of. For the Holy ghost speaketh of the name of the beast, that is, the Romane state, which else-where is called also whore of *Babylon*, and *semine*, a woman: And therefore well may the name be feminine. But although the number agreed (saith *Bellarmino*) yet it followeth not, that either *Romane* or *Latine* should be the name. First, because neither of them is his proper name, but common. Neither ought it, seeing it is the name of the beast, which signifieth a whole state. Secondly, because many other names make this number: And therefore it followeth not that any of these is the name here spoken of, because they containe the number 666. For diuers Authours haue noted, diuers other names, as *Hippolytus ἀρρεβας* (which indeed maketh not that number, but rather prooueth the authour (allegding *ἀρρεβας*) to be counterfeit; neither is it a Nowne, and much lesse a name) *Αρειας*, *σεκουσιθις*, *λακέρης* (which maketh not that number,) but *λακέρης*, *τετράς*, *δ* *νικίτης*, *καρδ* *δ* *νικίτης*, *δ* *νικίτης* *δ* *νικίτης*, (which is *δ* *νικίτης* barbarous) *νίκαι* *δ* *νικίτης*, *δ* *νικίτης* *δ* *νικίτης*: *Primasius* *ἀρρεβας*, *Rupertus* and *Haymo* *τετράς* and *Pichle*. Vnto these he addeth out of lying *Lindanus*, *Martin* *Lanier* (for *Luther*) in Latin letters, taken (as they neuer were) for numbers, after the manner of the Greeke: out of *Ghebrard* *Lithers* name in Hebrew, viz. *Lulter*: to which *Bellarmino* in his wisdom addeth, *Dauid Chireiu*, for *Dauid Chyrciu*, and *Σαξωνος* a Saxon, to signifie *Luther*: Which latter names shew the Papists to be fraught with malice and voide of judgement, forcing these mens names, as they might their owne, to this purpose. But we answer, that although there are many names which containe 666. yet notwithstanding, none can be the name here spoken of, vntill also it be the name of the beast, that is, the Latine or Romane state, and vntill it be such a name, as he to whom all other notes of Antichrist doe agree, causeth men to take vpon them. Consider therefore with what conscience *Bellarmino* would perswade vs, that any of these may be the name here spoken of, as well as *Latine* or *Romane*: Seeing first, either of these is the name of the beast, whereas none of these

those is or can be. Secondly, seeing those are such names as Antichrist will not cause men to take vpon them; whereas the Pope (whom we haue prooued to be Antichrist) inforceth either of those names vpon men, suffering none to buy or sell, or to liue among them, vnlesse he professe himselfe to be a Romane or Latine in respect of his religion. And thirdly, whereas these names agreed vnto him, to whom all other markes of Antichrist agree, many of those doe not; and those which doe, as *καὶ ὁ ἰδρυς*, an euill guide, which *καὶ ὁ ἰδρυς* agreeth to the Pope, *ἀρτυρος*, &c. yet cannot be this name, for the reasons before alledged. And thus I hope this Gordian knot is vnied, and this vnanswerable argument answered by this *ἀρτυρος*. The name of the beast is not yet knowne, therefore (saith he) Antichrist is not yet come. I answer, although the name were vnknowne, yet might Antichrist become. But now the name of the beast is knowne: how fare then *Ballarmin* from proouing by this argument, that Antichrist is not yet come?

The ii. Chapter: Concerning the marke, which Antichrist shall impose vpon men.



Concerning the marke of Antichrist, *Ballarmin* reciteth three opinions, vnto which he addeth a fourth of his owne coining. The first of the Protestants, who teach that the marke of Antichrist is some sign of obedience and conuiction with the Pope. The second opinion is of some Catholike Papists, who thinke this marke to be the letters of Antichrists name. The third of Hippolytus, and some others, who imagine that this marke of the beast is, not to use the signe of the crosse, but rather to denie it, and abhorre it. The first opinion, viz. of the Protestants, he detesteth as such an abominable. The second of the Catholicks, he rejecteth as false, which he signifieth when he saith, they were deceived. The third he would willingly embrace, because it seemeth to make against vs; but the authour is counterfeit, and his

his testimonie falsified by *Ballarmin*. And although indeed he do reject it, as he might well, because it is absurd to saie a priuative marke, as if the not vsing of some marke, were the marke whereof the Holy-ghost speaketh: yet he affirmeth, (such is his blind malice) that herein we are notable fore-runners of Antichrist. In the fourth place he addeth his owne conceit, that Antichrist shall inuent a positive or reall marke, which as yet is not knowne: whereby as he would overthrow all the former opinions, so especially he confuteth the last. From whence notwithstanding, as if it were true, he would saie inferre that we are the fore-runners of Antichrist. And this opinion he doth confute by two reasons. First, because the marke must be positive; and secondly, because it is as yet vnknowne. And this is the summe and effect of his whole eloquent Chapter. But what of all this? or whereunto doth all this discourse tend? You will say, to prooue that the Pope is not Antichrist. He had indeed propounded that question to prooue, but in this Chapter he concludeth nothing for the Pope. Only he collecteth vs, that there be three opinions concerning the marke, and to them he addeth a fourth of his owne, and there an end. Other Papists when they handle this argument, reason thus: Antichrist shall compell men to take the marke of the beast; the Pope doth not compell men to take the marke of the beast. Therefore the Pope is not Antichrist. Which argument if he had vsed, and had also made good the assumption, he should haue said something to the purpose. But *Ballarmin* concludeth no such matter, *Nec enim ausus est, nec potuit*. For well doth he know, that from this marke of the beast we conclude the affirmatiue, namely, that the Pope is Antichrist.

2. How then doth he argue? surely it is not easie to tell. For after the sophisters guise, he hideth his conclusion, that he may the more easily deceiue. *ὁ γὰρ ἀποφύγει τὸ καθ' ὅτι γινώσκων, τὸ δὲ ἀδύνατον, ὡς ὁ φιλόσοφος*, as the Philosopher saith. But so far as I can gesse, either by resolving the discourse it selfe, or by conferring the same with the former chapter, whereunto he seemeth to refer vs, he would seeme to reason thus: If Antichrists marke be not yet knowne, then is not Antichrist yet come: But Antichrists marke is not yet

knowne; therefore Antichrist is not yet come: and consequently the Pope is not Antichrist. The proposition he omitteth, and so taketh it for granted: although in truth there is no necessity of the consequence. For as we said before of his name, so now we say of his marke: that after Antichrist is come, his marke might bee unknowne, yea was for a time to bee unknowne. Otherwise he should not be able to enforce his marke vpon manie, few or none being so desperately wicked, as knowing his marke, to suffer themselves by the same to be branded to destruction; as all they are, who doe receiue and retaine it, *Apoc.* 14. 9. 10. And further I adde, that although this marke bee knowne to very many of those who haue the *Marke of Gods* yet to them that are branded with this marke of the beast, and doe retaine the same, that is, who liue and die Papists, it neither is, or shall be knowne, or at least not acknowledged of them during this life. And therefore no maruaile though *Bellarmino* confesse his ignorance in this behalfe.

3. But let vs see also how he prooueth the assumption, viz. that the marke of the beast is not yet knowne. Forsooth by this reason: *If neither that be the marke of the beast which the Protestants teach, nor yet that which the Catholicks imagine (so many of them take vpon them to know what this marke is) then assuredly this marke is not yet knowne: But neither is that the marke which the Protestants speake of, nor yet that which the Catholicks haue supposed: Therefore this marke is not yet knowne.* As for the Papists, we confesse that either they know not, or at the least acknowledge not this marke, for if they did, the most of them would refuse to take it. Wherefore leauing them to *Bellarmines* discretion, whether to be confuted or allowed, let vs consider whether that be the marke, which the Protestants haue supposed, or not. The hereticks of this time (saith *Bellarmino*) teach that the character of Antichrist is some signe of obedience and communion with the Pope of Rome. But what this signe is, they doe not expresse after the same manner. Bullinger vnderstandeth by the marke the Chrisme, wherewith young ones are annointed in their confirmation. *Bibliander* saith, it is the profession of the Romish

S. viii. 61.
in *Apoc.*
circ. 120.
82.

or

or Papist faith. Chytræus to this addeth the oath of fidelitie, which many are compelled to sweare to the Pope: as also the priestly unction which is receiued in the head and the hand, impressing (as the Papists speake) *Characterem indelebilem*: Finally to fall downe before Images, and the hoste, and to be present at Masses for the dead. Sed facile est (saith he) has nugari refutare. But it is easie to refute these sayes. But before I come to answer his trifling cauations, I thinke it needfull first to referre the reader to the former booke, where I shewed what this marke is, and that this marke which is but one in substance, is diuersly expresse and testified; and therefore that there is no opposition in the opinions of the Protestants, concerning this matter, all these notes, which they mention, belonging to the marke of the beast. And secondly, to deliuer briefly the Popish conceit concerning this marke. For the Papists imagine that the character is a visible marke of Antichrists name, which the followers of Antichrist shall haue imprinted in their foreheads, and carrie as a signe in their hands, that it may be as it were their warrant to buy or sell: And so *Bellarmino* (to omitte others) writeth also of the name and the number. The proper name of Antichrist (saith he) must be shewed for a token of all that buy or sell. To which purpose he approueth the judgement of *Rupertus*, who saith, that Antichrists name is such as he shall glory in, *Ad eo ut inbeat inscribi in frontibus hominum*, in so much that he shall cause it to be written in the foreheads of men. And againe, the beast (whose number this is) shall command all merchants that they use this number for a signe or token in their contracts. But who could be so grosse as to imagine that Princes and Magistrates, and men of all sorts, would euer suffer themselves to be branded as it were with Antichrists visible marke? or if that were Antichrists practise, who should not be able to discern him? Why, their ordinarie glossie could tell them, that the marke is receiued in the forehead by confession, and in the right hand by operation, as we also hold. *Antoninus* also and *Lyra* teach that Character est determinatus modus viuendi secundum legem aliquam, quo à ceteris distinguuntur. A Character or marke is a certaine manner of lining according to the lawe of any, whereby men are distinguished from others: which also agreeth with our judgement. Again, the Scriptures often

See lib. i.
chap. 8. §.
4. & 5.

chap. 10.
lib. 3. de.
Donis. Rom.

Exe. 9. often times make mention of markes and seales, which cannot without absurditie be vnderstood of visib'e markes.

4 Now let vs see how easily this trifler is able according to his vaine brag, to refute those royes of ours. His reasons are two: the former, because that which we deliver concerning the marke, agreeth not with the words of the text: which he sheweth by foure instances. First, because the text speaketh but of one character, we speake of many. We answer, that as of the Lambe, so of the beast also there is but one character in substance, although the same by diuers meanes may be diuersly exprest and testified; that is, subjection to the Pope as their head, and the acknowledgment of the See of Rome, and of the Popes supremacie, &c. And this marke (to answer his second instance also,) is common to all, as being enforced vpon all sorts of men without exception. Heare the words of their law; *Subesse Romano pontifici, omni humana creatura declaramus, dicimus, definimus, & pronuntiamus, a. n. n. esse de necessitate salutis:* For every humane creature to be subiect to the Pope of Rome, we declare, affirme, determine, and pronounce, that it is altogether of the necessitie of salvation. See more lib. i. cap. 8. § 6. & 7. Thirdly, saith he, The scripture sheweth this character to be such a one, as may indifferently be carryed either in the right hand or in the forehead. But none of these markes which the Protestants mention are such. The Chrisme is receined in the forehead, and not in the hand, &c. The scripture saith thus, *Apoc. 13. 16. And he causeth all, both small and great, &c. That he may giue them a marke on their right hand, or else vpon their forehead.* That is, by his vsurped dominion and tyranny, he shall make all sorts of men subiect vnto him: and in testimony of their subjection, to receiue his marke on the forehead by profession, or in the right hand by practise and operation. Of the carrying of this marke, and the carrying of it indifferently either on the forehead, or in the hand, the scripture speaketh not. The marke is subjection vnto him, which (as hath bene said) is diuersly exprest and testified. Fourthly, the Scripture saith, that none in the kingdome of Antichrist, shall be suffered to buy or sell, unless he haue this marke: but how many (saith he) are there within the dominion of the Pope, who hauing none of these markes, doe buy and sell, as namely the Iewes?

I an-

I answer, that Antichrist was to sit in the Church of God, and to tyrannize ouer Christians. Now of all those that professe the name of Christ, the Pope suffereth none where he hath to doe, either to buy or sell, except he haue his marke. See the Bull of *Martin* the first, annexed to the councell of *Constance*, where expresse and straight charge is giuen, that whosoever doth not lie in subjection to the Pope, and communion with the Church of Rome (meaning such as *Wichse* and *Engle*) shall not be suffered to buy or sell, or to enjoy the comforts of humane societie. Whereas therefore the Pope permitteeth that to the Iewes, which he will not permit to the professors of the Gospell of Christ: that, as it sheweth his greater opposition to the seruants of Christ, then to the enemies of Christ the Iewes; so it bewrayeth him to be Antichrist.

See lib. i.
cap. 8. §. 7.

5. His second reason is thus concluded. If all these things, which the Protestants mention, were used in the Catholick Church before the coming of Antichrist, then none of them belong to the marke of Antichrist, (for otherwise Antichrist should haue learned them of the Church:) But all these things as namely Chrisme and therest, which the Protestants mention, were used in the Catholick Church before the yeere 607. that is, before the coming of Antichrist, according to the opinion of the Protestants: therefore none of these belong to the marke of the beast. First I answer to the proposition, that although these things had bene used in the Catholick Church before the reuelation of Antichrist, yet that hindereth not, but that now they may appertaine to the marke of the beast. For we doubt not to affirme that before the reuelation of Antichrist there were many corruptions crept into the Church, both in Doctrine and in the worship of God (the mysterie of iniquitie more and more working, euen from the Apostles times, vnto the reuelation of Antichrist) which corruptions Antichrist was to retaine with increase. If therefore the seeds of Antichristianisme, which were sowne before Antichrists appearing, were signes of his approaching; the same being as it were growne vp, confirmed and increased, may without absurditie bee sayd to belong to the marke

of Antichrist already come. Especially if we consider the diuersitie in vsing of them since the reuelation of Antichrist and before. For there was not in the Catholicke church an vniuersall subiection to the Pope as the head, vntill he by much ambition and contention obtained the supremacie, and was called the vniuersall Bishop, and head of the vniuersall Church, which he could neuer obaine vntill the yeare 607. Seeing then there was not an vniuersall subiection to the Pope before that time, these things if they had beene vsed at all, could not be vsed as signes thereof; as since they haue: Neither were they imposed before and enjoyned vpon all by the lawes of the Pope, as since they haue: so that the cause of vsing them now, is not the example of the ancient Church, but the authoritie of the Popes lawe, injoyning and commaunding them. Therefore although these things had beene vsed in the Church before the yeere 607, yet now they may appertaine to the marke of the beast: And therefore the connexion of the proposition is first to be denied. But now if these things were not vsed in the first 600. yeeres, will not he then in confuting those toyes, shew himselfe a meere trisler?

6. But let vs consider of the particulars. And first, that *Chrisme* was vsed before the yeere 606. he proueth by the testimonies of *Tertullian, Cyprian and Augustine*. I answer, that these Fathers speake of the anointing with Oyle vsed in the Sacrament of Baptisme, which also without warrant of the Scriptures is retained among the Papists. But of the *chrisme* of saluation, which the Papists make the element of their counterfeit sacrament of confirmation, whereof there is no institution in the Scriptures, no worde, no element, these Fathers speake not. The ceremonie of imposition of hands, with prayer for the confirmation and strengthening of those, which before had beene baptized, was indeed vsed in the primitiue church: neither is it altogether mislikked of vs, although not much vsed among vs, because it was so much abused by them. But this ceremonie was done without vntion or *chrisme*: for further prooffe whereof see *D. Fulke* his answer to the *Rhemists*, *lib. 1. c. 17*. And therefore notwithstanding that ancient practise of the Church, this *Chrisme* vsed in

confir.

confirmation, may belong to the marke of the beast. And the rather because the Papists make their confirmation with *Chrisme*, not onely a sacrament, but also a most necessary and Principall sacrament. So necessary as that they haue set it downe as a law, that no man is to be esteemed a Christian without it. *Quamquam erit Christianus nisi confirmatione episcopali fuerit Christianus. He shall neuer be a Christian, who is not confirmed with Chrisme by a Bishop.* So principall, as that they preferre it before Baptisme, affirming that it is *maior veneratione venerandum, with greater veneration to be revered.* Now if it be a priuiledge peculiar vnto Christ the author and bestower of grace, to ordaine Sacraments of grace; then must it needes be accounted a practise Antichristian, if any man shall take vpon him to ordaine a Sacrament, and not onely to obtrude the same vpon all as necessary to saluation, but also to preferre it before that excellent Sacrament of Baptisme ordayned by Christ himselfe. Therefore as the ordayning and enforcing of this Sacrament vpon men is a note of Antichrist, so those which doe not onely receiue it when they are young, but also retaine it when they are olde, remayning in the communion of the Church of Rome, may be said to haue the marke of the beast.

7. Secondly, that to adhere to the *Romaine Church* was a marke of a true Catholicke before the yeere 606. he proueth by the authority of *Augustine, Ambrose and Victor Vicensis*. But we speake of the Church of Rome that now is, that is, the apostaticall Church of Rome: he argueth of the ancient Church which was apostolicall. Indeed whiles the Church of Rome did cleaue vnto Christ, so long might it be a note of a good Christian to cleaue vnto it, although these testimonies doe scarce proue it: but after that Church became apostaticall and adulterous, as appeareth by their fundamentall heresies, and horrible Idolatries, and consequently of a faithfull Church became an harlot, and of the Church of Christ the synagogue of Antichrist: it hath beene the marke of an Antichristian to lue in the communion of that Church. Besides this great difference betwixt the present and the ancient state of the Church of Rome, there

is also great oddes in the manner of adhering or cleauing thereto. Then, as other Churches did cleane to the Church of Rome, so did the Church of Rome cleane to them: now it acknowledgeth no Church besides it selfe. Then the Church of Rome was accounted but a part of the Catholicke Church, and so a man might be a good Christian although he were not of the Church of Rome: now the Church of Rome alone must be accounted the Catholicke Church; and consequently he that is not a member of that Church, must not be taken for a Catholicke or true Christian. For when the Pope got the title of vniuersall Bishop, or head of the vniuersall Church, then the church whereof he was head, was accounted the onely Catholicke and vniuersall Church. Hereunto agreeth that Glosse, *Constat ecclesiam vniuersalem esse vnam, quia in vniuersali ecclesia est vnum caput supremum; cui omnes de ecclesia obedire tenentur scil. Papa.* It is evident that the Church is therefore one, because in the vniuersall Church there is one supreme head, whom all that are of the Church are bound to obey. And agreeably therunto saith a late writer, whose bookes were published at Venice in the yeere 1588. *Non potest quis se Christianum sateri, qui cura Papa dicit se non subesse. No man may profess himselfe to be a Christian, who doth not confesse himselfe to be subiect to the Popes cure or charge.* And therefore in the conclusiō of his booke he professeth himselfe to be *Mancipium S. R. E.* The bound seruant of the holy church of Rome, *Non ignorans (he saith) haud possit habere se deum patrem, si sanctam vniuersalem Romanam ecclesiam non habuerit matrem, knowing that a man cannot haue God to be his father, vntill he haue the holy vniuersall Church of Rome to be his mother.* Seeing therefore the Church of Rome is become the whore of Babylon, as hath bene prooued, and the synagogue of Antichrist; & seeing the Pope compelleth all men to cleane to the church of Rome, suffering none to buy or sel, or to enioy any benefices of humane society, which professeth not themselves to be members of the Church of Rome: it followeth that this cleauing to the Apostaticall Church of Rome, or liuing in the communion thereof, belongeth to the marke of the beatt.

3. Inuincibilem obedientiam.

8. Thirdly, as touching the oath of obedience and fealty made to the Pope of Rome, *Bellarmine* prooueth that it was used in

in the time of Gregory the great, and therefore before the yeere 606. as appeareth in the Epistles of Gregorie. I answered, that although before the yeere 606. the Bishops of Rome tooke more vpon them, then became the ministers of Christ: yet *Bellarmino* is not able out of all antiquity to alleadge one example of such an oath of fealty and allegiance imposed by the Pope vpon foraine Bishops, and much lesse vpon Kings and Princes, as all Catholicke Bishops, as they call them, Priests, graduates, Princes and potentates are compelled to sweare vnto the Pope of Rome. That one example, which, as it seemeth, is all that he can alleadge, of an oath taken not long before the yeere 606. is litle to the purpose. For it is not an oath of obedience and allegiance to the Pope, but of faith and religion towards God, conformable to the faith and religion then professed by the Bishop, and Church of Rome. For it is the oath of a certaine Bishop who sweareth to renounce his former heresies, and to profess and maintaine that faith and religion, which then the Bishop and Church of Rome did profess: which oath in effect is no otherwise to be vnderstood, then if a minister among vs, being reclaimed from Popery or some other heresie, should take an oath before a Bishop, that whiles he liueth, he will profess and maintaine that religion which is now professed and established in the Church of England, and other reformed Churches; which is not to sweare allegiance to them, but the like allegiance with them vnto Christ.

9. Fourthly, the anointing of Priests, we confesse to be as ancient as the Priesthood of *Aaron*, from whence they profess they haue received this Iewish ceremony; which together with the sacrifices, Priesthood and ceremonies of the law, are abrogated by the sacrifice & death of our Saviour Christ. And why then do they not as well retaine circumcision, the sacrifices of Bulls and Goats, & other ceremonies of the Leuiticall Priesthood, that they might more plainly shew themselves, whiles they seek to be the Apes of the Iewes, to be as indeede they are, according to the censure of *Paul* in the Epistle to the *Galathians*

Lib. 10. Ep. 21.

4. Vntill sacerdotibus.

Galathians, Apostates from Christ. But as their priesthood it selfe is Antichristian, whereby the Leuitical priesthood and many Jew-
ish ceremonies are retained, as though Christ had not put an
end to them: whereby Christ is denied to be our onely Priest:
whereby Christ himselfe (as they say) is daily offered; to the
disgrace of his owne sacrifice, as though that once performed
had not bene sufficient: to the ouerthrow of his humane na-
ture, which they hold to be in many places at once inuisible and
incircumscribable, without quantity and dimension, and conse-
quently nobody; to the disparagement of his diuine excellen-
cie, whiles euery shaueling Priest taketh vpon him by brea-
thing out a few words after a magical maner to create his maker,
and when he hath done so offer him as a sacrifice to the father,
euery sacrifice being inferiour to the sacrificer: to the deifying
of a piece of bread consecrated to most factilegious Idolatry: as
I say, their priesthood it selfe is Antichristian, so their vñction,
wheth er of Bishops on the head, or of Priests on the hand, vn-
doubtedly belongeth to the marke of Antichrist. And although
they were able to shew some practise hereof in the Church be-
fore the yeere 606. yet this hindreth not, but that this Priestly
Vñction may belong to the marke, because as I said, some cor-
ruptions were before the reuelation of Antichrist crept into the
Church, which by him were to be retained with increase and
maintained, as also because this ceremony is vsed not by autho-
rity of their example, but as receiued from *Moses* by the autho-
rity of the ceremoniall law, as though it were not abrogated by
Christ, and as imposed vpon the Church by the law of the Pope:
And lastly because it is a ceremony belonging to such a sacrific-
ing Priesthood, as was not known in the primitive Church. But
as I suppose they are not able to produce any sufficient testimony
or authentick prooffe to declare the vse of this ceremony in the
primitive Church, which some of them impute to the rudenes,
and vnseled estate of that time. For whereas he alledgeth two
testimonies of *Nazianzen*, both places are to be vnderstood
figuratiuely, of consecration to the ministerie. For as appea-
reth by the testimony of *Innocentius 3.* this ceremony of annoin-
ting was not vsed in the Greeke Church, whereof *Nazianzen*

Pighius.

De sacra
vñctione c.
cum vñcti-
fit.

was,

was, but reiected as Jewish, vntill he imposed the same vpon
them, about the yeere 1200.

10. As touching the first: Sacrifices of praise we offered for
those that dyed in the Lord; but no propitiatory sacrifices, such
as their masses be, were offered for them. The oblations for the
dead, whereof *Augustine* speaketh, prooue not that masses
were vsed as propitiatory sacrifices for the quicke and the dead.
Vntill therefore he can prooue that they had before the yeere
607. masses as superstitious and Idolatrous as since: the fre-
quencing of Masses may now belong to the marke of the beast,
which before did not.

11. Adoration of images and of the Eucharist, may most
fully be said to belong to the marke of the beast. For those
that are made drunke with the cup of the whore of Baby-
lons fornications, that is, which are besotted with the Ido-
latries of the Church of Rome, are the same with those that
receiue the marke of the beast: But the adoration of Ima-
ges and of the Eucharist, is notorious Idolatry or spiri-
tuall fornication; and therefore those that are besotted with
these idolatries haue receiued the marke of the beast. And
as touching the worshipping of Images, it is most plainly
forbidden and condemned in the Scriptures, and Councils,
and writings of the fathers, who liued in the first 600. yeeres.
The Wine of this fornication, wherewith all sortes haue
bene made drunke, was first let abroad to the world in the
second Council of *Nice*, about the yeere 789. For further
prooffe whereof read *B. Jewell* in his 14. article against *M.
Harding*. And the like may be said of the adoration of the
Eucharist, which is a consequent of the eleuation of the sa-
crament and transubstantiation, neither of which were vsed
or heard of in the first 600. yeeres, as the same *Jewell* prooueth
Artic. 7 §. 10. And *Artic. 8.* he sheweth that the adoration
of the sacrament canot be warranted by any commandement of
Christ, nor by any word or example of the apostles or ancient fa-
thers, but that it is a thing lately devised by Pope *Honorius*
about the yeere 1226. But let vs weigh his prooffes. That Images

were

5. *Missa*
pro disme-
tis.

11b. de ha-

ref. c. 53.

Sec. D.

Eu. de in

Apoc. 14.

13. §. 5. con-
tra. Rhen.

6. Adora-

tio imagi-

num et E-

ucharistiae.

were worshipped he proueth by the testimony of *Ierome*, who in the life of *Paula*, speaking of her zeale and deuotion in visiting those places, where our Lord Iesus had bene conuerfant; he sheweth how at length she commeth to the sepulcher and kisseth the stone, which the Angell had rouled away fro the mouth of the sepulcher, and licked the place where Christs body lay: and seeing that very Crosse (as was supposed) whereon Christ was crucified, *Prostrata ante crucem quasi pendentem Dominum cerneret adorabat*, Falling downe before the crosse she worshipped the Lord, as if she had now seene him hanging on the Crosse. I answered that this practise was not common, but peculiar to her; and to her not vntuall, but onely at that time, and in that place: neither did she worship the Crosse (as the Papists doe the images of that Crosse, *culu latria* with diuine worship) but seeing the Crosse whereon Christ was crucified, and being rauished with the memory of his death, she falling before that Crosse, worshipped Christ. Now that the adoration of the Eucharist was also in vse before the yeere 606. he proueth by the testimonies of *Ambrose* and *Augustine*. *Ambrose* his words are these, *Itaque per scabellum terra intelligitur, per terram caro Christi, quam hodie quoque in mysterijs adoramus, et quam Apostolus Domino Iesu, ut supra diximus, adorauit*. Therefore by the footstools let vs vnderstand the earth, and by the earth the flesh of Christ, which at this day also we adore in the mysteries, and which the Apostles adored in the Lord Iesus, as we said before. But it is one thing to adore and honour Christ in his sacraments, as the ancient Christians and we doe: and another thing to adore the sacrament, as if it were Christ himselfe, as the Papists doe, deifying a piece of bread, and adoring it with such a worship as indeed belongeth not (I say not to the man Christ, but) to the humanity of Christ, whereof alone and not of the deity the bread is a sacrament; For the bread is a sacrament of the body of Christ crucified, and the wine of his bloud-shed. But if *Bellarmine* would haue read but fife or fixe lines further, he should haue found a better testimony against their adoration of Saints and images, then this was for the adoration of the

Lib. 3. de
spiritu S.
chap. 12.

the sacrament. For *Ambrose* prouing that the holy Ghost was to be adored, because he is adored that according to the flesh was borne of the holy Ghost: *Ac ne quis hoc derimet* (saith he) *ad Mariam virginam: Maria erat templum dei, non deus templi, et idcirco illi adorandus qui operabatur in templo: And least any should deriue this to the virgine Mary: Mary was the Temple of God, not God of the Temple; and therefore he alone is to be adored who did worke in the Temple.* *Augustine* vnderstanding by the footstools mentioned *Psalme. 99. 5.* the flesh of Christ saith, *Ipsam carnem nobis manducandam ad salutem dedit. Nemo autem carnem illam manducat nisi prius adorauerit: He gave his flesh it false to be eaten of vs to saluation, but no man eateth that flesh vntill he first haue adored it.* Where *Augustine* speaketh no more of the sacrament or of the bodily eating of the flesh, then Christ himselfe doth *Iohn 6.* & therefore this allegation is impertinent; or if it were not, yet is it one thing to adore the flesh of Christ, and another thing to adore a piece of bread, which by the testimony of Christ *Iohn 6.* and of *Augustine*, is proued not to be turned into the body of Christ, because both doe signifie, that the wicked doe not eate the body of Christ. To conclude therefore, whereas *Bellarmino* argueth thus, These things were vsed before the yeere 606. therefore they belong not to the marke of the beast: the summe of my answer is this, that they were not vsed in the first 600. yeeres: and againe, if they had bene vsed then, yet they may belong to the marke of the beast now, for the reasons before alledged.

In Psal. 98.

The 12. Chapter. Of the generation and nation of Antichrist.

THe Iesuits fift disputation is concerning the generation and nation of Antichrist, whereof he shall come, and of which he shall especially be receiued. From whence as he vainely suppoeth, is gathered a most euident demonstration, that the Pope is not Antichrist. For Antichrist shall be receiued of the Iewes for their Messias, and consequently he

he is to be a Jew both by nation and religion: But none of the Popes since the yeare 607. hath bene received of the Jews as their *Messias*; neither hath any one bene a Jew either in nation or religion: therefore the Pope is not *Antichrist*: or rather as hee ought to conclude from the premises, therefore not any one of the Popes is *Antichrist*. For in all this disputation *Bellarmino* presupposeth that to be true, which we have prooued to be most false, that *Antichrist* is but one singular person, and accordingly reasoneth, as if we held that this or that Pope were the *Antichrist*. We holde indeede that every Pope for his time, as he is the head of the catholicke Apostasie, so is an *Antichrist*; but the *Antichrist* is the whole rowe and order of them from *Boniface* the third downeward. If therefore *Bellarmino* argueth vpon a false supposition, we are like to haue but a simple demonstration of it. But let vs examine his disputation. Before he proposeth his proposition, as the basis or ground of his demonstration, he dealeth with vs as cunning tradesmen, who being desirous to utter their bad wares at a good price, first, shew those that are worse, that the naughtiness of the worse may commend and set forth those that be not so bad. So he bringeth forth diuers opinions concerning the generation of *Antichrist*, and first those that are false and absurde, as namely, that *Antichrist* should be borne of a virgin by the operation of the diuell, as *Christ* was borne of a virgin, by the operation of the holy Ghost. Which opinion is propounded by the author of the treatise concerning *Antichrist*, falslie ascribed to *Augustine*. Secondly, that the diuell himselfe is *Antichrist*, who shall sayne himselfe to haue taken flesh of a virgin, as *Christ* truly did; which is the conceit of *Hippolytus*: vpon whose counterfeit authority the Papists in other points concerning this controuersie, doe so much relie. Thirdlie, that *Antichrist* shall be a true man, but withall a Diuell, by the incarnation of the Diuell; when as *Christ*, who is God, by incarnation became man: which opinion (saith *Bellarmino*) Origen thought to be possible. These opinions shew into what absurdities men doe fall, when as they will needes be

be comparing *Christ* with *Antichrist*, as the Papists in many things do. Fourthly, that *Nero* who died about 1500. yeares agoe should come againe in his owne person to be *Antichrist*.

2 But these wares are all so corrupt, that *Bellarmino* will not for his credit sake commend them vnto vs. And therefore he maketh a second shew of such opinions as are more probable, viz. That *Antichrist* shall be borne in fornication and not in marriage, which is the opinion of *Damasen* and some others. And secondly, That he shall be borne of the Tribe of *Dan*, which is the iudgement of twelue of the Fathers, & other approued Authors among the Papists; and generally of all Papists almost besides *Bellarmino* himselfe. But although these opinions be, as he saith, very probable, & the latter commended by a whole sury of ancient writers, yet because they cannot be proued out of the scriptures, he will not put the into our hands, as though he meant to warrant the. So that now we must needes thinke that we shall be well dealt withall, and that no corrupt or counterfeit stoffe shall be commended vnto vs, but that which is currant and warrantable by the word of God. But what say you *Bellarmino*, cannot this opinion that *Antichrist* shall be of the Tribe of *Dan*, be proued out of the scripture? what say you then to those three places of scripture, which are to this purpose vsually alledged in the Church of Rome: the first *Gen. 49. 17. Dan shall be a serpent in the way, &c.* The second, *Ier. 8. 16. The neyng of his horses was heard fro Dan.* The third, *Apoc. 7.* where 12000. of euery Tribe being sealed to saluation, the Tribe of *Dan* is left out, because *Antichrist* was to come of that Tribe. To the first of these places *Bellarmino* answereth with vs, that the propheticall blessing of *Jacob*, was verified in *Sampson*, who was of the Tribe of *Dan*; & that *Jacob* meaning in these words to blesse *Dan*, his meaning cannot without absurditie be peruerter to the signification of a curse. And I adde, that they might with as good reason alledge that *Antichrist* shall be of the Tribe of *Benjamin*, of whom it is said, *verse 27.* that he shall rauen as a Wolfe. *Jeremy* vndoubtedly speaketh not of *Antichrist*, nor yet as *Bellarmino* saith, of the Tribe of *Dan*, but of *Nabuchadonoser*, who was to come by the coast or country called *Dan*, to destroy *Ierusalem*, as *Jerome*

rightly expoundeth. Why *Dan* is omitted in *Apoc. 7.* it is not well knowne saith *Bellarmino*, especially seeing *Ephraim* also which was one of the greatest Tribes is left out. But here *Bellarmino* doth pra-
uaticari, and by tripping betray the truth. For it is not true that *Ephraim* is left out: for seeing *Manasses* is mentioned *Verse 6.* wee must needs by the Tribe of *Ioseph* mentioned *Verse 8.* vnderstand the Tribe of *Ephraim*. Neuer thelesse, this may tru-
 ly be said, that there are other causes of this omission, then that which is alledged concerning Antichrist. For else we may say as well, that Antichrist should come of the Tribe of *Simeon*, because he is not mentioned in the blessing of *Moses*, *Deut. 33.* The truth is, that where the holy Ghost numbred the 12.
 Tribes, and mentioneth *Leui*, which for the most part is not reckned among the 12. Tribes, because it was scattered among them all; some one of the other Tribes is left out, otherwise, where 12. are named, 13. should be reckned. The mentioning therefore of *Leui*, is the cause why some one of the rest is not ex-
 pressed, but either comprehended vnder an other that is men-
 tioned, as *Simeon* vnder *Iuda* *Deut. 33.* *Ephraim* & *Manasses* be-
 ing two seuerall & great Tribes, vnder *Ioseph*, *Deut. 27. 12.* *Exec.*
48. 31. are altogether omitted, as *Dan. Apo. 7.* Now *Dan* seemeth
 to be omitted, rather then any other, because that was the first
 Tribe which fel from God vnto Idolatry: & for the same cause
 (as some thinke) the genealogie of that Tribe is omitted in the
 first booke of the *Chronicles*.

3 These opinions therefore though countenanced with the
 authoritie of the Fathers, *Bellarmino* dares not deliuer as mat-
 ters of truth, because they cannot be proued out of the scriptures.
 The which in truth is the cause why we reiect all the fancies
 of the Papists concerning Antichrist, wherein they differ from
 vs, because that although many of the were also the opinions of
 the auncient writers (who could but ghesse at the meaning of
 prophecies not then fulfilled) yet they cannot be proued out of
 the word of God, wherein Antichrist is sufficiently described.
 This libertie therefore which *Bellarmino* lawfully taketh vnto
 himself in reiecting the testimonies of the Fathers in this point
 not warranted by the scriptures, must in equitie also be graun-
 ted

ted vnto vs. For vpo the same principle or ground which *Bel-
 larmine* here setteth downe, we reason against the Popish con-
 ceits after this maner: Those opinions concerning Antichrist which
 cannot be proued out of the scriptures, are not to be held as certaine
 truties, or beleued as matters of faith, although they haue the testi-
 mony of the Fathers: But all the Popish conceits concerning Antichrist,
 are such as cannot be proued out of the scriptures: therefore none of
 the Popish conceits concerning Antichrist, are to be received for cer-
 taine truties, though diuers of them haue the testimony of the Fa-
 thers.

4 Now let vs heare in the third place what those things are
 which *Bellarmino* would haue vs to take vpon his word for cer-
 taine and found in this point. There be two things saith hee, most
 certaine: one that Antichrist shall come for the Iewes especially, and
 shall be received of them for their Messias. The other, that he shall be
 borne of the Nation of the Iewes, and shall be circumcised, and shall
 at the least for a time obserue the Sabbath. On which two points
 the proposition of the syllogisme before rehearsed doth consist,
 the which *Bellarmino* thought to set out as true, by setting by
 it other opinions more absurd then it is. But although there be
 degrees of falsehood in all these opinions, yet all of them are
 false, as being grounded vpon this false supposition, that Anti-
 christ is but one singular man. And secondly, by the same rea-
 son that moued *Bellarmino* to reiect the former opinions, may
 these also be reiected, namely, because they cannot be proued
 out of the scriptures; but contrariwise may be disproued there-
 by. For Antichrist shall sit in the Temple of God, that is,
 shall raigne in the church of Christ, and shall be an Apostate,
 and the head of the Apostasie, as *Bellarmino* confesseth, and
 therefore not the head of the Iewes (who cannot be said to make
 an Apostasie before they be called) but of back-sliding Chri-
 stians. Again, Antichrist is one of the seuen heads of the beast
 mentioned *Apoc. 17.* that is, of the Romaine state, having his
 seate in *Babylon*, that is, in *Rome*, in the gouernment whereof
 hee succeedeth the Emperour: who, whiles hee ruled in *Rome*,
 hindered the reuelation of Antichrist, as it hath beene
 shewed heretofore out of *Apoc. 17. 13.* & 2. *Thess. 2.*

All which do sufficiently proue, that Antichrist was not to be a Jew, either by nation or religion, but a Latine or Romaine, which name with the marke thereof, he causeth all sorts of men to take vpon the. And lastly, for as much as the Papists themselves hold the calling of the Jewes: it would be knowne whether they shall reuolt, after their calling from Christ to Antichrist, or whether they shall be called after the destruction of Antichrist, or during the time of Antichrists raigne, which shall be as they say, the terme of three yeares & a halfe precisely, or 1260. daies. But themselves denie that the Jewes shall reuolt after their calling, or that they shall be called in the time of Antichrists raigne: & that they shall be called after the destruction of Antichrist, which shall not be before the ende of the world, it is absurd.

5 But let vs see how he proueth these things which he saith are most certaine & fore, & from whence he draweth his most *euidens demonstration*. First that Antichrist shall be received of the Jewes for their Messias, he proueth by testimonies of scripture, by authoritie of Fathers, and by reason. Out of the scripture he produceth two testimonies, the former *Ioh. 5. 43.* which place I have heretofore freed from the corruptiōs of the papists, shewing that our Saviour Christ doth not speake absolutely, *Another shall come*, but conditionally, *If an other shall come*, & therefore doth not foretel what they were afterwards to do, but telleth them what in respect of their present dispositiō they were readie to do, if an other should come in his owne name vnto them, not sent of God. 2. Neither doth he speake definitely of Antichrist, but indefinitely of any false teacher. 3. he speaketh of those Jewes, to whom he speaketh, who could not be the receiuers of Antichrist, vnlesse he were come about 1500. yeares agoe.

6 His second testimony is *2. Thess. 2. 10. 11.* *Because they receiued not the loue of the truth that they might be saued: therefore God shall send them the efficacie of error that they may beleene lyes, &c.* Which words he vnderstandeth of the Jewes, who because they receiued not Christ, shall therefore be seduced by Antichrist. But the place is plaine enough to them that wil vnderstand. The Apostle immediately before these words saith, that Antichrist shall preuaile

preuaile with this that perishe, because they receiued not the loue of the truth that they might be saued: And immediately after these words, *(Therefore God shall send them the efficacie of error, that they may beleene lyes)* he addeth, *that all might be iudged or condemned that haue not beleeued the truth, but haue taken pleasure in vnrigh- teousnesse.* In which words the Apostle doth not goe about to define of what Nation or people Antichrist shall be receiued: but hauing described Antichrist as by other arguments, so in the last place by this effect of seducing, now he describeth the followers of Antichrist, who shall be seduced of him not by their nation, but by their condition before God. And withall cleareth the iustice of God in giuing them ouer to be seduced to their destruction. The followers of Antichrist are described by their condition before God, that they are reprobates, or such as perishe, according to that, *Math. 24. 24.* that it is impossible that the elect should finally be seduced by him: which is set downe, not so much to be a note wherby to discern Antichrist: as to signify the estate of those that follow him, whom before hee had described, that they are *such as perishe, and that worthily.* For as I said, in the next words he cleareth the iustice of God, after this manner: On such as haue not receiued the loue of the truth that they might be saued, nor beleened the same, but haue delighted in vnrightheousnesse, the Lord sendeth iustly the efficacy of error, that they may beleene lyes, that they may all be condemned: But the followers of Antichrist are such as haue not receiued the loue of the truth, that they might be saued, nor beleened the same, but haue delighted in vnrightheousnes: therefore the Lord iustly sendeth vpon them strong illusions, that they may beleene lyes, that all such as beleene not the truth, but delight in vnrightheousnesse, may be condemned.

This is the discourse of the Apostle, concerning the followers of Antichrist, which cannot with any shewe of reason be restrained to the Jewes, vnlesse it may be said that they alone are such as perishe: that they alone haue not receiued the loue of the truth that they might be saued, that they alone haue not beleeued the truth, &c. for he saith, that *all might be condemned, &c.* For it is certaine, that as Antichrist, which in this chapter is de-

scribed, is not the head of the Iewes, but of counterfeit Christi-
ans: so the Iewes (as they are Iewes) are not the followers of
Antichrist here described. Antichrist is the head of the apostasie
or revolt from Christ, and consequently the head of Apostate
Christians. 1. Tim. 4. 1. Antichrist shall sit in the Temple
of God, that is, shall rule and raigne over the Church of Christ.
Antichrist was to sit in *Babylon*, that is, *Rome*, and therein was to
succeed the Emperours: who whiles they ruled in *Rome*, hindered
the reuelation and dominion of Antichrist. All which
points as they do fit the Pope, so they do proue that the Papists
be the followers of Antichrist, and haue receiued the name and
marke of the beast. And hereof there can be no doubt, if this
description also agree vnto them, as most evidently it doth.
For seeing they are the Apostate Christians described; 1. Tim.
4. 1. 3. certaine it is, that they haue not receiued the loue of the
truth, that they may be saved. That strong illusion is sent vpon
them that they might beleue lyes, &c. it appeareth plainly in
their written vanities, which they call vnwritten verities, in
their legends, portuises, and festiuals fraught full of incredible
lies, in their ridiculous dotages & deuout superstitions, wherein
they plainly shewe themselves to be besotted and made
drunke with the whore of *Babylons* cuppe of fornications, and
to be giuen ouer to beleue vntruthes. That they will not beleue
the truth, appeareth by their manifolde grosse errors, fro
which they wil not be reclaimed. And that they delight in iniquitie
appeareth by their doting vpon the doctrine & religion of
Antichrist, which as there it is opposed to the truth, so
before is called the *mystery of iniquitie*. This description therefore
of the followers of Antichrist, ought to be an admonition for all
Papists to renounce that religiō of *Rome*, if they would not be
in the number of the that perish: & a caueat for all Christians,
who professing the true religiō, haue no true loue thereof, but are
ready to accept & embrace the religiō of *Rome*, least this heauy
iudgement of the Lord fall vpon the, that because they haue not
receiued the loue of the truth to their saluatiō, the Lord send vpon
the strong illusiō, that they beleue lies vnto their destruction.

7. Yea, but (saith he) *this place cannot be understood of Christi-*
ans.

Ver. 12.
Ver. 7.

Ans, but of the Iewes: for he saith, that Antichrist shall be sent to them
who would not receiue Christ, which is true of the Iewes, but vntrue
of Christians. The Apostle speaketh of those that receiue not the
loue of the truth that they might be saved, which may be verified
of vnfound Christians (as the Rhemists themselves on this
place do graunt) that is, of all those who content themselves
with a bare profession of the faith, hauing neither a true faith,
nor yet a sound loue of the truth. A sound Christian doth not
only professe the name of Christ, but also hath some good vnder-
standing & knowledge of the truth, and withall an assent
thereto, in which two, namely knowledge & assent, consisteth
the historically, or dogmatical faith: & not only a knowledge &
assent (for so much the diuels haue) but also a loue & liking of
the truth: & not onely that (for euen hypocrites & temporary
beleeuers may attaine to a loue & liking of the truth for some
temporary respects) but also a speciall application of the pro-
mises of the Gospell vnto himselfe, & particular apprehension
of Christ his merits, whereby he is receiued of the beleuer to
iustification & saluation. Now the Papists are such as profess
Christ, but indeed receiue him not, nor yet the loue of his truth
that they might be saved. And therefore this place is verified of
them. For doth any man I beseech you, receiue Christ or be-
leue in him, who doth not beleue that Christ is his Redeemer
& Sauour? But if thou be a Papist, thou must not beleue
that Christ is thy Redeemer & Sauour: thou must sing *Magnificat*,
but thou maist not say with *Mary*, that thy soule reioy-
ceth in God thy Sauour: nor with *Paul*, that Christ hath loved
thee, or giuen himselfe for thee. Gal. 2. 20. Must thou beleue
that Christ is thy Sauour & redeemer? the must thou beleue
that thou art redeemed by Christ, and shalt be saved by him.
Must thou beleue that thou hast redemption by Christ? then
must thou also beleue that by him thou hast remission of
sinnes. Eph. 1. 7. Col. 1. 14. But this to beleue without speci-
all and extraordinary reuelation, is damnable presumption
saith the Papist. Therefore they profess Christ, but
they receiue him not. Nay, they are so farre from recei-
uing Christ by a iustifying faith, that they might be saved,
that they haue not so much as the historically faith, which

consisteth in knowledge of the truth & assent thereto. For the most of them haue no knowledge, pleasing themselves in their implicite faith: vnder which name grosse & palpable ignorāce is commended in the laitie of the church of Rome. And the rest assent not to the truth, but set themselves against it. So that whereas all the faith which they profess themselves to haue, is but that faith which is also in the diuels, yet they haue not euen that little which they do profess. But the Apostle (saith Bellarmine) speaketh in the preterence, which haue not receiued the loue of the truth, &c. not in the future: therefore this speech cannot be vnderstood of any other but those who before the Apostle wrote this, had refused to beleene the preaching of Christ & his Apostles, that is to say, the Iewes. *Ans.* The Apostle speaking both of the sinne of the Antichristians, and of their punishment, which presupposeth their sin going before, he expresseth their sin in the preterence, which is to be referred not to the time of the Apostles writing, but to the time of their punishment. Antichrist shall be receiued of those that perishe. But why shall they perishe: because they haue not receiued the loue of the truth, &c. But this appeareth more plainly, *ver. 12.* God shall send them strong illusions to beleue lies, that al may be condemned, *ut pā mōstrauit nō dubitā, vñ dāmonis ē nō aliq.* that haue not beleueed, that is, that shall not haue beleueed the truth, *Qui non crediderint veritati*, but haue delighted, that is, shall haue delighted in iniquitie, *Sed acquiescerint in iniquitate.* Conferre with this place *Mar. 16. 16.* Goe preach the Gospell saith our Saviour Christ, to euery creature, baptising them (as it is in *Mathew 28. 19.*) *in dōm, & baptizabitis eos in nō mōstrauit nō dubitā, vñ dāmonis ē nō aliq.* Ho that hath beleueed and hath bene baptised shall be saued; that is, shall haue beleueed, and shall haue bene baptised, but he that hath not beleueed, that is, shall not haue beleueed, shall be condemned. Otherwise, if Bellarmine will needes vrge the preterence, as though the Apostle meant that Antichrist should be receiued onely of those who before that time had reiected the truth, he must with all hold, that Antichrist shall be receiued in the end of the world of those who died about 1500. years since.

8 To these testimonies of scripture he addeth the authoritie

Qui crediderit & baptizatus fuerit &c.

of diuers Fathers, who supposed that Antichrist was to be receiued of the Iewes, and accordingly expound the place alledged out of 2. Thess. 2. 10. 11.

Ans. So they held that Antichrist should come of the Tribe of Dan, & accordingly expounded some places of scripture, which no man now vlesse he will be too ridiculous, can vnderstand of Antichrist. Therefore as Bellarmine in that point answered a whole dozen of Fathers, so may I answer here with as good reason, that although this opinion might seeme probable to the Fathers in their time, liuing before the reuelation of Antichrist, yet now there is no probability in it, seeing it cannot onely not be proued out of the scripture, but as you heard, is confuted both by the scripture and the euent.

9 Let vs therefore in the third place consider his reason: Antichrist shall without doubt ioine himselfe first and chiefly to those who are readie to receive him: But the Iewes are readie to receive him, not the Christians nor the Gentiles, therefore Antichrist first and principally shall ioine himselfe to the Iewes. First to the proposition I answer, that Antichrist shall ioine himselfe not to any whatsoeuer, but to those in the Church that are readie to receive him. For as Cyprian truly noteth, *They be the seruants of Epist. 1. lib. 1.* God whom the diuell troubleth, and they are Christians whom Antichrist impugneth, Neq; enim quarit illos, quos iam subegit, aut gessit euertere quos iam suos fecit. For he seeketh not those whom he hath already subdued, or desireth to overthrow those whom he hath already made his owne, the enemy & aduersary of the church, whom he hath estranged and kept forth of the Church, whom he neglecteth and passeth by as captiues and ouercome: those he assaulteth, in whom he perceiueth Christ to dwell. If therefore Antichrist be ledde by the spirit of Satan, then no doubt he shall passe by both Iewes & Infidels, & set himselfe *in nō dubitā, vñ dāmonis ē nō aliq.* 2. Thess. 2. that is, both in the Church of God, and against it, that the vnfound he may seduce, and the found he may persecute. The assumption standeth on two parts: 1. affirmatiue, that the Iewes are readie to receive Antichrist; 2. negative, that the Christians and Gentiles are not readie to receive him. The former hee proueth, because the Iewes do yet looke for their Messiah, who shall be a

temporall King, such a one as Antichrist shall bee. But this reason is built on false suppositions. First, that Antichrist shall be one particular man, which we haue proved to be false. Secondly, that Antichrist shall professe himselfe to be the Messias of the Iewes, which as it hath bene disproued out of the scriptures, so can it not with any colour of reason be proved out of the same. For as hath bene shewed, Antichrist is the head of the Catholike Apostasie or Apostate Christians, sitting in *Babylon*, that is, *Rome*, professing her selfe the church of God, being one of the seven heads of the Romane state, succeeding the Emperours in the government of *Rome*, &c. Thirdly, as Antichrist shall not be such a one as the expected Messias of the Iewes: so there is no necessitie that there should such a one come to the Iewes, as they expect. The second part also of his assumption is false. For although sound and constant Christians bee not readie to receiue Antichrist, but alwayes haue bene readie to resist him euen vnto the death: yet vnfound and back-sliding Christians, who embrace not the lone of the truth that they might be saved, either are as readie to receiue Antichrist, as they are apt and prone to decline from the truth (a fearefull caueat to those which waxe wearie of the Gospell) or already haue reuolted from Christ to Antichrist, & haue received the marke of the beast. Yea, but Christians saith he, doe not expect Antichrist, as the Iewes doo. The Iewes looke for him with ioy, as for their Messias, but the Christians with feare. I answer, as true Christians looke not at all for the expected Messias of the Iewes to be Antichrist, but acknowledge him that is come: so Papists, but that they cannot see the wood for trees; might in stead of looking for Antichrist, looke vpon him.

10 The second thing which *Beharmine* deliuereth concerning Antichrist for a certaine truth, is, That Antichrist shall be a Iew both by Nation and Religion; that is, he shall be a Iew borne, hee shall be circumcised, hee shall be an obseruer of the Iewes Sabbath, and other Iewish ceremonies. But how is this certaine truth proved? forsooth from the premises. For the Iewes will not receiue one for their Messias, that is not a Iew borne, nor circumcised.

Nay,

Nay, it is not to be doubted, but that as the Iewes looke for their Messias out of the family of David; so hee will saigne himselfe to be of the Tribe of David, although indeed he be of the Tribe of Dan. But this Popish conceit, built vpon their owne vaine imaginations, needeth no answer. For seeing I haue overthrowne their former assertion, wherevpon this is grounded; therefore this building of it selfe falleth to the ground, *Whosoener* (saith hee) shall be receiued of the Iewes for their Messias, he shall be a Iew borne, and circumcised, but Antichrist shall be receiued of the Iewes for their Messias: as hath bene proued, therefore Antichrist shall be a Iew borne, &c. The proposition is not altogether true, for the Herodians receiued Herod for their Messias, and thence had their name. But I will not stand vpon that.

The assumption I haue already disproued, shewing that Antichrist was not to be receiued of the Iewes for their Messias, and therefore there is no validitie in this argument. In the next place therefore for want either of reason; or authoritie of scripture, he vnderproppeth this tottering wall with testimonies of Fathers; but such as either himselfe before hath receiued, or else in this question may by the same reason be little regarded. The twelue Fathers (saith hee) which affirmed that Antichrist shall be of the Tribe of Dan, doo therefore holde that hee should be a Iew borne. But himselfe hath tolde vs, that we are not to beleene them; because their opinion cannot bee proued out of the scriptures: and therefore by the same reason, neither they, nor the rest are to be beleued in this point, which hath no ground in the word of God.

And thus his most euident demonstration is come to nothing. For although the Iewes receiue not the Pope for their Messias, but rather esteeme of him as of an other Pharaoh, and withall apply vnto him all that is spoken either of Antichrist, as the Papists say, or of the type of Antichrist Antiochus, as we say, Dan. 7. & 11. this hindereth not, but that the Pope may bee Antichrist. Yea, this may bee some inducement to perswade vs, that if those things which bee spoken of Antichrist, or his type, may in the iudgement of

Epiphanius
lib. 1. de
haeresi
door. 7.

R. I. end
Person.

the Jewes, who are no parties, be applyed properly to the Pope: that then the Pope is that Antichrist, that in *Daniel* is figured, and in other places of scripture not vnlke to that figure described.

Chap. 13. Of the seate or See of Antichrist.

I



VR aduersaries fixt disputatio is, concerning the seat or See of Antichrist, concluded in this syllogysine. *Antichrist shall sit at Ierusalem, and not at Rome: the Pope sitteth at Rome, & not at Ierusalem: therefore the Pope is not Antichrist.* The proposition, concern-

ing which all the cotrouelie is, is first proued by testimonies of scriptures, & afterwards desed against our obiections. His or prooffe standeth on three testimonies of scripture. The first *Apoc. 11. 8.* where *Iohn* saith, that *Enoch & Elias* shall be staine of Antichrist in Ierusalem. And their bodies shall lie in the streets of the great Citie, which is called spiritual Sodome or Egypt, where our Lord also was crucified. But what if *Iohn* speaketh neither of Antichrist, nor of *Enoch & Elias*, nor of *Ierusalem*? that hee speaketh not of Antichrist, it may bee doubted. For verse 7. hee saith, that the beast which ascendeth out of the deepe (which seemeth to bee the former beast described in the beginning of Chap. 13.) shall kill the two witnesses. And verse 2. it is said that the court of the Temple should be given to the Gentiles, and that they should tread upon the holy Citie 42. moneths, which is the time allotted to the persecution of the beast with seven heads, *Apoc. 13. 5.* Besides, the Papiists teach, that Antichrist shall bee the Prince of the Jewes and counterfeit Christians: therefore by their owne doctrine, this persecution of the Church by the Gentiles, should not be the persecution vnder Antichrist. And that *Enoch* and *Elias* he not here spoken of, it hath bene shewed before: & thirdly, that the holy Ghost doth not meane *Ierusalem*, I haue heretofore proued. But

But suppose that *S. Iohn* did speake both of Antichrist, as it seemeth he doth not, and also of *Ierusalem*, which I am sure hee doth not: yet notwithstanding, this followeth not, that where- soeuer the witnesses of Christ are put to death by him, or by his authoritie, that there should be his principall seate. Whereas therefore *Bellarmine* argueth thus, *Where the two witnesses are put to death, there is the seate of Antichrist, at Ierusalem the two witnesses are put to death, therefore at Ierusalem is the seate of Antichrist*: I answer first to the proposition, that it being generally vnderstood, is false; particularly, then *Bellarmine's* argumentation is not a syllogysine, but a paralogsine. And to the assumption I answer negatively, & that answer I haue heretofore made good, prouing that not *Ierusalem* is here meant, but *ciuitas Romana* (the Citie and Empire of Rome) which euery where in the *Apocalyps*, is called the great Citie, wherein, and by authoritie wherof, our Lord was crucified. See the first booke, chap. 2. § 16. 17.

2 His second testimonie is, *Apoc. 7. 16.* whereunto I haue answered before in the second chapter of the first booke, § 13. But as from that place hee would proue that Rome is not the seate of Antichrist, so by an other argument which he addeth, he proueth that it is *Ierusalem*. For saith hee, *If Antichrist be a Jew, and proferse himselfe to be the Messias and King of the Iewes, then no doubt he will sit in Ierusalem*: but the former of these I haue disproued in the former chapter, and therefore further answer needeth not. Yea, but saue of the Fathers auouch that Antichrist shall sit at Ierusalem. Although they did, yet *Bellarmine* hath taught vs that we are not bound to beleue them, vnlesse their assertio can be proued out of the scriptures. And yet of these foure Fathers which he alledgeth, *Lactantius* speaketh not of Antichrist. *Hierome* and *Theodore*, where they denieth their owne iudgement, doo not asseme that he shall sit in the Temple at *Ierusalem*, but in the Churches of Christ.

3 His third testimonie is 2. *Thess. 2. 4.* In so much that he sit in the Temple of God. Of which words there be many expositi- ons saith *Bellarmine*: some by the Temple of God vnderstand the Thess. 2. mindes of the faithfull, in which Antichrist shall sit as he hath seduced 1. Anselm.

Hieronym. ad Algas. 9. 11.

Theodore.

seduc'd them: which interpretation agreeth fitly to the Pope, who only sitteth as it were a God in the mindes of men, prescribing lawes to binde the conscience, and that with guilt of mortall sinne, as they speake. Others expound these wordes of

2 *August. Antichrist and his whole people, who is therefore said to sit in templum Dei, because Antichrist shall professe himselfe with his people, to be the true church of God:* which also most fitly agreeth to the Pope and church of Rome, which vaunt that they alone are the catholike church; and that all others professing the name of Christ which are not subject to the Pope, or acknowledge not themselves members of the church of Rome, are heretikes or schismatickes. Others by the temple, understand the churches of the Christians, which Antichrist shall make subject to himselfe. The which as we proued it to be the most true exposition, so doth it properly agree to the Pope of Rome. Others by the temple of God, understand the temple of God at Ierusalem, wherein Antichrist shall sit, and this (saith Bellarmine) is the more common, more probable, and more literall opinion. I doubt not but that it is an opinion more plausible to the Papists, who care not what they holde concerning Antichrist, so that it agree not to the Pope.

But of these three things which Bellarmine avoucheth in commendation of this conceit, two are false, and the third is to no purpose. For neither is this exposition more common among the auncient Fathers, then that other, which by the temple understandeth the churches of the Christians: which heretofore we haue shewed to haue bene the iudgement of Theodoret, Ierome, Chrysostome, Theophylact, Occumenius, &c. And although it were the more common exposition, yet that would not proue it to be more true, for truth goeth not by voices, neither is to be weighed by multitude of suffrages, but by weight of reason. Neither is it more probable: for if the temple shall neuer be reedified, as hath bene shewed, then is there no probability that Antichrist should sit in it. Neither were that materiall, though it were more literall, vlesse the literall were vsuall. For in all the Epistles by the temple of God is meant the Church: and there is an vsuall metonymie betwixt the words

words which signifie either the assembly, or the place of the assembly. So *tabi*, which signifieth the place, is often vsed for the assembly or church: and *Ecclesia* that is church, is often vsed for the place. Neither can the temple erected by Antichrist be truly called the temple of God. *Tem* but (saith Bellarmine) in the scripture of the new testament, by the temple of God are neuer understood the churches, that is to say, the temples of Christians. The more absurd is he to understand this place of a materiall temple, contrary to the vsuall acceptation of the word in the writings of the Apostles. The Apostle therefore by temple, meaneth not a materiall temple of wood and stone, but a spirituall temple compact of shining stones: and by sitting in the temple, not a corporall gesture, for Antichrist is to sit there as God, that is, he is to rule and raigne in the church of God, as if he were a god vpon earth. But of this whole matter, see more in the first booke, chap. 2. § 13. & 14. & 15.

4 Now let vs come to his disproofe of our assertion, who hold that Antichrist shall sit not at Ierusalem but at Rome, and in Rome professing herselfe the church of God. First by a fond cauillation, wherein hee greatly pleaseth himselfe, he seeketh to driue vs to an absurditie. For (saith hee) if Antichrist shall sit in the Church of God, and if the Pope be Antichrist, then the church wherein the Pope sitteth is the true church: and consequently the Protestants and all others that be not of that church, are out of the church, &c. This cauill is to be refuted into three syllogismes. 1. Antichrist sitteth in the Church of Christ, The Pope of Rome is Antichrist, therefore saith Bellarmine, the Pope sitteth in the true church of Christ.

But hee might as well conclude thus: Hee that professeth the name of Christ is a Christian: the Papist, the Anabaptist, the Familist, &c. professeth the name of Christ, therefore the Papist, the Anabaptist, the Familist is a true Christian. But hath not Bellarmine learned so much Logicke as not to foist into the conclusion, that which is not contained in the premisses? the word true is not contained in the premisses, and therefore sophistically thrust into the conclusion. For Antichrist may sit in the church, although not in the true Church.

2
August.
de ciuit.
Dei lib. 20.
cap. 19.

3
Chrysost.
&c.

4

Li. I. ca. 4
615.

Church. Generally the Church of Christ signifieth the company of Christians, that is, of those that professe the name of Christ. But as of Christians, some are onely in title and profession, some indeed & in truth: so of Churches, some are onely in title and profession Churches of Christ, others are his true Churches. Now Antichrist he was to be an Apostata, and the head of the Catholike apostasie: therefore the church whereof Antichrist is the head, although it be in title and profession a church of Christ, as being a company of them that are christened, and professe the name of Christ: yet it is but an apostaticall church; a church which of a faithfull Citie is become an harlot, and of the true Church of God, the whore of *Babylon*. But may not this absurditie rather be returned vpon the Papists, who by the temple of God 2. *Thess.* 2. 4. vnderstand that temple which Antichrist shall build at *Ierusalem*? Antichrist shall sit in the temple of God, saith the Apostle, Antichrist shall sit in that temple which himselfe shall build at *Ierusalem* saith the Papist, therefore that temple which he shall build at *Ierusalem* shall be indeed the temple of God. Whereas in truth according to their owne conceits, it were rather to be called the temple of the diuell. If any man object that it might after a sort be called the temple of God, because the temple of God did stand there, and because Antichrist will pretend to make it to the honor of God, wherevnto the former temple was erected: I answer by the like reason the church of *Rome* may be called the church of God, because once it was a true church, and still is in title & profession the church of Christ, although in truth it be but little more the church of Christ, then Antichrist imaginary temple at *Ierusalem* would be the temple of God.

5 His second syllogisme which is inferred vpon the former is this. *If the Pope sit in the true Church of God, then the church of Rome is the onely true Church (for the Church of Christ is one as Christ is one): but the Pope sitteth in the true church of God,* as was proued in the former syllogisme, *therefore the church of Rome is the onely true church of Christ.* First, I answer to the prooffe of his proposition. The Catholike & inuisible Church of Christ is one sheepefold vnder one shepheard Christ: but particular

particular & visible churches are more then one, as the church of *Corinth*, the church of *Rome*, the seven churches in the Apocalyps, and all the Churches of the Gentiles mentioned *Rom.* 16. 4. and therefore the church of *Rome*, although it were a true visible church, yet were it but a particular church, and therefore not the onely true church. But now the church of *Rome* is not a true visible church of Christ, but the whore of *Babylon*, an adulterous, and Idolatrous, and Apostaticall church, which once was *Rome*, as *Petrarch* saith, now *Babylon*, once *Bethel*, now *Beithanun*: once the Church of Christ, now the synagogue of Antichrist, as hath bene proued. And therefore there being no truth either in the proposition, or the assumption, I answer the proposition by this *antithesis*, although the Pope did sit in the true church, yet it followeth not that therefore the church of *Rome* is the onely true Church: and the assumption by this *thesis*, but the Pope doth not sit in the true church, and therefore there is no shewe of reason in this cauil.

6 His third syllogisme is inferred vpon the second: *If the Church of Rome be the onely true Church, then those which are not members of this Church, wherof the Pope is head, as namely the Protestants, are out of the Church.* But now (say I) the church of *Rome* is so farre from being the onely true church, as that it is that *Babylon*, *Apoc.* 18. 4. from which we are commanded to separte, if wee will bee saued: there being no saluation in that Church for those that receiue and retaine the marke of the beast, *Apoc.* 14. 9. therefore this also is a fond and sophistical cauil. Notwithstanding, as the adulterous and apostaticall state of *Israel* vnder *Ieroboam* and *Ahab*, so the Church of *Rome* vnder the Pope, may be called the church of God: in respect both of some notes and signes of a visible Church, as the administration of some sacraments and profession of the name of the Lord, and also of some reliques and remainder, as it were the gleanings of the inuisible Church. In *Israel*, although an Apostaticall and Idolatrous state, the sacrament of circumcision was retained: so in the church of *Rome*, the sacrament of baptism. The church of *Israel* professed

Iehovah to be their God, although they worshipped him Idolatrously: so the church of *Rome* professeth the name of Christ, but exceedeth *Israel* in Idolatry. In *Israel* euen vnder *Achab* the Lord had reserved 7000. who neuer bowed their knee to *Baal*: and so we doubt not, but that in the corruptest times of Popery, the Lord hath reserved some who haue not receiued the marke of the beast. And as the church of *Sardis* was still called the church of Christ, although grieuously fallen from Christ, because they still professed the name of Christ, and retained no doubt the Sacrament of Baptisme, and had among them some fewe names that had not defiled themselves: so I confesse with *Caluin*, that the church of *Rome* may be called a church of Christ, both in respect of some vestigia and outward notes of a visible church, as administration of Baptisme, and profession of the name of Christ, and some secret reliques of the inuisible church, which haue not bowed their knees to *Baal*. But that which is saide to the church of *Sardis*, may most iustly be avowed to the church of *Rome*. Then hast a name that thou livest, but indeed art dead: thou professest thy selfe to be the church of Christ, but art the synagogue of Antichrist: thou art called the church of *Rome*, which once was famous for her faith, but art the whore of *Babylon*, the mother of all the fornications, and abominations in the christian world.

7 Heere *Bellarmino* objecteth two things: If there remaine in the church of *Rome* but ruines and reliques of a true church, then the church may be ruinated, and the truth hath lyed, who saith, that the gates of hell shall neuer preuaile against it.

Ans. The Catholike and inuisible church of Christ, which is the whole company of the elect, can neuer faile: But visible and particular churches which consist of hypocrites many times and vnfounde christians (which are in the visible church, but are not of the inuisible) as the greater part, may faile and fall away, although not one sound christian that is of the inuisible church doth fall away. As the lamentable experience of the church of *Israel* seuered from *Juda*, the examples

Apo. 20. 4

Apo. 3. 1.

Apo. 3. 4.

p. Job. 2. 19.

examples of *Corinth*, *Ephesus*, and many other famous Churches, which were planted by the Apostles. Againe saith *Bellarmino*: If the Church be ruinated, and the ruines remaine in Popery, then the Papists haue the Church, although decayed and ruinated, but the Protestants haue no Church; not entyre, for the entyre Church is ruinated: not ruinated or decayed, for the ruines are among the Papists. What haue they then? a new building, which because it is new, is none of Christs, and therefore who seeth not, that it is safer to liue in the church decayed, then in no church at all? But in this cauill there is not so much as any shew of reason, vnlesse he take that for graunted, (which we do most confidently denie, and they are neuer able to proue) that the church of *Rome* not onely is the true church of Christ, but also the onely true church. For otherwise the church of *Rome* may fall, and yet the Catholike church of Christ may stand, yea, shall stand, maugre the force of Antichrist, and malice of Sathan himselfe. And as for the church of the Protestants, it is no new building, as Antichrist vaunteth, but is a part of the Catholike church of Christ, reformed and renewed according to the word of God, and the example of the primitive church: euen as the Church of *Juda* vnder *Iesus*, was no new building, but the olde frame, as it was vnder *Dauid*, renewed and reformed according to the lawe of God.

8 The exceptions which he taketh against our arguments, concluding that *Rome* is the seate of Antichrist, I haue for the most part taken away before. It shall suffice therefore now, to answer those which before were not touched. That *Rome* is the seat of Antichrist we proue, because it is mysticall *Babylon*, situated on seven hilles, & hauing dominion ouer the Kings of the earth, &c. *Bellarmino* among other answers before refuted, saith, that by mysticall *Babylon* we are to vnderstand *Rome* *Ecclesiastical*, not *Rome* christned, because *S. Iohn* speaketh of that *Rome* which had dominion ouer the kings of the earth, and which is said to bee drunke with the bloud of the Saintes and Martyrs of *Iesu*. I answer, that although these notes agreed not to Po-

Lib. 1. cap. 2.

popish *Rome*, yet we might vnderstand the Apostle thus, that that cite which then had dominion ouer the Kings of the earth, & then persecuted the Saints, is called *Babylon*: because it was to be the seate or See of Antichrist. But now these notes agree also to Popish *Rome*, both in respect of dominion vsurped more insolently ouer the Kings of the earth by the Pope, then by any Emperour: and in regarde of most cruell persecution of the Saintes of Christ, as before hath bene shewed.

9. Again, whereas we proue that Antichrist shall sit in the church of God because the Apostle saith, he shall sit in the Temple of God, and withall affirme that this cannot be vnderstood of the Temple of *Ierusalem*, which now is utterly destroyed, & is no more to be reedified, as *Daniel* tellifieth chap. 9. verse 27: hee answereth that *Daniel* would say something that he doth not say: eyther that the Temple should not be reedified vntill a litle before the ende of the world. But *Daniel* doth not say vntill a litle before the ende: but as their owne translation readeth, *Vsq; ad consummationem & suam perseverabit desolatio, the desolation shall continue vntill the consummation and ende*: or as *Ierome* saith, *Vsq; ad finem mundi, vnto the ende of the world*: or as other, *Vsq; ad consummationem eamq; praeisam*. As it is said of *Michol* 2. Sam. 6. 23. that she had no childe vntill the day of her death. And of *Ioseph*, that he knew not *Mary* vntill shee had brought forth her first begotten sonne, *Matth.* 1. 24. & of Christ, that he will be with the faithfull vntill the ende of the worlde, *Matth.* 28. 20. Not that *Michol* at her death, or a litle before had children: not that *Ioseph* euer knew *Mary*: nor that Christ will enere forsake the faithfull: So that this word *vntill* in the scriptures signifieth rather perpetuities then cessation before the time, which seemeth thereby to be limited. Whereas therefore *Daniel* saith that the temple should lie desolate vntill the end & consummation of the world, it is as much as if he had said, that it should neuer be reedified. Or if that were not *Daniel*'s meaning, thē he must say, that although the temple should be built againe, yet as it was desolate before it be built, so afterward the abomination of desolation, that is, Antichrist or his Image, should remain in it to the end. Yea but the

primitive

Primitive Church beleueed that the temple should neuer be built againe, and held this assertion of the Papists as a Iewish fable. And as touching the abomination of desolation, it hath bene shewed that our Saviour Christ by a metonymic vnder-
Luk. 21.
 standeth thereby the armies of the Romanes, who in respect of
 20. and
 their paganism were abominable, and in regard of their ef-
Mat. 24.
 fect desolations, such as brought vpon *Ierusalem* the finall de-
 15.
 struction and desolation. *Daniel* saith *per aliam detestationem de-*
solantem by a synecdoche for *per legiones &c.* as *Esay* 8. 8. Or last-
 ly, this must be *Daniel*'s meaning, that the temple shall neuer per-
 fectly be reedified, but that the reedifying is to be begunne, and that
 in the temple so begunne Antichrist shall sit. Thus shamefully the
 wilfull patrones of error, sticke not to drawe the scripture to
 their fancies, not caring to conforme their iudgement to the
 scripture. *Daniel* in that place speaketh not a word of Anti-
 christ, nor yet of *Antiochus* his type, but of the vter desolation
 and finall destruction of *Ierusalem* by the Romanes: and of
 this desolation, according to their owne translation, he saith,
 that it should continue to the ende and consummation: that is,
 (saith *Bellarmino*) the temple shall neuer perfectly be built againe,
 but yet it shall be built againe, and in it being so built, Antichrist shall
 sit. How built? is it like that Antichrist, who shall according
 to their conceit be the most mightie Prince and Monarch in
 the world, that he I say, will suffer that temple which he chu-
 seth for his chiefe seate, to be vsuall: or that so great and so
 proud a monarch will sit in a temple without a rooofe or vnfini-
 shed, professing the same also to be his principall seate? Why
 but Christ saith, the destruction of the temple should be such
 as that one stone should not be left vpon another, and *Daniel*
 saith according to their owne translation, that this desolation
 of the temple should continue to the ende. How then can his
 meaning be, that it should be reedified either in whole or in
 part? The stories also of the church do testifie, that as *Daniel* *Socrat.* li. 3
 and our Saviour Christ had foretold the finall destruction and
 20.
 desolation of *Ierusalem*: so when *Julian* the Apostate, desiring *Theodores*
 to conuince the preaching of our Saviour of vntuth, endeauou-
 li. 3. ca. 20.
 red by the Iewes to reedifie the temple: the Lord to verifie his *Sozom.* li. 5
 word, cap. vii.

word, would not suffer it to be built either in whole, or in parte but by a fearefull earthquake overthrow the foundations, by fire from heauen burnt the tooles of the worke-men, by winde and tempest scattered the lime and morter, and by fire proceeding out of the earth burnt the workemen as they digged. *Ierusalem* & the temple were types of the church of Christ. Therefore when as by the preaching of the Gospell to all nations the church of Christ was planted among the Gentiles, the citie and temple were to haue an ende as our Sauour hath prophesied, *Matth. 24. 14.* then shall be the ende, to wit, of the citie and temple of *Ierusalem*; which being once overthrowne by the legions of the Romanes, should according to *Daniels* prophesie remaine desolate vntill the ende of the world: or as our Sauour foretold in other wordes, *that Ierusalem should be troden under foote of the Gentiles, vntill the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled.*

10 Lastly, whereas *Theodorus Bibliander* proueth by the testimony of *Gregory* the great, that Antichrist was to sit in the church, & to exercise an vniuersall dominion over the same, because *Gregory* saith that *Iohn of Constantinople* challenging the title of vniuersall Bishop, therein was the forerunner of Antichrist: and secondly, because hee saith that an army of Priests were prepared for Antichrist, thereby signifying that he should be a prince of Priests: *Bellarmine* answered, that the contrary is to be inferred upon *Gregory* his wordes. For the forerunner must not be equall to him, whose forerunner he is, but lesse and inferior. If therefore *Iohn of Constantinople*, who was the forerunner of Antichrist, challenged the title of vniuersall Bishop, Antichrist himselfe shall challenge greater matters, and shall aduance himselfe above all that is called God. But I reply, that although the pride and ambition of *Iohn of Constantinople* was very great and Antichristian: yet it was not to be compared with the incredible insolency and pride of the Antichrist of *Rome*. *Iohn of Constantinople* sought a superioritie ouer all other Bishoppes, but challenged not that height of authoritie and soueraignie which the Popes since haue vsurped, not only ouer Bishoppes and Ecclesiasticall persons, but also ouer the

Luk. 21.
24.

Lib. 4.
Epist. 38.

the Kings and Monarchies of the earth. Neither hath the Antichristian pride of the Pope rested heere, but as I haue shewed heretofore, in some thinges hee matcheth himselfe with Christ, in some thinges hee aduanceth himselfe aboue him, and aboue all that is called God. To the second *Bellarmino* answereth, that it was not *Gregories* meaning, that Priests as they are Priests, belong to the army of Antichrist, but as they are proud. But hence it followeth not saith hee, Antichristum fore principem sacerdotum, sed fore principem superbiorum, that Antichrist shall be the prince of Priests, but that he shall be the prince of proud men: shamelesse, and yet ridiculous. Doth it not follow, that if he be the prince of Priests as they are proude, that he is the prince of proude Priests, such as the whole hierarchy of *Rome* consisteth of? It followeth therefore vpon our arguments, notwithstanding all his cauls, that Antichrist was to haue his chiefe seate in *Rome*, and in *Rome* professing herselfe the church of God, but being indeed the whore of *Babylon*.

Chap. 14. Concerning the doctrine of Antichrist.



Vr aduersaries senenth disputation is concerning the doctrine of Antichrist. For whereas it is certaine, saith *Bellarmino*, that there are foure principall doctrines of Antichrist, none whereof is taught by the Pope, therefore it followeth necessarily, that the Pope is not Antichrist. I answer, that there are more doctrines of Antichrist than false prophet then foure, among which those two doctrines of diuels which are mentioned by the Apostle, *1. Tim. 4.* as notes of that Catholike Apostasie, whereof Antichrist is the head, are to bee numbred, forbidding marriage, and commaunding abstinence from meates. But yet not all these foure are the doctrines of Antichrist, and those which be, doe not vnitely agree to the Pope: as shall appeare in the particulars, which wee are to examine in order.

For from these foure doctrines *Bellarmino* fetcheth foure arguments. The first, *Antichrist shall deny Iesus to be Christ, and consequently shall oppugne all the ordinances of our Saviour, as Baptisme, confirmation, &c. and shall teach that circumcision, the Sabbath, and other ceremonies of the old lawe are not yet ceased: But the Pope doth not deny Iesus to be Christ, nor bring in circumcision instead of Baptisme, nor the Sabbath instead of the Lordes day, &c: Therefore, the Pope is not Antichrist.* The proposition, and so also the assumption hath two parts, the former concerning the deniall of Christe selfe, the second concerning the consequents thereof. Of the former, I haue sufficiently spoken heretofore: prouing evidently, that as Antichrist was to deny Christ, so the Pope doth, not in deed onely, but in word also and doctrine, although not openly, directly & expressely (for Antichrist was not to be an open and professed enemy), yet couertly, indirectly, and by consequent. And of such denying of Christ, *Bellarmino* himself in this chapter vnderstandeth *Iohn* to speak in the place by him alledged for the prooffe of his proposition.

2. But receiuing that this expulsiō will not cleare the Pope from Antichristianisme, he offereth that, *Antichrist is to deny Christ secretly, and openly, and by all meanes.* Which bold assertion I haue heretofore sufficiently disprooued, when I proued that Antichristianisme is as the Apostle calleth it, a mystery of iniquities; and that Antichrist is a secret and disguised enemy, who vnder the name and profession of Christianitie denieth, yea oppugneeth Christ and his truth. But let vs weigh his reasons. The first whereof hath all his weight in such assertions as we haue before proued to be lighter then vanitie it selfe: and it is thus concluded, *He that shall be in nation and religion a Iew, and shall be receiued of the Iewes for their Messiah, shall oppugne Christ, and teach that our Christ is not the Messiah.* But Antichrist shall be in nation and religion a Iew, and shall be receiued of the Iewes for their Messiah, as before hath bene shewed; therefore he shall oppugne Christ openly, &c. I am first to the proposition and assumption ioyntly, that there is no necessitie nor yet likelyhood that there should come to the Iewes such a one as they expect; and yet *Bellarmino* euery where taketh this

this for granted. But the assumption I haue proued heretofore to be a new fable, and therefore further answer is superfluous. *(Chap. 12.)*

3 The second argument is gathered out of 1. Iohn. 2. 22. *Who is a lyer, but he that denieth Iesus to be Christ, and this is Antichrist. For all heretikes (saith he) are called Antichrists, which any way deny Iesus to be Christ. Therefore the true antichrist himself shal simply & by all meanes deny Iesus to be Christ.* And this is proued, because by the heretikes the diuell is said to worke the mystery of iniquitie, because they deny Christ conerily, but the comming of Antichrist is called a reuelation, because he shall openly deny Christ. I answer first, that Iohn in that place speaketh neither of the body of Antichrist in general (as else-where in his Epistles the word *antichrist* is vsed) nor of the head of that body in particular, who is most worthily called *the Antichrist*; but of some other members of that body, that is to say, of those Antichrists or heretikes of that time, as Cerinthus and others, which denied the diuinitie of Christ; and denying the sonne, did consequently also denie the Father, for hee is the Father of the Sonne, as appeareth plainly by that which followeth in the text *1. Iohn. 2. 22. This is that Antichrist that denieth the Father and the Sonne.* Secondly, the difference betwixt the petite Antichrists & the graund Antichrist, is not in respect of the couert and open deniall of Christ; or if there be a difference to be made in this behalfe, it is in this, that diuers heretikes and petite Antichrists, such as Simon Magus & some others, haue denied Iesus to be Christ more plainly and directly, which the graund Antichrist according to his greater cunning and efficacie of deceit (comming as the Apostle saith, *in malicia* in all deceiueablenesse of iniquitie) was to denie more cunningly and couertly. But the difference is both in respect of the Apostasie & oppositiō against Christ, and also in regard of the ambition and aduancing of themselves. The Apostasie and opposition may be considered either in respect of the parts and points wherein it consisteth, or in respect of the parties which make it. In both respects the Apostasie & opposition of the petite Antichrists is but particular, that is, of fewe men in fewe things: but the Apostasie and oppo-

2. Thess. 2:
10.

opposition of the ground Antichrist is more catholike and general, that is, in the most parts of Christianitie, and of the greatest part of Christendome. Likewise, the ambition of petite Antichrists is to seeke preheminnence with *Diotrephes* in particular churches, and ouer some other men: But the ground Antichrist claimeth an vniuersall soueraignie ouer all men, and a double Monarchy ouer all the world: and not contented to aduance himselfe aboue all other men, euen Kings and Emperors, and that by many degrees; but in many things also matcheth himselfe with Christ the King of Kings, & in some things aduanceth himselfe aboue him. Yea, but this difference betwixt the small Antichrists & the great Antichrist is proued, because by the small Antichrists or heretikes, *Sathan* is said to worke the mystery of iniquitie, whereas the coming of Antichrist is called a reuelation. The mystery of iniquity, *1. Thess. 2. 7.* is Antichristianisme, or that Antichristian Apostasie fro Christ mentioned *Ver. 3.* which is therefore called a mystery of iniquity, because it being a diuillish opposition vnto Christ, is cunningly cloaked vnder the professio of Christ. This mystery as it was a working in the Apostles time in the heretikes & petite Antichrists by degrees: so was it more fully wrought & accomplished in Antichrist himselfe, the head of the catholike Apostasie: vnder who it deserueth so much the more to be called the mystery of iniquitie, as it masketh vnder more glorious shewes and visards of outward profession, and shrowdeth it selfe vnder the name and title of the catholike and onely true visible church. The mystery therefore of iniquitie, which in the former part of this Antithesis is appropriated vnto heretikes, doth indeed most truly belong to Antichrist himselfe; and therefore if it be called a mystery because it is a couert and cunning deniall of Christ, then vnder the ground Antichrist Christ shall be most cunningly denied, when he is most gloriously professed. Now Antichrist is said to be reuealed, when the head of the Antichristian body is manifested, and of this reuelation there be degrees: the first his shewing of himselfe in his colours, by challenging & vsurping an vniuersall supremacie & soueraignie ouer all the world; and secondly his acknowledgedmet after he was come to his full growth, of which

we

we haue heretofore spoken. It appeareth therefore that Antichrist was not to denie Christ plainly and openly; and consequently, that the first part of his proposition (wherevpon the latter is inferred) is false.

4 The latter part of his proposition is, *that Antichrist shall abolish all the ordinances of Christ, & in stead of them bring in the ceremonies of the Iewes, as circumcision in stead of baptisme, & the Iewish Sabbath in stead of the Lords day.* But how is this proued? because he shall openly deny Christ, and shall in nation and religion be a Jew. But as both these assertions haue bene proued false: so are we to thinke of this which is inferred vpon them. For seeing he was to be a disguising hypocrite, and his religion a mysterie of iniquitie: cannot be thought that he sitting in the Temple of God; and professing the name of Christ, should abolish all his ordinances; but rather that he would deprive & corrupt them, and take away the right vse thereof, by diuillish doctines, by superstitious Idolatries, by mixture of Iewish and Heathenish ceremonies. But both the parts of his proposition he seeketh further to proue by testimonies of Fathers, and by reason. The testimonies of the Fathers in this question deserue no further credit, the as they conspire with the prophesies of scripture, and agree with the enent. But let vs examine them severally. First *Hilary* is alledged as though he testified, that whereas the *Arrians* affirmed that Christ is not the sonne of God by nature, but onely by adoption: the Antichrist shall teach that he is not so much as the adoptiue sonne of God. But if you read the place, you shal find that *Hilary* applieth the speech of *Iohn. 1. Epist. 2.* to those heretikes who professing Christ to be their Saviour, but denying him to be the natural Ion of God, & consequently denying him to be Christ, affirmed that he is the adoptiue son of God: & therefore inferreth out of that place of *Iohn*, that they cannot auoyd, but that they are Antichrist. Wherefore the Antichrist, of who *Hilary* speaketh, confesseth the name of Christ; neither doth he denie him openly & directly, but indirectly & by consequent. The next authority of *Hippolytus* is counterfeited, and the testimony here alledged as currant, (that the marke of Antichrist shall be *nego baptismum, nego signum crucis, I deny baptisme, I deny the signe of the Crosse*) heretofore hath bene reiected

*Lib. 6 de
trinit. fol.
102.*

*De consan-
mat. in un-
di.*

by

by *Bellarmino* himselfe, and refuted as false. Chap. 11. Where he hath taught that there is but one marke of the beast, and that not a priuatie (as this is) but a positive marke, which is not yet knowne. Thirdly, he alledgeth *Augustine*, as though he affirmed that Antichrist should suffer none to be baptised. Yet *Augustine* speaketh not of Antichrist, but of the diuell, and affirmeth, that euen then when the diuell shall be loosed, many shall be added to the church: and that the diuell himselfe being loosed, shall not be able to hinder Baptisme, but *surely so valiant shall be both the parents for the baptising of their children, and also those which shall then first beleue, that they shall overcome that strong one being unbound.* The speech of *Ierome* on the 11. of *Daniel*, if it deserue credit, it must be taken either as a prophesie it selfe, or else a true exposition of *Daniels* prophesie. Verse. 21. 22. But *Ierome* was no Prophet. And *Daniels* speech vndoubtedly is to bee vnderstood of *Antiochus Epiphanes*, to whom this exposition (if it were good) should liter. ally agree. But *Antiochus* did not rise of the Iewes, neither did he claime himselfe to be the Prince of the covenant. And for further answere, and better vnderstanding of the place, read *Polan*, on *Daniel* 11. If *Sedulius* affirme as *Bellarmino* cited him, that Antichrist shall restore all the ceremonies of the Iewes, his speech is incredible, for many of them cannot be obserued but in the Temple, which shall neuer be reedified. If he speake of many, it may be verified of the Pope, and of some other hereticks, who notwithstanding haue not openly denied Christ. *Gregorie* in the same place which *Bellarmino* alledgeth, doth affirme that Antichrist shall haue in reuerence not onely the Sabbath day, but also the Lords day, which cannot stand with such an open deniall of Christ as *Bellarmino* imagineth. His words be these, *Qui veniens diem Sabbati atq dominicum ab omni faciet opera custodiri, Who when he commeth (speaking of Antichrist) shall cause the Sabbath day, and the Lords day, to be kept from all worke.* And of this there may better reason be giuen, then of the other, because (as hath bene proued) Antichrist was to be a pretended Christian.

5 These were his authorities: now let vs weigh his reason, which

which is thus concluded. *In whose time the publike seruice of God, and diuine sacrifices shall cease by reason of the vehement persecutio, he shall openly deny Christ, and shall abolish all his ordinances, and in stead of them, bring in Iewish ceremonies: But in Antichrists time, by reason of the vehement persecution, the publike seruice of God, and diuine sacrifices shall cease; therefore, &c.* I answere by distinction: If by the seruice of God he meane the true worship of God, the proposition is vntue. For in the Papacie the true publike worship of God, by reason of the vehemencie of persecution hath ceased, and yet the Pope doth not openly deny Christ and abolish his ordinances, although he do vileyly depriue them, and mingle them not onely with Iewish, but also Heathenish ceremonies. If by the publike seruice, and diuine sacrifices he meaneth generally any seruice of God, although superstitious, any sacrifices although idolatrous (such as is the sacrifice of the Masse) then the assumption is false: for such superstitions and will-worshippes do best beseeeme Antichrist. But of this argument concerning the persecution of Antichrist, we haue spoken before, chap. 7.

6 This may suffice for answere to his proposition and the proofes thereof. Whereas therefore he assumeth, that the Pope doth not deny Christ, &c. I answere: if he meaneth a direct deniall in open profession; that the Pope may be Antichrist, although he do not so denie Christ: If he meaneth a deniall of Christ in deed and in truth, although couertly, indirectly, and by consequent, I haue heretofore proued that he doth so denie Christ, not onely in word and doctrine, as he is a false Prophet, but also in deed and fact, as he is a man of sinne, denying him in his life, and as he is an aduersary, not onely denying, but also oppugning Christ and his truth. See the first Booke, chap. 4. §. 6. 7. 8.

7 The second doctrine of Antichrist faith *Bellarmino*, is to affirme himselfe to be the true Christ. From whence he gathereth his second argument. *Antichrist shall affirme himselfe to be Christ. The Pope doth not affirme himselfe to be Christ, therefore the Pope is not Antichrist.* That Antichrist being *hostis & amicus Christi*, (that is, an enemy of Christ opposed vnto him, in emulation of

like honour) shall indeed challenge vnto himselfe those offices, prerogatiues and authoritie which properly belong to Christ (which in effect is as much as if he should say, *I am Christ*) we denie not: and withall auouch that the Pope of Rome doth so affirme himselfe to be Christ. But that Antichrist shall openly and in so many words expressly affirme that he is the Christ or Messias of the world, that we deny to be agreeable to that Antichrist, who is described in the word of God. For Antichrist was to be a dissembling hypocrite, as hath bene proued, and his religion is a myserie of iniquitie cloaked vnder the profession of Christianity. Neither could he seduce so many Christians, if hee should plainly and openly professe himselfe to be the true Christ. But let vs see how *Bellarmine* proueth that Antichrist shall openly and expressly name himselfe Christ. Forsooth out of *Ioh. 5. 43.* *If an other come in his owne name, him will you receiue: Where saith he, our Lord seemeth of purpose to haue added these words* (in his owne name) *for seeing that the Lutherans and Calvinists would say, that Antichrist shall not come in his owne name, but in the name of Christ as being his Vicar.* But I haue heretofore proued, that Christ in this place doth not speake absolutely *an other shall come*, but conditionally, *if an other shall come*, nor definitely of Antichrist, but indefinitely of any false Prophet that should come in his owne name, not sent of God. Neither doth it follow, that if Antichrist shal come in his owne name, that therefore he will professe himselfe to be Christ. For all false Prophets come in their owne name, because they are not sent of God, and yet the most of them haue not professed themselves to be Christ. And it is plaine that our Saviour Christ in this place maketh an opposition betwixt himselfe and euery false Prophet in this respect, that he came vnto them in the name of his Father, that is, not taking vpon himselfe this honour to be our Prophet and Priest, without authoritie and commission from God, but sent from the bosome of his Father, and yet was not receiued of the Iewes: but if an other, meaning any other false Prophet, should come vnto them not in the name of the Father, but in his owne name, that is, hauing no commission or authoritie from God, such a

one

one should be embraced of them. And further we are to consider, that Christ professing himselfe to be the Messias, seemeth to deny that he came in his owne name, (for hee signifieth that false Prophets come in their owne name, but hee came in the name of the Father) therefore to come in his owne name, signifieth to come of himselfe, without any calling or commission from God: And therefore our aduersaries cannot with any shewe of reason conclude out of this place, that Antichrist shall professe himselfe to be Christ. And yet this is all the proofe which he can bring out of the scriptures. Yea, but though the scriptures teach no such matter, *Yet some of the Fathers affirme, that Antichrist shall professe himselfe to be Christ:* yea, but *Bellarmino* hath told vs, that we are not to giue credit to such coniectures of theirs as haue no ground in the word of God. For how could they, being no Prophets, certainly foretell such things of Antichrist without booke, that is to say, without warrant of the scriptures. And whereas he addeth, that these Fathers affirme, that he shall be receiued of the Iewes for their Messias, and therefore shal professe himselfe to be the Messias, I answer, that in like sort a dozen of them affirmed that Antichrist should come of the Tribe of *Dan*, wherof notwithstanding there is no probabilitye.

8 To the proposition therefore I answer, that Antichrist was not plainly and openly to professe himselfe to be Christ, but to challenge the office and authoritie of Christ, which is in effect although indirectly & by consequent, as much as if he said *I am Christ*. To the assumption I answer, that although the Pope doth not plainly & directly say, *I am Christ*, but beareth the name of Christ, as *Cesar* did the name of a King: yet notwithstanding, in that he challengeth the office & authoritie of Christ, it is as much in deed and in truth, although indirectly and by consequent, as if he made himselfe Christ, *Christ* being a name of office. For certainly whosoever professeth himselfe to be the foundation, the head, the husband, & Lord, &c. of the vniuersal church, he maketh himselfe Christ, although he do abstain from the name. For who is the head and Lord, &c. of the vniuersal church, but Christ, who hath authoritie to ordain sacraments, to

prescribe

prescribe lawes to the conscience, to deliuer doctines and articles of faith as necessary to saluation, to forgive the sinnes of the quicke and the dead; who is the Prince of Priests, the great Priest after the order of *Melchizedec*, the Pastor of Pastors, the King of Kings, and Lord of Lords, by whom Kings and Emperours do raigne, who hath authoritie to command the Angels, to bestow the kingdome of heauen on whom he pleaseth. Finally, vnto whom is all powe giuen in heauen and in earth, but onely to Christ? But the Pope doth challenge al this to himselfe, and much more, as hath bene shewed. He forsooth is the foundation, the head, husband and Lord of the vniuersall Church, &c. And to conclude, if you respect his nature, *Atque ac Christus Deus est ens secunda intentione, compositum ex Deo & homine*, As well as Christ he is God, an essence of the second intention, compounded of God and man: if his office, *unctionis Christus est*, he is by annointment Christ, hauing the very same office which Christ had when he was vpon the earth. And therefore if this be a propertie of Antichrist to leaue vnto our Saviour the name and title of Christ, & to take to himselfe the dignitie, office, and authoritie of Christ: it cannot be auoyded but that the Pope is Antichrist.

9 The third doctrine of Antichrist (saith *Bellarmino*) is this: He shall affirme himselfe to be God, and will require that hee may be worshipped as God. From whence he reasoneth thus: Antichrist will affirme that he is God, and will be worshipped for God: The Pope of Rome doth not affirme himselfe to be God, neither would be worshipped as God, therefore the Pope is not Antichrist. The proposition is proued out of 2. Thess. 2. 4. So that he siteth in the temple of God, shewing himselfe as though he were God. Answ. The meaning of the Apostles words is thus much, that Antichrist shall sit in the Temple of God, as God, that is, he shall rule and raigne in the church of God, as if he were a God vpon earth, shewing himselfe not so much by words as by deedes, that hee is a God. Or as the vulgar Latine edition and English translation of the Rhemists doe reade, *tantum sit Deus, as though he were God*. And thus *Chrysostome*, *Theophylact*, and *Oecumenius*, expounde this place, *quod in templo sedet inquit*, (saith *Chrysostome*)

stoma) in illis sedet, et in templo sedet, et inquit, *quod in templo sedet*, he saith shewing himselfe, he said not, saying, but endeavouring to shewe, for he shall worke great workes, and shall shewe forth wonderfull signes: and the word *sedet* shewing, as *Beza* obserueth, is answerable to the Hebrew *Moreh*, faciens se apparere, pra se ferens, or as we say, taking vpon him as if he were a God.

It is not therefore necessary that Antichrist should in worde plainly & openly professe himselfe to be God: it is sufficient, if in deed and behauiour hee taketh vpon him as if hee were God. As for example, if he shall be content to be acknowledged, saluted and called God. If he shall cause, nay if hee shall but willingly suffer himselfe to be worshipped as God, if he shall challenge vnto himselfe those titles, attributes, and workes which are proper & peculiar to the Lord. But *Bellarmino* perceiving that this place in this sense may fitly be applied to the pope: therefore he contendeth that it is not sufficient that Antichrist should indeed shew himselfe to be God (as the Pope doth) but that he shall openly name himselfe God: and that he shall usurpe, not only some authoritie of God (as the Pope doth) but also the very name of God. And that he saith is proued out of these words of the Apostle, 2. Thess. 2. in so much that he siteth in the temple of God, shewing himselfe *tantum sit Deus*, as though he were God. Where saith he *Paul* doth not onely affirme that Antichrist shall sit in the temple, (for we also sit in temples, and yet are no Antichrists) but also expoundeth his manner of sitting, namely that he shall sit as God: so who alone a temple is properly erected. And this he saith is more clearly set down in the Greek text: for it is not said *ut sit* as God, but *ut sit* that hee is God. But in this cauill are contained diuers errours: 1. by temple, which as we haue proued, signifieth the church of God, he vnderstandeth a materiall temple, which should be built at *Ierusalem*. 2. by sitting in the temple, which signifieth his raigning in the church, he vnderstandeth the corporall gesture of sitting in that materiall temple. 3. by his sitting in the temple of God as God, which signifieth his ruling ouer the church as if he were God, hee vnderstandeth thus much, that the materiall temple should be erected and consecrated

De civit.
Dei lib. 20
c. 8.

by *Bellarmino* himselfe, and refuted as false. Chap. 11. Where he hath taught that there is but one marke of the beast, and that not a privative (as this is) but a positive marke, which is not yet knowne. Thirdly, he alledgeth *Augustine*, as though he affirmed that Antichrist should suffer none to be baptised. Yet *Augustine* speaketh not of Antichrist, but of the diuell, and affirmeth, that euen then when the diuell shall be loosed, many shall be added to the church: and that the diuell himselfe being loosed, shall not be able to hinder Baptisme, but *surely so valiant shall be both the parents for the baptising of their children, and also those which shall then first beleue, that they shall overcome that strong one being unbound.* The speech of *Ierome* on the 11. of *Daniel*, if it deserue credit, it must be taken either as a propheticke it selfe, or else a true exposition of *Daniel's* propheticke. Verse 21. 22. But *Ierome* was no Prophet. And *Daniel's* speech vndoubtedly is to bee vnderstood of *Antiochus Epiphanes*, to whom this exposition (if it were good) should literally agree. But *Antiochus* did not rise of the Iewes, neither did he faigne himselfe to be the Prince of the covenant. And for further answer, and better vnderstanding of the place, read *Polan*, on *Daniel* 11. If *Sedulius* affirme as *Bellarmino* citeth him, that Antichrist shall restore all the ceremonies of the Iewes, his speech is incredible, for many of them cannot be obserued but in the Temple, which shall neuer be reedified. If he speake of many, it may be verified of the Pope, and of some other hereticks, who notwithstanding haue not openly denied Christ, *Gregorie* in the same place which *Bellarmino* alledgeth, doth affirme that Antichrist shall haue in reuerence not onely the Sabbath day, but also the Lords day which cannot stand with such an open deniall of Christ as *Bellarmino* imagineth. His words be these, *Qui veniens diem Sabbati atq; dominicum ab omni faciet opere custodiri, Who when he commeth (speaking of Antichrist) shall cause the Sabbath day, and the Lords day, to be kept from all worke.* And of this there may better reason be giuen, then of the other, because (as hath bene proued) Antichrist was to be a pretended Christian.

5 These were his authorities: now let vs weigh his reason, which

*Polan. in
Daniel.
cap. 11.
ver. 21. 22.
in 2 Theff.
2.*

*Lib. 11.
Epist. 3.*

which is thus concluded. *In whose time the publike seruice of God, and diuine sacrifices shall cease by reason of the vehement persecutio, he shall openly deny Christ, and shall abolish all his ordinances, and in stead of them, bring in Iewish ceremonies: But in Antichrist's time, by reason of the vehement persecution, the publike seruice of God, and diuine sacrifices shall cease; therefore, &c.* I answer by distinction: If by the seruice of God he meane the true worship of God, the proposition is vitue. For in the Papacie the true publike worship of God, by reason of the vehemencie of persecution hath ceased, and yet the Pope doth not openly deny Christ and abolish his ordinances, although he do vilely depriue them, and mingle them not onely with Iewish, but also Heathenish ceremonies. If by the publike seruice, and diuine sacrifices he meaneth generally any seruice of God, although superstitious, any sacrifices although idolatrous (such as is the sacrifice of the Masse) then the assumption is false: for such superstitions and will-worshippes do best becomme Antichrist. But of this argument concerning the persecution of Antichrist, we haue spoken before, chap. 7.

6 This may suffice for answer to his proposition and the proofes thereof. Whereas therefore he assumeth, that the Pope doth not deny Christ, &c. I answer: if he meaneth a direct deniall in open profession, that the Pope may be Antichrist, although he do not so denie Christ: If he meaneth a deniall of Christ in deed and in truth, although couertly, indirectly, and by consequent, I haue heretofore proued that he doth so denie Christ, not onely in word and doctrine, as he is a false Prophet, but also in deed and fact, as he is a man of sinne, denying him in his life, and as he is an aduersary, not onely denying, but also oppugning Christ and his truth. See the first Booke, chap. 4. §. 6. 7. 8.

7 The second doctrine of Antichrist saith *Bellarmino*, is to affirme himselfe to be the true Christ. From whence he gathereth his second argument. *Antichrist shall affirme himselfe to be Christ. The Pope doth not affirme himselfe to be Christ, therefore the Pope is not Antichrist.* That Antichrist being *hostis & emulus Christi* (that is, an enemy of Christ opposed vnto him, in emulation of

hkg.

like honour) shall indeed challenge vnto himselfe those offices, prerogatives and authoritie which properly belong to Christ (which in effect is as much as if he should say, *I am Christ*) we denie not: and withall auouch that the Pope of Rome doth so affirme himselfe to be Christ. But that Antichrist shall openly and in so many words expressly affirme that he is the Christ or Messias of the world, that we deny to be agreeable to that Antichrist, who is described in the word of God. For Antichrist was to be a dissimbling hypocrite, as hath bene proued, and his religion is a myserie of iniquitie cloaked vnder the profession of Christianity. Neither could he seduce so many Christians, if hee should plainly and openly profess himselfe to be the true Christ. But let vs see how *Bellarmino* proueth that Antichrist shall openly and expressly name himselfe Christ. Forsooth out of *Ioh. 5. 43.* *If an other come in his owne name, him will you receiue: Where saith he, our Lord seemeth of purpose to haue added these words* (in his owne name) *foreseeing that the Lutherans and Calvinists would say, that Antichrist shall not come in his owne name, but in the name of Christ as being his Vicar.* But I haue heretofore proued, that Christ in this place doth not speake absolutely *an other shall come*, but conditionally, *if an other shall come*, nor definitely of Antichrist, but indefinitely of any false Prophet that should come in his owne name, not sent of God. Neither doth it follow, that if Antichrist shal come in his owne name, that therefore he will profess himselfe to be Christ. For all false Prophets come in their owne name, because they are not sent of God, and yet the most of them haue not professed themselves to be Christ. And it is plaine that our Saviour Christ in this place maketh an opposition betwixt himselfe and euery false Prophet in this respect, that he came vnto them in the name of his Father, that is, not taking vpon himselfe this honour to be our Prophet and Priest, without authoritie and commission from God, but sent from the bosome of his Father, and yet was not receiued of the Iewes: but if an other, meaning any other false Prophet, should come vnto them not in the name of the Father, but in his owne name, that is, hauing no commission or authoritie from God, such a one

one should be embraced of them. And further we are to consider, that Christ professing himselfe to be the Messias, seemeth to deny that he came in his owne name, (for hee signifieth that false Prophets come in their owne name, but hee came in the name of the Father) therefore to come in his owne name, signifieth to come of himselfe, without any calling or commission from God: And therefore our aduersaries cannot with any shewe of reason conclude out of this place, that Antichrist shall profess himselfe to be Christ. And yet this is all the prooffe which he can bring out of the scriptures. Yea, but though the scriptures teach no such matter, *Yet some of the Fathers affirme, that Antichrist shall profess himselfe to be Christ:* yea, but *Bellarmino* hath told vs, that we are not to giue credit to such coniectures of theirs as haue no ground in the word of God. For how could they, being no Prophets, certainly foretell such things of Antichrist without booke, that is to say, without warrant of the scriptures. And whereas he addeth, that these Fathers affirme, that he shall be receiued of the Iewes for their Messias, and therefore shal profess himselfe to be the Messias, I answer, that in like sort a dozen of them affirmed that Antichrist should come of the Tribe of *Dan*, wherof notwithstanding there is no probability.

8 To the proposition therefore I answer, that Antichrist was not plainly and openly to profess himselfe to be Christ, but to challenge the office and authoritie of Christ, which is in effect although indirectly & by consequent, as much as if he said *I am Christ*. To the assumption I answer, that although the Pope doth not plainly & directly say, *I am Christ*, but beareth the name of Christ, as *Cesar* did the name of a King: yet notwithstanding, in that he challengeth the office & authoritie of Christ, it is as much in deed and in truth, although indirectly and by consequent, as if he made himselfe Christ, *Christ* being a name of office. For certainly whosoever professeth himselfe to be *foundatiour*, the head, the husband, & Lord, &c. of *any* universall church, he maketh himselfe Christ: although he do abstain from the name. For who is the head and Lord, &c. of the *universall* church, but Christ: who hath authoritie to ordain sacraments to prescribe

prescribe lawes to the conscience, to deliuer doctines and articles of faith as necessary to saluation, to forgive the sinnes of the quicke and the dead: who is the Prince of Priests, the great Priest after the order of *Melchizedec*, the Pastor of Pastors, the King of Kings, and Lord of Lords, by whom Kings and Emperours do raigne, who hath authoritie to commaund the Angels, to bestow the kingdome of heaven on whom he pleaseth. Finally, vnto whom is all power given in heaven and in earth, but onely to Christ? But the Pope doth challenge all this to himselfe, and much more, as hath bene shewed. He forsooth is the foundation, the head, husband and Lord of the vniuersall Church, &c. And to conclude, if you respect his nature, *Atque ac Christus Deus est ens secunda intentionis, compositum ex Deo & homine*, As well as Christ he is God, an essence of the second intention, compounded of God and man: if his office, *vrilione Christus est*, he is by annointment Christ, having the very same office which Christ had when he was vpon the earth, And therefore if this be a propertie of Antichrist to leaue vnto our Saviour the name and title of Christ, & to take to himselfe the dignitie, office, and authoritie of Christ: it cannot be auoyded but that the Pope is Antichrist.

Lib. 1. cap.
5.

Bellarmin.
de pontif.
Rom. lib. 5.
cap. 4.

9 The third doctrine of Antichrist (saith *Bellarmin*) is this: *He shall affirme himselfe to be God, and will require that hee may be worshipped as God*. From whence he reasoneth thus: *Antichrist will affirme that he is God, and will be worshipped for God: The Pope of Rome doth not affirme himselfe to be God, neither would be worshipped as God, therefore the Pope is not Antichrist*. The proposition is proued out of 2. Thess. 2. 4. *So that he siteth in the temple of God, shewing himselfe as though he were God*. Answ. The meaning of the Apostles words is thus much, that Antichrist shall sit in the Temple of God, as God, that is, he shall rule and raigne in the church of God, as if he were a God vpon earth, shewing himselfe not so much by words as by deedes, that hee is a God. Or as the vulgar Latine edition and English translation of the Rhemists doe reade, *inquam sit Deus; as though he were God*. And thus *Chrysostome*, *Theophylact*, and *Oecumenius*, expounde this place, *quod inquit inquit*, (saith *Chrysostome*)

(some) in this manner, *quia inquit inquit*, he saith shewing himselfe, he said not saying, but endeavouring to shewe, for he shall worke great workes, and shall shewe forth wonderfull signes: and the word *inquit inquit* shewing, as *Beza* obserueth, is answerable to the Hebrew *Moreh*, *faciens se apparere, praefere*, or as we say, taking vpon him as if he were a God.

It is not therefore necessary that Antichrist should in worde plainly & openly professe himselfe to be God: it is sufficient, if in deed and behaviour hee taketh vpon him as if hee were a God. As for example, if hee shalbe content to be acknowledged, saluted and called God. If he shall cause, nay if hee shall but willingly suffer himselfe to be worshipped as God, if he shall challenge vnto himselfe those titles, attributes, and workes which are proper & peculiar to the Lord. But *Bellarmin* perceiving that this place in this sense may fitly be applied to the pope: therefore he contendeth that it is not sufficient that Antichrist should indeed shew himselfe to be God (as the Pope doth) but that he shall openly name himselfe God: and that he shall vsurpe not only some authoritie of God (as the Pope doth) but also the very name of God. And that he saith is proued out of these words of the Apostle, 2. Thess. 2. in so much that hee siteth in the temple of God, shewing himselfe tanquam sit Deus, as though he were God. Where saith he *Paul* doth not onely affirme that Antichrist shall sit in the temple, (for we also sit in temples, and yet are no Antichrists) but also expoundeth his manner of sitting, namely that hee shall sit as God: to who alone a temple is properly erected. And this he saith is more clearly set down in the Greek text: for it is not said *ut sit* as God, but *ut sit* that hee is God. But in this cauilt are contained diuers errors: 1. by temple, which as we haue proued, signifieth the church of God, he vnderstandeth a materiall temple, which should be built at *Ierusalem*. 2. by sitting in the temple, which signifieth his raigning in the church, he vnderstandeth the corporall gesture of sitting in that materiall temple. 3. by his sitting in the temple of God as God, which signifieth his ruling ouer the church as if he were God, hee vnderstandeth thus much, that the materiall temple should be erected and conse-

and none but he; or if he shall so affirme of himselfe that Christians and Jewes and all the world almost will acknowledge and worship him as the onely true God? Again, the Antichristian seate is figured by the whore of *Babylon*, which because of her owne idolatrie is called a whore, and because she infecteth all nations that adhere vnto her with her idolatries and superstitions, she is said to make them drunke with the cup of her fornications, and also to be the mother of all the fornications, that is, idolatries of the earth. Yea, & the Papists themselves expound *Deut. 11.38*, where *Antiochus Epiphanes* is described as an Idolater, as properly spoken of Antichrist. And do not themselves teach that Antichrist shall professe himselfe to be the Messias of the Jewes, and consequently that he is sent and annointed of God? Now if he shall professe himselfe sent from God, shall we thinke that he wil say there is no God besides himselfe? Or if hee being but a mortall man, shall say there is no God besides himselfe, may we not well thinke that either they will hisse at him as a foole, or stone him to death as a blasphemers? Nay, do not themselves teach that he shall be in religion a Jew, an obseruer of the Sabbath, and other Jewish ceremonies? And do they not alledge *Jerome* to proue, that Antichrist shall feigne himselfe to be the chiefe of the covenant, and a maintainer of the lawe and testament of God? And are not his two hornes like the Lambe expounded by some approued Authors among them, of the two testaments which hee shall seeme to professe?

12 But let vs see how this wise conceit is proued: Forsooth by testimonies of the scriptures and the Fathers. Out of the scripture hee alledgeth two places, the former *2. Thess. 2. 4.* Who is extolled aboue all that is called God, or worshipped. As if hee should say, Antichrist shall bee aduanced aboue all that is called God, or that is worshipped, therefore hee shall avouch that hee alone is God, and will suffer no other God either true or false to bee worshipped besides himselfe. I denie the consequence. For first Antichrist may aduance himselfe aboue all that is called God, or that is worshipped, and yet suffer, yea require them to bee worshipped. *Jupiter* was supposed among

among the Heathen to aduance himselfe aboue all other Gods, and yet suffered them to be worshipped as Gods. Antichrist the second beast, aduanceth himselfe about the Image of the former beast, which is the Empire renewed, whereon he sitteth as the rider death vpon a beast, and yet requireth the same to be worshipped. The Pope aduanceth himselfe aboue Angels, Kings, and Princes, who are called Gods; aboue the Saints, the Host, the Crosse, and whatsoever *eikona* is in the church of Rome, and yet requireth them all to be worshipped. Secondly, Antichrist may aduance himselfe aboue or against al that is called God, or is worshipped, and yet not professe himselfe to be the only God. For so *Antiochus Epiphanes* aduanced himselfe against euery God, yea, against the God of Gods, *Dan. 11.36* and yet he was neuer so mad as to professe himselfe the only God.

Thirdly, seeing Antichristianisme is not open Atheisme, but a mystery of iniquity; & Antichrist is described in the scriptures as an hypocrite & pretended Christian; we may be assured that although in deed & in truth he shall aduance himselfe against God, & against Christ our Sauour, & lift vp himselfe aboue all that is called God, or that is worshipped; yet he shall professe himselfe to be the seruant of Christ, and a worshipper of God. Fourthly, the words of the text do not ascribe to Antichrist so great an extolling of himselfe as the Iesuit imagineth. For first he is called a man of sinne, & sonne of perdition, & therefore we are to conceiue of such an aduancement of himselfe, as is incident to a mortall & wretched man. Secondly, he is said to extoll himselfe aboue all that is called God, or that is worshipped. By all that is called God, we are to vnderstand all to whom the name of God is communicated, as to Angels in heauen, to kings and Princes on earth. And of this aduancing aboue Kings, we are the rather to vnderstand this place, because afterwards it is said, that the Romane Empire hindered Antichrists aduancing or reuealing himselfe. And by *eikona* we are to vnderstand any thing which is worshipped as God, or wherein God is worshipped: Such in the Church of Rome are the Host, the Crosse, the Saints, & their Images & reliques. Aboue al which a man may aduance himselfe (as the Pope doth) and yet may

acknowledge some other God besides himselfe. Thirdly, the greatest height of pride that is incident to any creature whatsoever, is not to seeke to be about God, for that cannot be imagined, but to be as God. And indeed the height of Antichrist his pride and aduancing of himselfe, is noted in the words following, *in as much that he shall sit in the temple of God as God.* Whosoever therefore being but a mortall man, shall aduance himselfe about all that is called God & worshipped, in so much that he shall sit in the temple of God as God, that is, ruled in the church of Christ as if he were a God vpon earth, he is to be deemed Antichrist (that is *amulus Christi*, one that would faine be equal to Christ) although he neither professe himselfe to be the onely God, who onely is to be worshipped, neither yet abolish all other worship of God both true and false. And if in this sense this place do properly agree to the Pope, as indeed it doth, then can it not be auoided but that he is Antichrist.

13 The second testimony which he alledgeth to prooue this fond conceit is *Dan. 11. 37. neither shall he care for any of the Gods, but shall rise against all.* I answer, Daniel in this place speaketh not of Antichrist, and he of whom he speaketh was an Idolater, and therefore this allegation is altogether impertinent. As touching the first, it is euident that Daniel from the 21. verse of that chapter to the end, doth most plainly & properly describe *Antiochus Epiphanes*. For howsoever in this place *Bellarmino* would proue by the authoritie of *Ierome*, that these words are to be vnderstood of Antichrist, & not of *Antiochus*; yet in another place when part of this verse is objected by some protestants as sitting the Pope, he telleth vs plainly that *Daniel* speaketh *ad literam*, literally of *Antiochus*, who was a figure of *Antichrist*. Secondly, hee of whom *Daniel* speaketh was an Idolater, and establisher of Idolatry. So farre was hee from professing himselfe to be the onely true God, or suffering none to be worshipped besides himselfe. For if he speake of *Antiochus Epiphanes*, (as most certainly he doth) it may easily be proued both by Historie of the *Machabees*, and by other stories, that he was both an Idolater himselfe, and an enforcer of Idolatry vpon others. See *1. Maccab. 1. 50. 2. Macc.*

cab. 6. 21.

1. Maccab. 1. 50. *Polybius* also testifieth that in sacrifices & honouring the Grecian Gods, he surpassed other Kings which went before him, *Apud A.* as might appeare by the Olympieum at Athens, and the Images at theaume, *bene the altar at Delos.* This *Ierome* also auoucheth, and *Bellarmino* confesseth. But of whomsoever *Daniel* speaketh, he doth plainly describe him in the next verse to be an Idolater. *Ver. 38.* And it is a world to see what silly shifts the Jesuit maketh to auoid this truth. For first he readeth the words thus: *And he shall honor the God Maozim in his place:* Secondly, he omitted the words following (the God which his fathers knew not, he shall honour with golde, &c. which most plainly specifie his Idolatry who is here described) and busieth himselfe wholly in giuing a false interpretation to the god *Maozim*. The God *Maozim* saith he, signifieth either *Antichrist* himselfe, and then the meaning is he shall honor himselfe, that is, cause himselfe to be worshipped: or else it signifieth the diuel whom *Antichrist* being a forcerer shall worship in secret, which interpretation he preferreth before the other. And therefore this place doth not proue that he which is here described shall be an Idolater.

14 I answer first, that although either of his interpretations of the God *Maozim* were true (as neither is) yet the one hindreth not, and the other proueth that he which is heere described is an Idolater. For let the word *Maozim* signifie what it may, yet the words following plainly conuince the partie here described of Idolatry, the God which his fathers knew not he shall worship with gold. And if the God *Maozim* signifie any but the true God, and if altho the words are so to be read as *Bellarmino* readeth them: And he shall honor the God *Maozim*, and the God who his fathers knew not, he shall worship with gold and siluer, &c. then by these words the Idolatry is encreased. For first it is said, that he shall worship the God *Maozim* according to *Bellarmines* reading, whereby is not meant as he saith the true God, nay he saith to make Christ the God *Maozim*, it is intollerable blasphemy, O therefore first in these words is signified an Idolater: and secondly it is added, that the God also which his fathers knew not hee shall worship, where againe his Idolatry is most plainly noted.

2. But indeede *Bellarmines* interpretation is meereley
K 4 false,

Li. 3. ca. 21.

false, and that which he inferreth therevpon, altogether absurd. The God *Mabuzim* signifieth the God of fortitudes, that is, the most mightie or almightie God, which title as it is proper to the Lorde, as *Jeremy* calleth him *Yehouah, my strength and fortitude*: And likewise *David*, *Psal. 31. 5.* so may it not be ascribed to any other. And therefore it is a senselesse imagination, that *Daniel* by the God of fortitudes would signifie either Antichrist himselfe, a wicked and wretched man, or the father of Antichrist the Diuell. And further, as touching the former interpretation, it seemeth to be absurd, that when *Daniel* according to his reading faith, he shal worship the God *Maozim*, his meaning should be, that Antichrist should worship himselfe, as though he that worshippeth, and hee that is worshipped were one and the same. And the in like sort in the latter clause, by the God which he shall worship, which his fathers knew not, we must absurdly vnderstand himselfe. For whereas he cauillet at the word *worship*, and saith, wee must reade *glorifie*, as though *Daniel* meaning were, that Antichrist should glorifie himselfe, and cause himselfe to be worshipped: it is certaine that the vulgar Latine (which hee preferreth before the Hebrew, and which by the Councell of *Trent* hee is bound to stand to) hath *venerabitur, shall worship*. & himselfe both in the second clause of the verse, hee readeth according to the vulgar *colet, shall worship*: and in his second interpretation, which he saith is the better, he doth so reade and vnderstand the word. His first interpretation therefore, that the God *Maozim* should signifie Antichrist himselfe, is foolish and absurd.

15 Let vs therefore consider whether the second which he preferreth before the other, be any better. In the second place saith he, it may be said, which pleaseth me better, that Antichrist shall be a *Magician or sorcerer*, (such as very many Popes of *Rome* haue bene) and that according to the manner of other *Magicians*, he shall in secret worship the Diuell, (as diuers of the Popes haue done homage vnto him) by whose helps he shall worke wonders, and that he is called the God *Maozim*. *Ans.* Whereas *Bellarmino* preferreth this exposition before others, it seemeth hee hath forgotten the question which hee tooke vpon him to de-

send,

send, namely, that Antichrist shall not be an Idolater. For if he shall be a worshipper of the diuell, and also of a God whom his fathers knew not, I hope by this exposition he shall be proued an Idolater. But let vs see what hee further alledgeth to proue this exposition, which although it be false (for *Daniel* here neither speaketh of Antichrist, nor yet of the Diuell) yet it maketh against himselfe. Forsooth *Maozim* as hee supposeth is not the name of God, but of a certaine strong and secret place, in which shall be the chiefe treasures of Antichrist, and wherein he shall worship the diuell. For it followeth in *Daniel*, that he shall fortifie *Maozim* with a strange God whom hee knew, and surely *Maaboz* signifieth as well fortitude as a tower or place of munition. His meaning then is, that the diuell is here called the God *Maozim*, because Antichrist shall worship him in a certaine tower, which if it were true, hee should rather be called the God *Maoz*, but *Daniel* speaketh in the plurall number, the God of fortitudes or munitions, signifying according to the Hebrew phrase, the most mightie and strong God, *Deum summi roboris*, as *Tremellius* readeth.

And whereas hee saith it followeth, that hee shall fortifie *Maozim* with a strange God, whom he hath knowne, I answer, that there is no such matter in the originall text, which word for word is thus: And he shall doo to the munitions of *Mabuzim* with a strange God, that is, hee shall commit the munitions of *Mabuzim*, that is, *Ierusalem* and the cities of *Iewry* to a strange God. Yea, but saith *Bellarmino*, one of these interpretations (either that Antichrist is the God *Maozim*, or if he be any other (for he dare not now say it is the diuell) hee shall not be worshipped of Antichrist, but secretly and in a most hidden place) one saith hee, of these interpretations must be good, or else there will be a repugnancie in *Daniel*'s words. For if he care for no God, how shall hee publicly worship Idols? yea, rather if he care for no God, how shall hee worship any privately? For it is more like that he which is an Atheist, and careth for no God indeed, will in Machiuilian policie worship some God publicly, although privately he careth for none. And it more fitly sheweth the disposition of Antichrist to be secretly an Atheist,

K. 5.

and

and openly an Idolater, then contrariwise although *Belshazzar* here doth hold the contrary.

16 But now perhaps you expect, that having freed this place of *Daniel* from *Belshazzar's* corruptions and depravations, I should open unto you the true meaning thereof, and shewe how this prophesie was fulfilled in *Antiochus*, who in many things was a type of Antichrist. And the King saith the Angell, *Verse. 36.* (or this King *Hamelec*, that is, *Antiochus Epiphanes*, of whom I have all this while entreated, namely from the 21. Verse) *hee shall doe what hee will*, his will shall be to him for a law; wherein hee might seeme to be a lively figure of the Pope, of whom it is saide, *Sic volo, sic iubeo, stat pro ratione voluntas*: And againe, *Iudiciumq, est pro lege iuum*. And this was the ground of all his actions, willfully following in all things his owne will. Then more particularly the Angell describeth his actions, both in respect of religion and policie.

His actions tending to irreligion (of which onely we are now to speake) are first summarily comprised, *Verse. 36.* and afterward more fully expressed. The summe is this, that hee should alter and abrogate all the religions of the Syrians, as well the false religions of the Idolaters, as the true religion of the Jewes. The abrogation of all the religions of the Syrians, is here called the magnifying himselfe, *or* above or against every god, whose worships he did put downe. The prophana-tion of the Jewish religion ordained by the true God, the God of Gods, is here signified by speaking ~~in~~ great & swelling words against him, which wee are to understande of his blasphemous edicts to abolish the whole religion of God: both which wee see performed by *Antiochus Epiphanes*, 1. *Macab. 1. 43. 46. &c.* The same things are againe repeated, *Verse. 37. & 38.* First, as touching the goddes and religions of the Syrians in generall, whether true or false, he saith *Verse 37.* that *unto the Gods of his fathers he shall not attend, neither will hee listen to the desires of women*: that is, as some expound, his wiues, who entreated the continuance of those religions whereunto themselves were addicted: so that neither the reverence of

of his fathers, nor the love of his wiues could stay him from following his owne will in abrogating their religions, *neither will he regard any of the Gods*, viz. of the Syrians, *because hee will magnifie himselfe against all*, in abrogating the religions of them all, whether true or false. And more particularly concerning the true religion of the true God, he saith *Ver. 38.* *And as touching the God Mahazzim*, that is, the God almightie, and there he pauseth, *in his place he will honour, even a God whom his fathers knew not, will he honour with golde and with silver, with precious stones and with Jewels; and (verse. 39.) hee shall commit the munitions of Mahazzim*, that is, of the Almighty unto a strange God, that is, he shall deale so despightfully with the God of Israel, the Lord of Hosts, that having abrogated his worship and religion, he shall set up in the temple of God the Idoll of *Iupiter Olympius* to be worshipped (as it is recorded 2. *Mac. 6.*) who was a God whom his fathers knew not, that is, acknowledged not, nor worshipped. For the Syrians worshipped *Apollo* and *Diana*. And the munitions of *Mahazzim*, that is, *Jerusalem* and other cities of Jewry, which had bene as it were the munitions and cities of God, *hee committed them to the tuition of a strange God*, namely, *Iupiter Olympius*. The same prophesie in effect was before delivered, *Dan. 7. 25. & 8. 11.* by conference of which places with this in hand, it is manifest, that by the God *Mahazzim*, is meant the true God.

17 This prophesie therefore being meant of *Antiochus Epiphanes*, & fulfilled in him, cannot properly belong to Antichrist or any other. Notwithstanding as in some other things, so in the premises *Antiochus* may not visibly be thought to have bene a type or figure of Antichrist. In so much that both the aunient Fathers have understood these prophesies of Antichrist, and many also of the late writers (besides the Jewes) have applied the same particularly to the Pope. For besides that it is most true of the Pope, that hee doth what he will, see. *Legit non* ing hee is subiect to no lawe, and no man may say to him, *Sir subiacet* why doo you so? The rest also after a sort may be verified vnto

of him, that both hee setteth himselfe against the Idols of the Gentiles, and also hath abrogated the true worship of God. And that in stead of Christ the Almighty God, he hath set vp in his churches, besides many other Idols, the abominable Idol of the Masse, a God which his fathers the first Bishops of Rome knew not, which notwithstanding he honoreth with gold and siluer, and precious stones, and hath committed the churches, cities, and countries of Christendome, to the tuition and patronage of diuers Saints, who as they are indeed, so are they called by *Paulus Iouius* a Popish Bishop, the *intelar Gods* of the Papists.

Hist. lib.
24. in fine.

18 And these were his testimonies of scripture. In the next place, for want of better proofes, he flyeth to the authoritie of the Fathers as his last refuge, as though they testified that Antichrist shall not be an Idolater, nor one that will suffer Idols. But I answer, that the Fathers do either speake of the Idols and Idolatry of the Gentiles onely, and in that sence their speeches are verified in this behalfe of the Pope, who neither honoreth nor suffereth the Idols of the Gentiles: or else if they sprake of all Idols and Idolatry in generall, when they say *Idola sepeius as treneus*, or *ad idololatriam non admittet as Hippolitus*, or *idola odio habebis*, as *Cyrill*, or *ad idololatriam non adducet ille*, as *Chrysostome*, they deserue such an Antichrist as in this behalfe is better then the Pope. But indeed as the Pope is, so Antichrist in the scriptures is described to bee an Idolater, as hath bene shewed.

19 Having thus doubtfully proued this Popish conceit, the Iesuit proceedeth to the disproofe of our assertions & expositions of some places of scripture, and especially that of *2. Thess. 2.* Our assertion concerning the doctrine of Antichrist, hee saith is onely built vpon the scriptures falsely expounded by new glosses. In token whereof saith hee, they alledge not one Interpreter or Doctor for them. But this is a malicious slander, witnesse this place which he mentioneth *2. Thess. 2.* where we proue by the consent of many of the Fathers, that by the Temple is meant the church of Gods; and that in the church of God Antichrist was to be reuealed, after the Romane Empire, which hindered was taken

taken out of the way, &c. Our assertions concerning Antichrist, are grounded on the propheties of scriptures expounded by the euent, which is the best expounder of propheties. And with our assertions the opinions of the Fathers agree, where they are consonant to the scripture and the euent. Contrariwise, the assertions of the Papists concerning Antichrist, as they are repugnant to the scriptures and the truth of the euent: so are they wholly grounded either vpon the vncertaine (and many times misalleged) coniectures of the Fathers, who were no Prophets, and therefore being not able to foresee the euent, did not many times vnderstand the Propheties: or else on the blinde conceits of Popish writers, who being deceived with the efficacie of illusion, and made drunke with the whore *Babylons* cuppe of fornications, were giuen ouer to beleue lyes. And whereas our writers expounding those wordes of the Apostle, *2. Thess. 2. 4. (who is lifted up about all that is called God, or that is worshipped)* doo apply the same vnto the Pope vpon very good and sufficient proofes, and from thence do plainly conclude the Pope to be Antichrist, (for euidence whereof, I referre the Reader to the 5. chapter of my former booke.) He culleth out some stragling sentences out of some one of the vnsoundest writers of our side, (as their manner is) which he may best hope to answer. As though we had no more, nor no better arguments to proue, that the Pope aduanceth himselfe aboue all that is called God, or that is worshipped, then these two: First, because he professeth himselfe to bee the Vicar of Christ: And secondly, whereas Christ subiected himselfe willingly vnto the scriptures, the Pope challengeth authoritie to dispense with the scripture. Howbeit the former of these two reasons hee depraueth, and the latter he is not able to satisfie. For *Ilyricus* his reason to proue that the Pope aduanceth himselfe aboue all that is called God, is not because he maketh himselfe the Vicar of Christ, but this, because hee vaunting himselfe to be the Vicar of Christ, doth notwithstanding vsurpe greater authoritie, then the sonne of God claimed vnto himselfe, of which, that which *Belharmine Catalog.* alledgeth as a second reason, is by *Ilyricus* added as a proofe: *test. pag. 3.* Where.

Contrary Wherevnto Bellarmine is no otherwise able to answer, then by
to Galat. impudent and shamelesse deniall, either that *Christ* subiected
 4. 4. himselfe to the lawe and word of God, or that the Pope taketh upon
Luke. 25 him to dispense with the scriptures, or that any Catholike (meaning
 Popish) writer hath said, that he may dispense with diuine precepts,
 both which notwithstanding I haue heretofore proued by
 many instances and most euident allegations. See the first
 booke. chap. 5. 6. 10. 11. 12. For that which hee addeth of
 Christs subiecting himselfe to the prophesies, and not to the
 precepts, as though *Ishyrus* had spoken of the one in his pro-
 position, and of the other in the assumption, it is partly
 false and partly ridiculous, and indeede not worth the an-
 swering.

Chap. 15. Of the miracles of Antichrist.

1



EE are now come to the eight maine argu-
 ment, which Bellarmine vseth to proue
 that the Pope of Rome is not Antichrist
 because forsooth those things which the
 holy Ghost in the scriptures hath foretold
 concerning the miracles of Antichrist, do
 not agree to the Pope & church of Rome.

For concerning the miracles of Antichrist, the

scriptures (saith he) mention three things. 1. that Antichrist shall
 worke many miracles. 2. what manner of miracles they shall be. 3.
 there are recorded examples. Of al which points I haue intreated
 heretofore, prouing from Bellarmine his owne grounds, that
 the Pope is Antichrist. And first that many signes and won-
 ders should be wrought by Antichrist & his adherents, which
 they call miracles, the scriptures testifie, the euent hath proued,
 and we do confesse. And secondly, that all these signes & won-
 ders, howsoever he and his followers do boast of them, and in
 respect thereof contemne the true professors: yet are as the A-
 postle saith, *lying signes and wonders*, both in respect of the ende,
 which is to seduce and to confirme lies, & in respect of the subs-
 tance, which is counterfeit. For whereas Bellarmine addeth that
 they are also called lying signes in respect of the efficient and au-
 thor

thor of them, which is the father of lies, according to whose power
 Antichrist was to come, who as some of the Fathers affirme, was to be
 a notable Magician or forcerer. This seemeth to be somewhat far
 fetched, vntill we will take the word *Antichrist* to be masculine (as
 none doth). Notwithstanding, because the Apostle ascribeth
 the working of these miracles to the power of Sathau, we will
 trace him in his owne steppes, not doubting to apply this note
 also to the Pope and church of Rome: seeing it cannot be doub-
 ted, but that as very many not onely of their Cleargy, but euen
 of their Popes, haue bene notable Magicians and forcerers: so
 also very many of the miracles in the church of Rome, haue bin
 the operations or illusions of the diuell. As for their Cleargy, who
 knoweth not, but that there haue bin fewe learned men among
 the, who haue not bene knowne, or at the least suspected, to be
 coniuers, and skilfull (as some call it) of the blacke Art. But as
 touching the Popes, because it may seeme incredible, that any
 known Magician or forcerer should be aduanced to the Apo-
 stolike See, as they call it: therefore it may be thought, that the
 forcery & witchcraft of the most of the, who indeed were for-
 cerers, was hidden & vnkown. Notwithstanding eue in their
 owne writers there are recorded as knowne Magicians & for-
 cerers about 20. Popes, diuers wherof gaue themselves wholly
 to the diuell, that in the prophesie of the Apostle might be
 fulfilled, viz. that they might come to the Papacie by the helpe
 of the diuell, or as the Apostle speaketh, 2. Thess. 2. 9. that their
 comming might be according to the efficacie of Satan: And as
 this hapned often, so especially about those times wherein An-
 tichrist in the Papacie was in a maner come to his full growth,
 that is to say, in *Syluester 2.* & *Gregory 7.* and all the Popes be-
 twixt them, who were a sort of infamous forcerers. And there-
 fore if any miracles haue bin wrought by such Popes, (as *Satan*
ders braggeth of many signes & wonders wrought by *Gregory*
7.) we need not doubt, but that as themselves were Magicians
 and forcerers, so their signes and wonders were wrought by
 the power of the diuell

2 And thus Bellarmine through all the causes sheweth
 the miracles of Antichrist, to be lying signes and wonders.

But

Demonstr.
 20.

Lib. 1. cap.
 7.

But to what ende I beseech you seruet all this discourse? Will *Bellarmino* conclude from hence that the Pope is not Antichrist, either because there are no miracles in the church of *Rome*, which was the first point, or because those miracles which they haue, be not lying signes and wonders, which was the second? If this were his ende, why then doth hee not from this proposition as it were his groundworke, assume and conclude after this manner. *By Antichrist and his adherents many signes and wonders shall be wrought (which they call miracles) as the scripture testifieth: By the Pope and his adherents many signes and wonders haue not bin wrought which they call miracles, therefore the Pope is not Antichrist.* But *Bellarmino* durst not reason thus, seeing the Papists bragge of nothing more then of their signes and wonders, which they call miracles. And therefore from this ground I haue heretofore inferred the contrary. For if it be a peculiar note of Antichrist and his adherents in these latter times to worke many signes and wonders, which they call miracles: then can it not be auoyded, but that the Pope of *Rome* is Antichrist, and the church of *Rome* the Synagogue of Antichrist, seeing they alone do bragge of miracles. See the first booke, chap. 7. §. 1. & 2. Secondly, why doth hee not reason thus? *By Antichrist and his followers, lying signes and wonders shall be wrought: But by the Pope and church of Rome, there haue bene no lying signes and wonders wrought, therefore the Pope is not Antichrist.* Indeed this would *Bellarmino* haue the simple reader gather from his words, and that is the drift of all that discourse. But this he could not assume and conclude, because his owne conscience doth tell him that, which all the worlde knows, that their church is full of lying signes and wonders, which they call miracles. Therefore from *Bellarmines* owne ground I reason thus: If it be a peculiar note of Antichrist and his Synagogue in these latter times to work many lying signes and wonders, then it must be confessed, that the Pope is Antichrist, and the church of *Rome* the Synagogue of Antichrist, because among them are many lying signes and wonders: but the first is testified in the scriptures, and therefore the latter cannot be denied, seeing I haue proved that the church of *Rome* is full

full of lying signes and wonders, which notwithstanding they call miracles. See the first Booke. Chap. 7. §. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7.

3 It is plaine therefore, that of those three things which *Bellarmino* obserueth out of the scriptures concerning the miracles of Antichrist, the two first doo fidly serue to proue the Pope Antichrist. Neither will the three examples of Antichrist his miracles which *Bellarmino* setteth downe in the third place, disproue the same. For of these three examples, to wit, First that Antichrist, or at least his Ministers, shall make fire to come downe from heauen in the sight of men. Secondly, that he shall put life into the Image of the beast, and cause it to speake. Thirdly, that he shall saigne himselfe to die, and to rise againe. The two first (which indeed belong to Antichrist) doe fidly agree to the Pope (as hath bene shewed in the first booke, chap. 7. from the 8. §. to the ende of the chapter.) The third belongeth not to Antichrist. From whence notwithstanding, *Bellarmino* argueth thus. The third miracle of Antichrist (saith he) is, that he shall saigne himselfe to die & to rise againe, for which miracle especially the whole world almost shall admire him, But neuer did any Pope saigne himselfe to die and rise againe, therefore the Pope is not Antichrist. I answer to the proposition, that no such miracle in the scripture is assigned vnto Antichrist, but that it is a fond imagination of the Papists, which by some of them, and namely by *Lib. 3. de Bellarmino* himselfe is propounded more fondly, to wit, that pontif. Antichrist shall saigne himselfe to die, and by the helpe of the diuell *Rom. cap. 5* shall rise againe. For if his death be but counterfeited, he shall not neede the diuels helpe to raise him. Notwithstanding, they would grounde this miracle vpon those words, *Apoc. 13. 3. And I sawe one of his heads as it were wounded to death, but his deadly wound was healed, and all the world wondered after the beast.* I answer, that in these words the holy Ghost speaketh not of Antichrist, & that he of whom he speaketh, doth not saigne himselfe to die, and rise againe. As touching the first of those two beasts described in this chapter, the former is not Antichrist, but the latter. The former which is described vnto the 11. Verse, is the *Romane Empire*, especially vnder the persecuting

Lib. 3. de
Pontif.
Ro. ca. 10.

cuting Emperours, as hath bene shewed, every part of that description fitting the same. And that the latter beast signifieth Antichrist, it is in a manner confessed of all. Heare what *Bellarmino* saith in the beginning of his tenth chapter, speaking of the 16. 17. and 18. Verses of this 13. chapter of the *Apocalyp*, which are spoken concerning the second beast, *Fateatur omnes* (saith hee) *pertinere omnia ad Antichristum verba illa Iohannis* Apoc. 13. *& faciet omnes pusillos cum magna, &c.* All men confesse, that those words of Iohn, Apoc. 13. *And he shall make all both small and great, &c.* do wholly appertaine to Antichrist. And in this very chapter how doth *Bellarmino* proue, 1. that Antichrist shall worke great signes, because it is said, *verse 13. & faciet signa magna, and he wrought great signes.* 2. that many of the signes of Antichrist shall be phantasticall, and onely in appearance, because it is said in the same verse, that he doth cause fire to descend in the sight of men. 3. that Antichrist shall cause fire to come downe from heauen, and make the Image of the beast to speake, because it is so prophesied of Antichrist, *verse 13. and 15.* Now if this be confessed, that the latter beast is Antichrist, then can it not be truly affirmed, that the former beast is Antichrist, vntil we may say, that the former and the latter are one and the same. But that cannot be truly saide. For of the latter *Iohn* saith, *And I sawe another beast, verse 11.* If it be an other, then is it not the same, and the great difference in the descriptions of both, doth shewe that they are diuerse beasts. The one arising out of the Sea, hath tenne hornes, the other arising out of the earth, hath two hornes like the Lambe. The latter exerciseth the power of the former, and that in his sight, causeth men to worship the former beast, whose deadly wound was healed, maketh an Image to the former beast which had a deadly wound, & liued. *verse 14.* Therefore the second beast which signifieth Antichrist, is not that beast which had the deadly wound and was cured thereof, nor yet the head which was so wounded.

Verse 12.

4. Again (to come to that obiection which *Bellarmino* maketh vnto himselfe, and doth not satisfie) this miracle and the two first doe not belong to one and the same subject: if there.

therefore the two first concerning fire and the Image, belong to Antichrist, then this doth not; or if this do, then the other two do not; but all confesse, that those two do belong to Antichrist, therefore this doth not.

Herevnto *Bellarmino* would seeme to answer, that the former beast signifieth either the *Romane Empire*, or the multitude of the wicked, and that one (that is to say the chiefe head thereof) which seemed to dye and rise againe, is Antichrist. For saith hee, Antichrist shall be the chiefe and the last head of the wicked, as also of the *Romanes*. The second beast signifieth either Antichrist himselfe, according to *Rupertus*, or the Ministers and Preachers of Antichrist, according to *Richardus* and *Anselmus*. And therefore these three miracles belong either to Antichrist alone, or to him and his Ministers. In which answer of *Bellarmino*, we see that proverbiall speech verified, that *Great is the truth, and it shall prevaile*. Seeing the force and evidence of truth hath expressed from him in this place a confession that ouerthroweth the popish doctrine concerning Antichrist, and manifestly proueth the Pope to be Antichrist. Namely, when hee confelleth according to the true interpretation of the auncient Interpreters and Fathers of the Church, that the beast with seuen heads is the *Romane Empire*, & that Antichrist is one of those seuen heads: as also else-where he hath confessed that the whore of *Babylon* is the cite of *Rome*. From hence therefore it followeth, that Antichrist shall be the head, not of the Iewes, but of the *Romanes*, that his chiefe seate or See shall be, not *Ierusalem*, but *Rome*, that the name of the beast is *Romane* or *Latine*, that Antichrist is not one particular man, no more then the other sixe heads of the *Romane Empire*, but a state of gouernment, as the Kings were one head, and the Consuls an other, and the Emperours but one head, and the Popes and Papacie but one head, and lastly, that the head of the beast or *Romane Empire*, which is Antichrist, can be no other but the Pope of *Rome*. For of these seuen heads *S. Iohn* saith, that in his time five of the were fallen, one was, & an other was not yet come. These five which were fallen, were the five first, viz. kings, consuls, *Decemviri*, tribunes, & dictators.

Esd. 3. 41

Cap. 13.

The head that then was, out of question was the Emperours, who were the sixth head, the seventh (which is of the Popes) was not yet come: Which then of these seven heads doth signifie Antichrist? surely none of the five first, for they were past before *S. Iohns* time: nor the sixth, which is the state of Emperours, for that then was, and Antichrist was not yet come; and as the Papists confesse, that was it which hindered the reuelation of Antichrist, and therefore was to be done out of the way before Antichrist could be reuealed. It remaineth therefore that the seventh head (which is of the Popes) is Antichrist. For as touching the Imperiall state renewed in the West, the holy Ghost plainly saith, that the beast which was, and is not, though it be, as being but the Image of the olde Empire, is the eight, and is one of the seven: that is, in name and title it is the same with the first, as Images beare the names of those things which they doo represent. If therefore Antichrist bee one of the seven heads of the Romane state (as vndoubtedly hee is, and as our aduersary here confelleth) then can it not be denied, but that the Pope, who is the seventh head, is Antichrist.

5 The other interpretation, that the beast with seven heads doth signifie the whole multitude of the wicked, is senselesse and absurd. For if the beast be the vniuersall company of the wicked, what is the world, which *verse. 3.* is said to wonder after the beast? what are all the kindreds, tongues, nations which are made subiect to the beast, *verse. 7.*? who are all those inhabitants of the earth that do worship him? doth not the holy Ghost plainly say, *verse. 8.* that they are those whose names are not written in the booke of the Lambe; that is to say, the company of the wicked and reprobates? When as *Bellarmino* therefore saith, that this beast signifieth either the Romane Empire, or the whole company of the wicked, we may adde, but it signifieth not the whole company of the wicked. It remaineth therefore that it signifieth the Romane state, whereof Antichrist is a head. But although Antichrist bee one head of the seven, yet it followeth not, that the head which was as it were wounded to death, is Antichrist, but rather the estate

of

off Emperours which then was. For albeit the beast with seven heads doth signifie the Romane state in generall, yet in that place it seemeth to bee described as it was subiect to the first head. In the 17. chapter as it is renewed and subiect to the Antichristian state. For the beast (which he there speaketh of) which was, and is not though it be, was after to arise *again*, and being the eight in order, was in name one of the seven, upon which beast as also vpon those waters, that is, nations whereof the old Empire did arise, the whore of *Babylon* (whereby is meant the Antichristian state) sitteth, that is, ruleth and raigneth as a Queene.

6 And that it may appeare that there is no necessitie that we should vnderstand this wound of Antichrist, let vs consider what wounds the Romane state had receiued, and was cured thereof. First therefore by the death of *Iulius Caesar*, and the ciuill warres therevpon ensuing, the Romane Empire receiued as it were a deadly wound, & yet recovered it so againe, as that in *Augustus* and some of his successors, it flourished more then euer before. And this some thinke to be the wound of the beast which was cured, whereof the holy Ghost here speaketh, describing the beast by that which was knowne to haue bene done in the Romane state. The second wound which the Romane Empire receiued, was at the death of *Nero*, in whom the stocke of the *Cæsars* ended: which being cut off, the succession of the Imperiall Crowne was vncertaine, and by the vncertainie of succession the like desolation threatened to that Empire, which happened to the Græcian Monarchy after the death of *Alexander* the great, the Empire being left as a prey for the mightiest. Neither was this wound cured vntill *Vespasian* obtained the Empire. For after *Nero*, *Sergius Galba* seized vpon the Empire, and enioyed the same but seven monethes and seven dayes. And albeit to establish the succession, hee had adopted *Piso*, yet was hee murdered by *Sylvius Otto*, who succeeded him; and *Otho* after three moneths and five dayes was slaine by *Vitellius*; who also after eight moneths was deposed and put to an ignominious death by *Vespasian*: In whom the Empire which since the death of

L 3

Nero

Nere had bene incertum & vagum, as Suetonius saith, was established, and as it were cured of the former wound, which diuets learned men thinke to be vnderstood in this place. Others rather expound this deadly wound of the dissolution of the Empire in the West, *Augustulus* being overcome by the Gothes, and the Empire in the West lying voyd vntill *Charles* the great, in whom this wound was after a sort cured. Therefore although Antichrist be one of the heads of this beast, yet seeing he is but one of the seuen, and the holy Ghost speaketh of this Empire especially, as it was ruled by the sixt head, that is to say, the Emperours; there is no necessitie, nay, no probability that by the head which was wounded wee should vnderstand Antichrist, especially seeing Antichrist is after wards described at large, and that by these notes among others, that he causeth men to worship the former beall; whose mortall wound was healed, *verse 12.* and caused an Image to be made to the beall which had the deadly wound, *verse 14.* which as appeareth also by the Image, was the Romane State vnder the Emperours; for thereof the Empire renewed is an Image.

7 But now suppose that Antichrist were this head which was wounded and cured as he is not, yet how doth it follow that therefore Antichrist shall feigne himselfe to die and rise againe, seeing he speaketh not of a particular mans death and resurrection, as the Papists imagine, but of the wounding and curing of a state signified by the head. Neither speaketh he of death and resurrection, but of wounding and curing: neither is the wound and the cure counterfeited and fained, but the wound is truly inflicted and truly cured; such, as was both the wound of the Romane Empire, either at the murder of *Julius Caesar*, or death of *Nero*, or vanquishing of *Augustulus*; and also the cure in *Augustus*, in *Kassian*, and as *Bellarmino* else-where saith, in *Carolus Magnus*. If therefore neither Antichrist be spoken of in this place, nor yet he who is spoken of, doth feigne himselfe to die and rise againe; how is it proued from these words, that Antichrist shall feigne himselfe to die and rise againe?

De trans-
lat. impo-
rissim. I.
cap. 4.

Chap.

Chap. 16. Of the kingdome and battailes
of Antichrist.



Concerning the kingdome and battailes of Antichrist, we reade foure thinges in the scriptures saith *Bellarmino*: 1. that Antichrist arising from a most base estate, shall by fraude and deceit obtaine the kingdome of the Iewes. 2. that he shall fight with three kings, to wit, of Egypt, Libya, and Aethiopia, and hauing overcome them shall possesse their kingdomes. 3. that he shall subdue seuen other kings, and by that meanes shall become the Monarch of the whole world. 4. that with an innumerable army he shall persecute the Christians in the whole world: and that this is the battaile of Gog and Magog. Of all which seeing none agreeeth to the Pope, it followeth manifestly that he can by no meanes be called Antichrist.

To these foure points I will answer, first ioynly to them all, and then severally to euery one. For whereas *Bellarmino* saith, that these foure thinges are read in the scriptures concerning the kingdome and battailes of Antichrist, I answer, that not any one of these foure is to be found in the scriptures, and therefore that this argument as it is the last, so of least force, and that his disputation standing now as it were on the tilt, he seemeth to drawe of the lees. Notwithstanding the three first hee would faine father vpon *Daniel*, as though hee in the 7. and 11. Chapters had prophesied such thinges concerning Antichrist. But I answer, that these prophesies had, and according to *Daniel* were to haue their complement before the coming of the Messias, and therefore that the Papists may as wel with the Iewes expect the coming of their Messias, as still to expect the fulfilling of these thinges in their imaginary Antichrist, the counterfeited Messias of the Iewes. Seeing as I said, these prophesies were to be fulfilled before the coming of Christ; and seeing the Iewes do still waite for their Messias, because with the Papists they will not acknowledge these

L 4

these propheties (which were to haue their complement before the coming of the Messias) to haue bene fulfilled before the incarnation of Christ. The occasion of which error of the Papists (whereat the Iewes also do stumble) hath bene an erroneous interpretation of some of the Fathers, who vnderstand whatsoever is spoken of the kingdome of the *Seleucide* and *Lagide*, that is, the kingdome of *Syria* and *Egypt* (so farre forth as it tyranized ouer the people of God the Iewes) figured by the two legges of the Image, chap. 2. and the fourth beast with tenne hornes, chap. 7. they vnderstand (I say) as spoken of the Romane Monarchy. And consequently whatsoever is spoken of the little horne, chap. 7. 8. 11. whereby *Antiochus Epiphanes* is most plainly described, they expound it of Antichrist.

2 But the learned of our times haue made it cleare, although the Papists shut their eyes against the truth, that by the two legges of the Image, and by the fourth beast, is not to be vnderstood the Romane Empire, and by the little horne not Antichrist properly, but *Antiochus Epiphanes*. For these things which are recorded of the two legges, chap. 2. and of the fourth beast, chap. 7. do not onely fitly, but also properly and onely agree to the kingdome of the *Seleucide* and *Lagide*. And those things which are written of the little horne, do wholly & properly belong to *Antiochus Epiphanes*, as the Papists themselves cannot deny. *Porphyr* that learned, though malicious enemy of Christianitie, perceived *Daniel's* propheties in the 7. 8. 11. & 12. chapters, which the Papists vnderstand of Antichrist, so fully and perfectly to agree to *Antiochus Epiphanes*, that he cauelled against the propheties of *Daniel*, affirming that they were written not before hand of *Daniel*, but after the fulfilling of them by some one that liued in the times of *Antiochus Epiphanes*. For so *Ierome* writeth of him: *Contre prophetam Danielm duodecimum librum scribit Porphyrius, notans eum ab ipso cuius inscriptus est nomine esse compositum, sed à quodam qui temporibus Antiochi, qui appellatus est Epiphanes, fuisse in Iudea, & non tam Danielm ventura dixisse, quam illum narrasse praterita.* And after, *tanta enim dissimulatio fuit, ut propheta incredulis hominibus*

Presatio.
ne in Da-
niel.

non

non videatur futura dixisse, sed narrasse praterita. So fully and plainly is *Antiochus* deciphered in the prophetic of *Daniel*, that the authour of that booke seemed to *Porphyr*, to haue written a story of *Antiochus Epiphanes*, rather then a prophetic.

3 As for Antichrist, he is not once mentioned or meant in all the prophetic of *Daniel* the which I deliuer, not as though I thought, that those things which the papists expound concerning Antichrist, could not for the most part be fitly applied to the Pope: for not onely diuers protestants arguing from the papists owne groundes, haue out of *Daniel* prouoed the Pope to be Antichrist: but also the Iewes, and namely *R. Levi Gerson*, whom *Bellarmino* citeth, chap. 12. expoundeth all those things in *Daniel*, chap. 7. and 11. which the papists vnderstand of Antichrist, as spoken of the Pope of *Rome*, whom he called another *Pharao*. And most true it is, that excepting *Antiochus Epiphanes*, these propheties doe best fit the Pope of *Rome*. And therefore I willingly graunt that, which both olde and new writers haue assumed, that *Antiochus Epiphanes* may be said to haue bene a type of Antichrist. A type I say, not in all and euery particular (as though whatsoever can be said of *Antiochus*, the like may be said of Antichrist) but in some principall matters, in respect whereof he is a type. *Salomon* the King of peace, *David* the kingly Prophet, the high priests, which by offering sacrifices made atonement for their bretheren, *Iosua* the deliuerer of the people, were types of Christ. And yet it were a ridiculous, if not a blasphemous course, to apply to Christ whatsoever is recorded of *Salomon*, *David*, the high Priests, or *Iosua*. Neither is this without cause set downe by the Schoolemen as a rule of Diuinitie, that *theologia symbolica non est argumentum*. For those things which properly are spoken of *Antiochus*, cannot properly be vnderstood of Antichrist, (if at all) but onely allegorically; and allegories proue not: and that force which they seeme to haue in prouing, is not to proue the same particular, but the like: for allegories are similitudes without notes of likenes. If therefore it were scarce a good argument in diuinitie, from a type or allegory:

legory to proue the like, because *similia claudicant*: then must it needs be a sencelesse argumentation from a similitude; to conclude not the like, but the same particular, seeing *nulum simile est idem*, no like is the selfe-same. The principall matters which are recorded of *Antiochus* are these: that he was *enimvero* an enemy to God, and a persecuter of his church, an aduancer of himselfe aboue or against every God; or as the Apostle speaketh, *ut superius est dictum*, one that was

Dan. 7. 8. ruled by no lawe, but his owne wil, hauing a mouth speaking

2. Thess. 2. presumptuous things, and such like: which as they are recorded of *Antiochus*, so are they by the Apostles applied to Anti-

christ, and do most fitly and properly agree to the Pope. But if we shall apply to Antichrist those things which were proper to the person of *Antiochus*, and in respect whereof he was not a type of Antichrist, and from thence shall inferre not the like, which were too much, for like things are not like in all things, but the same particular which was proper to his person, we shall be ridiculously absurd. As for example, if we shall say that Antichrist shall by craft attaine, not to his kingdom, but to the same kingdom of *Syria*, because *Antiochus* did so: that Antichrist shall fight with the kings of *Egypt, Libya & Ethiopia*, because in *Bellarmines* conceit *Antiochus* did so, and such like particulars; then may we by as good right asserme, that Antichrist shall immediately succeed in the kingdom of *Syria* his brother *Selenus Philopater*, for that is expressly noted *Dan. 11. 21. and in his place, &c.* and consequently, that he shall be the sonne of *Antiochus Magnus*, that he shall be an hostage at *Rome* before he be king, as *Epiphanius* was: that he shall make three expeditions into *Egypt*, and in his returne homeward e- uery time shall hee afflict the land of *Iury*, especially in the se-

Ioseph. antiq. lib. 12. cap. 6. cond expedition, when being hindred by the shippes of *Chiti- sim*, that is the Romans, he wreaked his malice vpon the Iewes, chap. 11. 30. and all the rest of the particulars, which properly belong to the person of *Antiochus*, all which *Daniel* doth so fully and particularly describe, that hee hath seemed to some which knew not with what spirit he did write, to haue written a story rather then a prophecie of him. Chap. 7. 8. 11. 12.

4. But now let vs examine generally the particular instances from

from whence *Bellarmino* would proue that the Pope is not Antichrist. From the first he argueth thus: *Antichrist arising from most base estate (ex humilimo loco) shall by fraud & deceit obtaine the kingdom of the Iewes. The Pope of Rome ariseth not from base estate, neither obtaineth the kingdom by fraude and deceit, therefore the Pope is not Antichrist.* The proposition is after his manner proued out of *Dan. 11. 21. And in his place shall stand a vile person, and they shall not giue vnto him the honor of a king, but he shall come secretly, and obtaine the kingdom by fraude.* I answer first, that *Daniel* speaketh not of Antichrist: and secondly, that this proposition is not true of him of whom *Daniel* speaketh; and therefore that this allegatio is both impertinent & untrue. That *Daniel* speaketh not of Antichrist, it shall appeare out of *Daniel* himselfe. For *Daniel* speaketh of him that immediately in the kingdom of *Syria* succeeded *Selenus Philopater*. For so he saith, *in his place*, who was described, *vers. 20 shall stand up a vile person*, meaning thereby *Antiochus*, who *den' antiochus* is called *in latin*, but properly as *Polybius* calleth him *in latin*, vnto whom that which is cited out of the 21. verse, and all the rest of the chapter vnto the end, doth wholly and properly agree:

5. For the better vnderstanding of this place & the rest of *Daniel*, we are to know, that excepting oho propheticall comfort of the resurrection, chap. 12. his whole prophecie is of those things which happened within lesse then 700. yeares, that is to say, from the taking of *Ierusalem* by the Chaldeans, vnto the finall destruction thereof by the Romanes: and his prophecie concerneth those kingdoms which should in the meane time be in the world. And those are either such terrestriall kingdoms vnto whose tyrannie the Iewes were subiect before the coming of the Messias: or else the spirituall kingdom of Christ, (the Messias & king of the Iewes) before which all the former kingdoms were to haue an end. *Dan. 4. 33. & 7. 11. & 26. 27.* The time whereof, as also of the destruction of *Ierusalem*, is foretold, cap. 9. 25. 26. 27. according to which time this Messias and king, is by the wise men acknowledged to be born *Mat. 2.* and his kingdom by *Ioh. Baptist* the forerunner of Christ, was said to be at hand. *Mat. 3. 2.* and in like sort preached our Saviour Christ, *Mat. 10. 5.* & his apostles, *Mat. 10. 7.* Christ also a little be- fore:

fore his death confessed that he was a king, and in his death his title was the king of the Jewes. After his death & resurrection he professeth that all power was given him in heaven and in earth, and thereupon ascendeth into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of God: which is noted in *Daniel*, chap. 7. 13. that after Christ the son of man was come into the worlde, he went vnto the auncient of dayes, and to him was given power, glory, and kingdome, that all people, nations and tongues should serue him. Of both these sorts of kingdomes *Daniel* intreateth, chap. 2. and 7. And as touching the terrestriall kingdomes which tyrannized ouer the Jewes before the coming of Christ in the flesh, they are noted to be foure: the first of the Babylonians, the second of the Medes and Persians, the third of the Macedonians, the fourth of the Seleucidæ and Lagidæ. And of these foure *Daniel* prophesieth, either ioyntly of all together, or severally of some of them. In the second & seventh chapters, of them all together, resembling them in the second chapter by an Image, the golden head whereof figureth the Babylonians, the breast and armes of siluer the Medes and Persians, the belly and sides of brasse, represent the Macedonians, his legges of yron, and his feete, part of yron, and part of clay, resemble the Seleucidæ & Lagidæ: and in the seventh chapter, the same foure kingdomes are figured by 4. beastes, the Babylonians by a Lyon, the Medes and Persians by a Beare, the Macedonians by a Leopard, the Seleucidæ and Lagidæ, by the beast with tenne hornes.

6 Seuerally he prophesieth, either of the Babylonian Monarchy, or of the rest. His prophecies concerning the Babylonian Monarchy, which also were fulfilled in his time, are set downe chap. 4. and 5. Of the three other, and especially of the last (because that especially was to afflict the people of the Jewes) he prophesieth againe in the 8. and 11. chapters. In the 11. chapter, to omit the rest, the Angell promiseth, vers. 2. to declare the *trumb*; that is, the true and proper sense & meaning of the aforesaid visions concerning the three kingdomes which yet remained, recorded chap. 2. 7. 8. And first as touching the kingdome of the Medes & Persians, he mentioneth

but foure Kings, because the rest did nothing memorable against *Juda*, vers. 2. In the third verse he prophesieth of *Alex-Verse. 3.* ander the great, the mightie Monarch of the Græcians, and of the diuision of that Empire into foure principall parts, vers. 4. *Verse. 4.* which before was foretold, chap. 8. 22. Of which diuision *Jerome* writeth thus; *Quo (sc. Alexandro) tricesimo secundo aia. In Dan. 8. tie sue annorum in Babylone, surrexerunt pro eo quatuor duces eius, qui sibi imperium diuiserunt. & Egyptum enim Ptolemeus Lagi filius tenuit, &c. Alexander being dead in Babylon, in the 32. yeare of his age, there arose in his stead foure of his captaines, who diuided the Empire among them, For Ptolemy Lagides held Egypt. Philip who also is called Arideus, the brother of Alexander held Macedonia. Seleucus Nicanor, held Syria and Babylon, and all the kingdomes of the East. Antigonus ruled ouer Asia minor.* These foure kingdomes were by mutual conflicts reduced to two vnder *Seleucus Nicanor*, & *Ptolemy Lagides*, from whom did spring the kingdom of the *Lagida* & kings of Egypt on the South: and of the *Seleucida* or kings of Syria & Babylon in the North. These two used to contend for *Judea*, which lying in the midst betwixt them, became a prey to the conquerors, and was greuously afflicted by them. These two are the two legges and feete of the *Image*, chap. 2: and also the fourth beast with tenne hornes, chap. 7. for of these two kingdomes there are tenne kings reckened, which tyrannized ouer the people of the Jewes, especially the tenth horne; that is, *Antiochus Epiphanes*, who arose in the ende of the kingdome of this beast; namely, ouer the Jewes, chap. 8. 23. For in his time the people of God were freed from the tyrannie of the *Seleucida*, by *Judas Maccabæus*.

7 These tenne hornes which successiue tyrannized ouer *Jewry*, are mentioned in order in this 11. chapter. First *Ptolemy Lagides* (the first horne) who is called vers. 5. the king of *Verse. 5.* the South, that is of Egypt, who shortly after he had gotten *Joseph. an. Egypt*, invaded *Judea*, and surprized the citie of *Jerusalem* on a *tiq. hb. 12.* Sabbath. Secondly, *Seleucus Nicanor* (the second horne) the mightiest of the Princes of *Alexander*, as he is described in the same fifth verse. For although *Ptolemy* for a time helde *Judea*,

yet after it was agreed vpon that *Seleucus* should haue *Syria* and therein *Iudea*. Him succeeded *Antiochus Soter* (the third horne) so called, because he expelled the French-men out of *Asia*: whose sonne *Antiochus Theos* (the fourth horne) to continue a league betwixt him and *Ptolemy Philadelphus* King of *Egypt*, tooke in marriage *Bernice*, the daughter of *Ptolemy Philadelphus*, according to that prophetic of the two legges, consisting of yron and claie mingled together, that they should mingle themselves together in the seede of man, but they should not cleaue together, euen as yron cannot be mixed with claie, chap. 2. 43. for euen so it followeth vers. 6. For howsoeuer they had combined themselves together by marriage, yet this coniunction helde not, and they which had any hande in it shortly after died. For *Antiochus Theos* had a former wife yet liuing named *Laodice*, by whom he had *Seleucus Callinicus*, and *Antiochus Hierax*. This *Laodice* to reuenge this despite, poisoned her husband *Antiochus Theos*: her sonne *Seleucus Callinicus* (the fift horne) slewe *Bernice*, her childe, and her traine: and *Ptolemy Philadelphus* shortly after this marriage ended his life. But in his place, vers. 7. did arise his sonne *Ptolemy Euergetes* (the sixt horne) proceeding from the same rootes with *Bernice* (that is, her brother) who to auenge the death of his sister, made warre with *Seleucus Callinicus*, and ouercame him, and hauing caused himselfe to be crowned king of *Syria*, returned with much spoile, and many captiues into *Egypt*; and being stronger then *Seleucus Callinicus*, hee held the domination of *Syria* for many yeares. But the sonnes of *Seleucus Callinicus*, to wit *Seleucus Ceraunus*, and *Antiochus Magnus*, raised warre, vers. 5. 10. First *Seleucus Ceraunus* against *Ptolemy Euergetes*, and they both beeing dead about the same time, *Antiochus Magnus* against *Ptolemy Philopator*, the sonne of *Euergetes*. Of him (I meane *Antiochus Magnus*) the Angell prophecieth vnto the 20. vers. to wit, of his battailes first with *Ptolemy Philopator*, and those sometimes prosperous, whereby hee recovered *Syria*, vers. 10. sometime aduerse, whereby he lost the same again, vers. 11. 12.

Where-

Wherevpon *Ptolemy* being lift vp. becometh the 7. horne, and killeth many of the Iewes, for which hee shall not prosper, vers. 12. After, of his battailes and victories against *Ptolemy Epiphanes* sonne of *Philopator*, vers. 13. 14. 15. Of vers. 13. his afflicting the lande thereby that is *Iewry*, vers. 16. as 14. 15. being the eight houre: of his giuing his daughter *Cleopatra* to *Ptolemy Epiphanes* to mingle the yron and the clay (according to the prophetic, chapter 2.) therein pretending peace and friendship, but intending by her his destruction, although in vaine, sheioyning with her husband against her father, vers. 17. 17. Of his expeditions into the Ilandes of *Greece*, and conquering them. Of his warres with the *Romaines*, which brought shame vpon him, they making him to sit downe with dishonourable conditions, vers. 18. Of his ignominious ende, namely in a Barbarian tumult for sacriledge, vers. 19. In his place succeedeth his sonne *Seleucus Philopator* (the ninth horne) one who did pill and poll his subiects by great tributes and exactions, and sent to emptie and exhaust the treasury and temple of *Ierusalem*: and hauing set free his brother *Antiochus Epiphanes*, who was an hostage at *Rome*, and in stead of him sent his owne sonne *Demetrius*, is shortly after poisoned by *Heliodorus*, suborned by *Antiochus Epiphanes*, vers. 20.

8 Now in his place (saith the Angell, vers. 21.) shall stand a vile person, &c. that is, in the kingdome of *Syria*, a vile person shall succeed *Seleucus Philopator* as the tenth horn, which cannot be vnderstood properly of any other but of *Antiochus Epiphanes*, who in the rest of the chapt. to the end, is most fully & plainly described. For first he intreateth of his coming vnto the kingdome: secondly of his affaires afterwards: and lastly of his end. Of his coming vnto the kingdome he saith, that hauing no right of succession (for *Demetrius* was the heire) nor lawfull election, by flattery & fraude attained to the kingdome, pretending himselfe (as *Richard* the third did) to be the tutor & protector of the young Prince *Demetrius*, and Administrator of the kingdome during the minoritic and absence of *Demetrius*, who had bene sent in his stead as an hostage to *Rome*.

Wherefore:

Lib. 3. cap.
21.

Wherefore *Daniel* in this place speaketh not of Antichrist, vnlesse we may say, that Antichrist was to be the immediate successor of *Selencus Philopater*, which is ridiculous; yea, and *Bellarmino* himselfe confesseth else-where, that in this latter part of the chapter, *Daniel* speaketh of *Antiochus* literally, who was a figure of Antichrist. This place therefore doth not proue *Bellarmines* proposition, namely, that Antichrist arising from most base estate, should by fraud obtaine the kingdome of the Iewes. Neither doth this proposition fit *Antiochus*, who is here described; neither is it agreeable to the description it selfe. For neither did *Antiochus* arise from most base estate, for hee was sonne to *Antiochus* the great, and brother to *Selencus Philopater*: Neither doth *Daniel* say so, but onely that *Antiochus* a vile or despised person should succcede *Selencus Philopater*; which is to be vnderstood not in respect of his base estate and condition, but of his base manners and vile conditions, in regard whereof the holy Ghost calleth him, although a great Kings sonne, vile and contemptible. And so is euery wicked man, though mightie in the world, a vile and despised person in the eyes of the godly, *Psalm* 15. 4. *The wicked man is vile in his eyes*, And as *Solomon* saith: *The wicked man is an abomination vnto the righteous*. Such an one was *Haman* in the eyes of *Mardochee*, and *Iehoram* the wicked king of *Israel* in the eyes of *Elixeus*. So that it was not the base condition, but the vices and base conditions of *Antiochus* that made him vile, in respect whereof *Polybius* calleth him *impudens*. So is *Selencus Philopater*, verse. 20. in the vulgar translation called *Vilissimus*, because of his base polling of his people, and not because hee did arise from base estate. Wherefore it is euident, that *Daniel* speaketh not of Antichrist in this place, and that he of whom he speaketh, did not arise from most base estate, as *Bellarmino* would beare vs in hand; vnlesse it be a most base estate to bee the sonne of a mightie King, who for his greatnesse was called *Antiochus* the great.

Pro. 21. 27.
Hess. 3.
2. King. 3.
13. 14.

9 But will you see with one view the absurditie of this Popish argument. Hee proueth from this place, that Antichrist shall arise from most base estate, and shall by deceit obtaine the

the kingdome of the Iewes. But (say I) *Daniel* speaketh not of Antichrist, but of *Antiochus Epiphanes*. Yea but *Antiochus* was a type of Antichrist. Be it that hee was a type not onely in some other things, but also in this particular; yet from hence we must inferre not the selfe same particular which is proper to the person of *Antiochus*, but the like, and that by way of allegory onely, which were but a sleight argument to proue so weightie a controuerfie in diuinitie. Whereas therefore he inferreth from hence not the like (viz. as *Antiochus* obtained his kingdome by fraude: so shall Antichrist obtaine his) but the verie same particular, (viz. as *Antiochus* obtained the kingdome of the Iewes, so shall Antichrist obtaine the same kingdome of the Iewes) his argument is ridiculous: and yet this is not all the absurditie of this argument: for when as from the likenesse of Antichrist to his type, he would proue that Antichrist shall arise from base estate, this assertion is not true, of the type it selfe. Yea but *Ierome* saith, that this place may better be vnderstood of Antichrist, *Qui consurgere habet de modica gente id est de populo Iudaorum, &c. Who is to arise of a small nation, that is, the people of the Iewes, &c.* and *Daniel* compareth Antichrist because of his base beginning to the little horne, chap. 7. I doe not denie but that Antichristes beginning might be base, but yet neither can the testimony of *Ierome*, neither doth that allegation out of *Daniel*, proue it. For *Ieromes* testimony in this case, if it ought to be of weight with vs, it must be taken either as a prophetic, or else as a fit exposition of *Daniels* prophetic, as I haue said heretofore. But *Ierome* was no Prophet: neither doth hee fitly expound *Daniel*, who speaketh plainly, not of Antichrist, but of the successor of *Selencus Philopater*. And it is a wonder that *Ierome* one of the most learned of the Fathers, should in so easie a matter be ouerseene. For seeing hee confesseth that the former part of the chapter is to be expounded of the *Selencide*, and that in the 20. verse is described *Selencus Philopater*, for so hee saith on those wordes (*Et stabit in loco eius vilissimus*) *Selencum dicti cognomento Philopatorem, filium magni Antiochi*, he speaketh of *Selencus*, surnamed *Philopater*, the sonne of *Antiochus* the great. M It is

It is therefore most plaine, that when *Daniel* saith, *and in his place shall stand a vile person*, he speaketh of the next successour of *Seleucus Philopator*, meaning *Antiochus*, even as in the 20. verse after he had spoken of *Antiochus Magnus*, he saith, *and in his place shall stand up a sower forth of an extortioner*, meaning *Seleucus*. Neither doth *Daniel* say any where, that Antichrist, or he of whom he speaketh, shall arise of a small nation, meaning thereby the Iewes: that which he speaketh *de medico populo*, vers. 23, is to be vnderstood properly as *Ierome* himselfe expoundeth it, according to the literal, that is, the proper sense, of the small company wherewith *Antiochus* surprised *Egypt*: neither can there be any such allegorical sense, as he seemeth to frame. Neither doth *Daniel* by the little horne meane any other but *Antiochus Epiphanes*, who may not vnjustly in diuers things be said to haue bene a type of Antichrist. For the terrible beast with ten hornes, doth not signifie the Romane state as the Papists would haue it, but the kingdome of the *Seleucide* and *Lagide*: and by the ten hornes, not the ten Kings whereof *Iohn* speaketh, *Apoc. 17.* among whom the Romane Empire was to be diuided; but ten of these Kings, viz. three *Lagide*, and seven *Seleucide*, which tyrannized or ruled ouer the people of God. The tenth, that is to say, the last of them that had dominion ouer *Iudea* was, not Antichrist, but *Antiochus Epiphanes*, who in crueltie towards the people of God surpassed all that went before him.

IO Which I speake not as though this exposition did much hinder our assertion; for others which haue held the same, haue applied those things which are spoken of the little horne, vnto the Pope. And surely if this fourth beast were the Romane state, and the hornes the rulers thereof, and the tenth or last horne Antichrist: then is it hereby very likely that the Pope is Antichrist, seeing hitherto hee is the last that hath ruled in *Rome*, and shall according to the Papists owne conceit continue to the end. But the truth is, that the description of the fourth beast doth not agree to the Romanes, but to the kingdome of the *Seleucide*. For this fourth beast was a kingdome which was to haue an end before the coming of the *Messias* & his kingdome,

dome, chap. 7. vers. 11. 26. 27. So had the kingdome of the *Seleucide*, so had not the Romanes. 2. This fourth beast warred with the Iewes, tyrannized ouer them, and hindred their religion & worship of God at *Ierusalem*, not only before the coming of Christ, but also before the purging of the temple, and restitution of religion by *Iudas Maccabaeus*, cha. 7. vers. 25. 26. 27. So did the *Seleucide*, so did not the Romanes. 3. Of the fourth beast there were but ten hornes, that is Princes that ruled ouer *Iudea*, which is most true of the *Seleucide* & *Lagide*; but of the Romanes, after they had once obtained the dominion of *Iury*, there were many more then ten that ruled ouer the holy land. If any say the Romane Empire is figured *Apoc. 17.* by a beast with ten hornes, I answer, that the ten hornes wherof *Iohn* speaketh, *Apoc. 17. 12.* are ten kings, among whom the Romane Empire was to be diuided, who succeeded not one another in the same kingdome, but were rulers of so many seuerall prouinces or kingdoms at the same time: but these ten hornes tyrannized ouer the same kingdome of the Iewes successiue, as they are particularly described, chap. 11. And further, he that in *Daniel* is supposed by the Papists to be Antichrist, is one of the tenne hornes, but in *Iohn* not. 4. that which is spoken in *Daniel* of the tenth horne, doth fully & wholly agree to *Antiochus Epiphanes*, who was the tenth and last king of that kingdome, that ruled ouer *Iudea*, but the same things cannot in like sort be applied to the tenth Prince of the Romanes. 5. By conference of that which is written of the little horne, chap. 7. with those things which are more plainly recorded of *Antiochus*, chap. 8. 23. &c. and chap. 11. 21. &c. to the end of the chapter, it appeareth euidently, that he & no other is that little horne. For whereas *Daniel* in the 7. chap. had described 3. kingdomes besides the Babylonian, which should tyrannize ouer the Iewes by three beasts: in the 8. chap. he figureth the same 3. kingdomes by 2. beasts. For the kingdome of the Medes & Persians which before was resembled by a Beare, is here signified by the Ramme with 2. hornes: the kingdome of the Macedonians & *Seleucide*, which before were represented by two seuerall beasts, are here figured by the Goate Bucke, containing them both.

for both the Macedonians and *Seleucida* were *Ianan*, that is, the Greekes, *Daniel*. 8. 21. And as in the 7. chapter, the kingdom of the Macedonians was signified by a Leopard which had foure heads: so here it is saide, that after the great horne signifying *Alexander* the great was broken off, there grew foure hornes in stead thereof, meaning the foure Princes among whom the Macedonian Monarchy was diuided. The fourth kingdom figured chap. 7. by the heall with 10. hornes, is here signified to be that kingdom which was chiefly erected by one of those foure hornes, namely *Seleucus*, that is, the kingdom of the *Seleucida*: and from him, namely in the end of their kingdom ouer the Iewes, came forth a little horne, that is, the king with the impudent face, chap. 8. verse. 9. 23. which is *Antiochus Epiphanes*, who was the tenth horne of the fourth beast. And in the eleventh chapter without figures of beastes the same three kingdoms are described, the same tenne hornes reckned vp, the same tenth horne more particularly decipled. 6. The people pusht at and oppressed by these hornes, is *Daniels* people, the people of the Iewes yet remaining and inhabiting in *Tzeby*, that is in *Iury* and *Ierusalem*, not onely before the desolation of *Ierusalem*, but also before the reformation vnder *Iudas Macchabeus*. But Antichrist, if we will beleue the Papists, shall be the counterfeite Messias of the Iewes, neither shall hee afflict the Iewes, but by them the Christians, and that in the ende of the worlde, &c. 7. The times of afflicting the people of God assigned to the little horne, doe precisely agree to the persecution vnder *Antiochus*. But these times are diuersly to be reckened in respect either of the beginning, or the end of the account. For as touching the beginning, we reckon either from the defection and revolt of the people wrought by *Menelans* the priest, in the year 142. the sixt moneth, and sixt day, vnto the restitution of Religion, in the year 148. and 25. day of the ninth moneth, and this space is 2300. dayes, (that is 6. moneths, 3. yeares, 18. dayes) foretold *Dan*. 8. 14. or else we reckon from the pollutiō of the temple, and erection of the new altar, & abolishing of the daily sacrifice, to wit, in the 145.

yeare.

yeare of the *Seleucida*, on the 15. of *Casten*, diuersly in respect of the ende, *viz.* either to the restitution begunne by *Iudas Macchabeus*, in the 25. of the same moneth *Casten*, in the year 148. 119. 16. 12. which space is called a time and times, and parcell of time, that is, three yeares and tenne daies: or if we reade a time and times and halfe a time, we may reckon vnto the time of that victorie which *Macchabeus* and the Iewes had against the Armies of *Antiochus*, whereby his instauration of Religion was secured and confirmed, and *Antiochus* his Armies were expelled out of *Iury*, which as *Iosephus* noteth, was done after three yeares and sixe moneths: or if we reckon to the time that *Antiochus* hauing heard of these and some other overthrowes of his Armies after his owne discomfiture and flight from *Persopolis*, was stricken by the hand of God, and promised all good things to the Iewes, it is 1290. dayes; if to his death, 1335. By all which considerations, it appeareth that *Daniel* by the fourth beast vnderstandeth not the Romane Monarchy, but the kingdom of the *Seleucida*, and *Lagide*: nor by the tenth horne Antichrist properly, but *Antiochus Epiphanes*.

II Thus much therefore may suffice to haue spoken of his proposition: now let vs briefly consider of the assumption. *The Pope* (saith he) *ariseth not from base estate, neither by deceit obtaineth his kingdom.* As touching the former I answered, that although it were false of *Antiochus*, yet is it true of the Pope, whether you consider the meane estate of the first Bishops of *Rome*, or the base birth and obscure parentage of diuers Popes. For that which *Bellarmino* alledgeth in commendation of the Primitiue religion, and auncient church of *Rome*, is but a vaine flourish, nothing appertaining to this purpose. 2. That the Pope hath not attained to his kingdom by fraude and deceit, *Bellarmino* had rather it should be taken for graunted, then once called in question: and therefore cunningly passeth it ouer with silence. But if this were set downe in the scriptures as a badge of Antichrist, to attain to his greatness by fraude & deceit, I would make it manifest, that neuer in any estate more deep policy, and diuelliſh deceit hath bene

M 3

vsd

used then in the See of Rome, whereby they have obtained their supremacy, and maintained their soueraignty over the Christian world. Yea their whole religion of Popery and mystery of iniquitie, seemeth to be nought else but a packe of policy deuised by worldly men to deifie the Pope, and to enrich the popish cleergy. For wherevnto else I beseech you tended their Indulgences and Pardons, their lubbies, their doctrines of merits & supererogation, their purgatory, their trentalls of Masses, and praier for the dead, their pilgrimages and adoration of Saints, Images, and reliques, their licences and dispensations, their thunderbolts of excommunication, their oathe of allegiance and fealtie imposed on Princes and potentates, subiection to the Pope enforced vpon all sorts, as absolutely necessary to saluation, their wilfull deprauations of scriptures, forgeries of Canons, countefeit donations of *Constantine* and others, to proue the double supremacy of the Pope? When vnto tended his often maintaining of quarrells among Christian Princes, his warres inioyned them for the recovery of the holy laude, but that they being by these meanes weakened, might be the more easily subdued vnto himselfe: his Croisades and promises of heauen, to all those that fight such battailes as like him? Haue not their cleergy come to their riches, and the Pope to his greatnes by these and such like meanes? But because the coming to his greatnes by fraude and deceit, is not set downe in the scriptures as a note of Antichrist, vnlesse it be by way of type and allegory in *Antiochus*, I will therefore let it passe: onely let me put you in minde that the prophetic of *Peter* in the former respects is performed in the Pope and cleergy of Rome, who by fained words make merchandise of mens soules through couetousnesse. And this was *Belshazzar* his first instance.

12 His seconde argument is thus to be framed. *Antichrist shall warre with three Kings, to wit of Egypt, Libya, and Ethiopia; and hauing overcome them, shall possesse their kingdomes. But the Pope of Rome hath not warred at any time (he should say, shall not warre, and that is more then hee is able to proue)*

(proue) with the Kings of Egypt, Libya, and Ethiopia, neither hauing vanquished them, hath possessed their kingdomes, therefore the Pope of Rome is not Antichrist. And in this argument *Belshazzar* doth so greatly please himselfe, that after an insulting manner hee breaketh forth into these bragges: *Hoc autem maxime refellit insaniam hereticorum, &c. This especially refuteth the madnesse of heretikes, who make the Pope Antichrist. For let them say if they can, when the Pope hath killed the Kings of Egypt, Libya, and Ethiopia, &c. What would this Thraso do to thinke you, if hee had any good argument against vs, that thus insulteth vpon a meere dotage? For where doth the scripture say, that Antichrist shall fight with the Kings of Egypt, Libya, and Ethiopia, and that hauing vanquished them, he shall possesse their kingdomes? Forsooth in the 7. and 11. of Daniel. In the 7. chapter Daniel speaking of the tenne hornes of the fourth beast, he saith, verse. 8. I considered the hornes, and loe the last horn came up, a little one among them, and thre of the former hornes were pluckt up before it. And after, verse. 24. expounding the same words, hee saith: And the tenne hornes are tenne Kings of that kingdom, after whom shall arise the last (namely of the tenne) diuerse from the rest, and he shall abase thre Kings.*

But this allegation is impertinent. For I haue shewed that this fourth beast is the kingdom of the *Seleucidae* and *Lagidae*; that the tenne hornes are those tenne Kings of that kingdom which tyrannized or ruled ouer Iewry; that the tenth or last of them that tyrannized ouer the Iewes, was *Antiochus Epiphanes*, who is therefore called little before his coming to the crowne, because of his vnlikenesse to be King. First because hee was the third and youngest sonne of *Antiochus Magnus*, his elder brother *Seleucus* hauing also a sonne called *Demetrius*. Secondly, because he was to be a perpetuall hostage at Rome. For when as other hostages, which *Antiochus* the great gaue to the Romanes, were to be changed every third yeare, he was to be a perpetuall hostage. And thirdly, because of his vile and base conditions. Now whereas it is saide that thre

hornes were to be plucked vp before him, wee are by those three hornes to vnderstand three kings, not of others, & those also diuers kingdomes, as of *Egypt*, *Libya*, and *Aethiopia*; but three kings that successiue had ruled before him in the same kingdom vnder the Iewes, as being expressly called three former hornes, viz. of the tenne, verse 8. *Tertius Antiochus was a type of Antichrist*. It cannot be proued that he was a type in this point, or if he were a type in this, we may not inferre the same particular as *Bellarmino* doth, for then those three kings mentioned in *Daniel*, must be reuiued againe, that Antichrist may make them away: but the like might be inferred, viz. that as *Antiochus Epiphanes* to make himselfe a way to the kingdom, did make away his brother and two others that went before him: so it is not vnlike, but that this should be an Antichristian practise. It is well knowne that *Gregory* the seuenth, who resembled *Antiochus* in many things, to make himselfe a way to the Papacy, made away sixe of his predecessors by poyson. And it is an ordinary practise among the Cardinales of *Rome* that aspire to the Papacy, now and then to minister an Italian Figge to their Popes: that you may not maruell that there haue bene nine Popes in the time of *Queene Elizabeth* raigne, of whom the three next predecessors of the present Pope *Clement 8.* were so suddenly plucked vp before him, namely *Urbanus 7.* *Gregory 14.* and *Innocent 9.* that I suppose their names haue bene heard of fewe among vs.

13 But the 11. of *Daniel*, perhaps will proue *Bellarmines* assertion. That allegation will proue nothing but *Bellarmines* wilfull blindness. Hee saith that in the 11. chapter vers. 43. *Daniel* explaneth who those three Kings are. Hee shall stretch out his hand ouer countreies, and the land of *Egypt* shall not escape, and he shall passe through *Libya* and *Aethiopia*, as *Bellarmino* readeth, but according to the Hebrew, the *Lubim* and *Cushim*, that is, the *Libyans* and *Aethiopians* shall be in his passages or voyages. Whence *Bellarmino* inferreth, that Antichrist shall kill three kings, viz. of *Egypt*, *Libya*, and *Aethiopia*.

Answer,

Answer. 1. *Daniel* speaketh not of Antichrist but of *Antiochus*, as I haue manifestly proued. 2. although *Antiochus* were graunted to haue bene a type of Antichrist herein, yet the same particular which is proper to the person of *Antiochus*, may not be applied to Antichrist. For then we must dreame that the world and the kingdomes thereof, must be brought againe iust to the same palle wherein they were when *Antiochus* raigned, and the same kings to be reuiued; but something like might be applied, that as *Antiochus*, in *Bellarmines* conceit, suppressed three kings, so Antichrist should be a suppressor of kings, which is true of the Pope: who besides diuers kings deposed by his meanes, hath also deprelled foure Emperours at the least, as *Bellarmino* himselfe confelleth. 3. *Daniel* in this place is so saue from mentioning three kings slaine by Antichrist according to *Bellarmines* conceit, that he neither speaketh of Antichrist, nor of three kings, nor of the killing of any one king, but onely of *Antiochus* his spoyling of *Egypt*, hauing in his company the *Libyans* and *Aethiopians*. Whether therefore this argument of *Bellarmino* doth reprove our madnesse, or rather proue his folly, let any indifferent arbiter be Iudge. Now if *Ierome* or any other of the Fathers haue let fall any such thing, we are to esteeme it as an excrement of theirs, which we are to passe by, rather then with the *Cacophony* the Papists, to gather it vp as *Cacophony*, fit foode for their soules.

14 And the like answer we frame vnto his third argument, which is not grounded vpon the scriptures; but vpon the bare coniectures of some of the Fathers. For where is there in all the scriptures any word of this which *Bellarmino* as an assertion saith he readeth in the scriptures, that Antichrist shall subdue several other kings, and by that meanes shall become the Monarch ius vesca of the whole worlde? Forsooth *Lactantius* and *Irenaeus* say so. But I neuer tooke their writings before to be the scriptures. Why then *Ierome* saith so vpon *Daniel* 11. 24. where *Daniel* speaketh of *Antiochus* his dealing in *Egypt*, that he did that which his forefathers neuer did; *Nullus Indorum absque Antichristo in tota unquam orbe regnauit*. These be *Bellarmines*

miners scriptures. But where do the scriptures indeede say that Antichrist shall subdue seven of the tenne Kings? Nay, the contrary may rather bee gathered out of the scriptures. The tenne hornes whereof *Daniel* speaketh, were tenne Kings which successively reigned over *Judaea*, as hath bene shewed. And although *Antiochus Epiphanes* might helpe away three of his next predecessors, yet hee could not hurt the other sixe (for there were but nine besides himselfe) which were all dead and gone before he came to yeares. Yea, but this opinion of the Fathers is plainly enough deduced out of *Apoc. 17. 12.* where we reade, and the tenne hornes which thou sawest, are tenne Kings; these haue one minde, and they shall giue their power and authoritie to the beast.

No manuell though some of the Papists call the scripture a nose of waxe, seeing they can frame and fashion it at their pleasure, and giue vnto it what sense they list. Doth *John* speake of Antichrist his either killing three, or subduing seven? Or doth *John* speake of the same tenne hornes whereof *Daniel* doth? *Daniel* speaketh of tenne Kings which were to bee dead and gone before the coming of the Messias; *John* speaketh of such as in his time had not yet attained to their kingdome, verse 12. *Daniel* speaketh of tenne Kings of the *Selencide* and *Lagide* which succeeded one an other. *John*, of tenne Kings among whom the *Romane* Empire was to be diuided, who also were to haue their kingdome together with the beast. *Daniel* telleth vs what the little horn which was one of the tenne, should doo to three of the other nine, without mention of the rest, *John* sheweth what all the tenne hornes should doo to Antichrist, which is none of the tenne hornes, but one of the heades of the beast. If therefore *Bellarmino* can proue from hence that these are the same tenne hornes spoken of in *Daniel*, and that Antichrist shall kill three of them, & subdue the other seven, he may hope to proue any thing.

But what other scriptures hath hee? forsooth *Chrysostome* and *Cyrill*. For *Chrysostome* on 2. *Thess. 2.* saith, that Antichrist shall bee a Monarch, and shall succede the *Romanes* in the

the Monarchy, as the *Romanes* succeeded the *Greekes*; the *Greekes* succeeded the *Persians*, and they the *Assyrians*. And *Cyrill* saith, that Antichrist shall obtaine the Monarchy *Catech. 15* which was the *Romanes*. I answer, that for substance these Fathers held the truth. For what Monarch hath there bene in the West these five or sixe hundred yeares, besides the Pope, who calleth himselfe King of Kings, and Lorde of Lords, to whom all power is giuen in heauen and in earth, who hath as they say, the double Monarchy both of spirituall and temporal power; who forsooth is Lord of the whole earth, in so much that he taketh vpon him authoritie to dispose of the new found world. And that he succedeth the Emperors in the government of *Rome*, as it becometh Antichrist, who is the second beast, *Apoc. 13.* and the 7. head of the beast, *Apoc. 17.* whereof the Emperour was the sixt, I shall not neede to proue.

15 There remaineth the fourth argument. Antichrist shall persecute with an innumerable army the Christians throughout the world, and this is the battell of Gog and Magog; but thou agreest not to the Pope, therefore the Pope is not Antichrist. I answer to the proposition, that no such thing can be proued out of the scripture. Hee alledgeth *Ezech. 38. & 39. & Apoc. 20. 7. 8. 9. 10.* But *Ezechiel* speaketh not of Antichrist, nor of the persecution of the Christian Church by him. But hauing foretold chapter 37. the restitution of the *Iewes* from the *Babylonian* captiuitie, and also prophesied of the coming of Christ; in those chapters hee foretelleth of the afflictions and troubles which the people of the *Iewes* should sustaine in the meane time, to wit, after their returne out of captiuitie, before the coming of the Messias, and withall, denounceth the iudgements of God against the *Selencide*, who were the kings of *Syria* and *Asia* minor, and their adherents, who should be the chiefe enemies of the church, and people of the *Iewes* after their returne. For *Gog* signifieth *Asia* minor, hauing that name from *Gyges* the King thereof. *Magog* is *Hierapolis* the chiefe seate of Idolatry in *Syria*, built by the *Scythians*, and fro them hath that name.

Alexand.
6.

Plin. lib. 5.
cap. 23.

Ad Tre-
mell. &
Iun. in E-
zech. 38.
c. 39.

name. So that by the land of *Magog*, wee are to vnderstand *Syria*; and by *Gog*, *Asia* minor. And the rest of the peoples that are named in *Ezechiel*, were such as assisted the *Selencidae* (who were the kings of *Syria*, and *Asia* minor) in their warres, either as their subiects, or as their friends, or as their mercenary soldiers. And for as much as the princes and people of *Syria* and *Asia* minor, were the most grievous enemies of the Jewes, by whom they sustained the chiefest calamities after their returne before the coming of Christ: therefore by an vsuall speech in the Iewish language, the mortall and deadly enemies of the church, are called *Gog* and *Magog*. And in this sense *Iohn* the Diuine vseth these names, *Gog* and *Magog*, to signifie the enemies of the church, meaning not the same enemies whereof *Ezechiel* speaketh, but the like enemies of the Church, which should afflict the true Christians, as *Gog* and *Magog* afflicted the Jewes. Neither doth *Iohn* in this place speake of the persecution of Antichrist properly, but of Sathan (after he was loosed) his inciting the enemies of the Church to battell, and of Gods iudgements against them, signified by fire. And so much shall suffice to haue answered to this argument. For after so long a Treatise I will not trouble the Reader with the tenne feuerall opinions which *Bellarmino* reciteth concerning *Gog* and *Magog*, neither yet with any further answer to his cauillations and exceptions against some of the arguments of diuers Protestants, which he thought were more easie to answer: seeing in the former booke I haue sufficiently cleared those arguments whereby the Pope is more evidently proued to be Antichrist: neither is the controuersie betwixt vs, whether every argument that hath bene produced by every one, doth necessarily conclude the Pope to be Antichrist. That discourse therefore being rather personall then real, I let it passe.

Chap.

Chap. 17. Being the conclusion of the whole Treatise.



Having therefore both by sufficient arguments manifestly proued that the Pope is Antichrist, and by euidence of truth maintained the same assertion against the arguments of the Papists: let vs now consider in the last place, what conclusions may vpon this doctrine be necessarily inferred for our further vse. For first, if this be true, that

the Pope is Antichrist, as I haue proued; and the church of *Rome* that now is, *Babylon* the Synagogue of Antichrist: then all other controuersies betwixt vs and them, may be easily decided: their chiefe ground being the authoritie of their church, and of the See Apostolike. For then it is to be presumed, that those doctrines which are peculiar to the Pope and Church of *Rome*, are the errors of Antichrist; yea, and as the Apostle calleth them, *doctrines of diuels*.

1. Tim. 4.
2.

2 If the Romish church be Antichristian, then our separation from it is warranted, yea, commanded by the word of God, and all returning to it forbidden. *Apos. 18. 4. Come out of her my people, least partaking with her in her sinnes, you partake also in her punishment.*

3 If the Pope be Antichrist, then those that embrace that religion, and ioyne themselves to that church, acknowledging the Pope to be their head, receiue the marke of the beast. And those that do receiue the beasts marke (especially after he is reuealed) shall drinke of the wine of Gods wrath, and shall be punished with fire and brimstone before the holy Angels, and before the Lambe. *Apos. 14. 9.* This therefore must serue as a serious admonition, and necessary caueat both to reclaim all tractable Papists, and to confirme all wavering and vnstayed Protestants. The former, as they tender their saluation, so to come out of *Babylon*: The latter, as they will auoid their endles confusion, to keepe out of *Babylon*. For not onely to retaine the marke:

marke of the beast wilfully after he is discovered, but to reuolt from the profession of the truth vnto Antichristian religion: it also is a fearefull signe of reprobation. For it is impossible that the elect should finally be seduced by Antichrist. *Matth. 24. 24.* And the Apostle *Paul* obserueth, that Antichrist shall effectually deceime them that perish with all deceitfulness of iniquitie, because they have not receiued the loue of the truth, that they might be saued. And therefore God shall send them strong delusions, that they should beleue lies, that al they might be damned which beleue not the truth, but delighted in vnrightheousnesse. *2. Thess. 2. 10. 11. 12.* Whereupon *Chrysostome* also writing, hath these words, *in his knowledge againe, Antichrist preuaileth with Castawayes or such as perish.* And *Ierome* likewise, *They shall be seduced (saith hee) by the lies of Antichrist, who are prepared vnto perdition.* But on the other side, those which renounce the Pope and church of *Rome*, and rise frō the grave of Antichristianisme and Popery, and follow our Sauour Christ in the sincere profession of the truth, *Blessed and holy are they for they hauing part in the first resurrection, shall be freed from the second death:* And howsoever they are esteemed of the followers of Antichrist, as heretickes & schismatickes, which are to be persecuted with fire and faggot, yet are they happie in their life whiles they ioyne with Christ against Antichrist, for such are called, *elect and faithfull*, and redeemed out of the world; and they are also blessed in their death, dying in the quarrell of Christ against Antichrist: for of those specially doth the holy Ghost speake, *Apoc. 14. 13. Blessed are those that dye in the Lord, &c.*

*Ad Alca-
sina quest. 11.*

Apoc. 20. 6

Apoc. 17.

14.

Apoc. 14.

4.

4. If the Pope be Antichrist, then those that are found to be resolute Antichristians, that is recusant Papists; but especially Iesuites and Seminary Priests, which are sent to reconcile men vnto the Pope and Church of *Rome*, that is, (as hath bene proued) to set on them the marke of the beast, & consequently to brand them to destruction, and all such as seeke to peruert & seduce others, ought not to be fauoured or spared in a Christian common wealth. First, because they are limmes of Antichrist, and therefore by the commandement of God, we should do

do to them as they haue done to vs. *Apoc. 18. 6.* Secondly, because they are enemies to God, and traitors to Christian Princes. They are enemies to God, not onely because themselves are Idolaters, and consequently such as hate God, *Ezed. 20. 5.* but also because they labour to withdrawe others from the true worship of God, vnto superstition and idolatrie, and therefore in no case ought to be spared, *Deut. 13. 5. 8.* They are traitors also to Christian Princes, being sworne vassalls to the Pope their capitall enemy. For hee esteemeth all Christian Princes that do not acknowledge him to be their head, as schismatickes or heretickes. And as he useth (so oft as he dares) to proceede against such foure wayes, viz. by excommunication, deposition, depriuing them of their temporall goods & possessions, and raising warre against them, so all Papists acknowledging the Popes supremacy, do hold both that he hath authoritie so to proceede against Christian Princes, and also that in his definitive sentence hee cannot erre. And therefore if they put not in execution the sentence of their holy Father, it is not for want of treasonable will, and rebellious affection towards their Prince, but for lacke of meanes and oportunitie. As for example, when *Pius 5.* had sent his Bull of excommunication against our late Soueraigne Queene of happie memorie, therein deposing her from her crowne, and absolving her subiects from their allegiance towards her, it is most certaine, that whatsoeuer many hollow hearted Papists pretended, yet fewe of them did acknowledge her for their lawfull Queene; and many of them thought it a meritorious worke to take away her life. And surely if not their persons, then much lesse ought their Antichristian religion, the mysterie of iniquitie, be tolerated in the Church of Christ. For what fellowship can there be betwixt light and darkenesse? or what agreement can the Temple of God haue with Idols?

5. If the Pope be Antichrist, and his Church Antichristian, then can there be no reconciliation betwixt vs & the church of *Rome*, we being, as often hath bene proued, the true church of God. For what agreement can there be betwixt Christ and Antichrist? Such neuters therefore shewe themselves to be

*Antonin.
sum. part.
3. tit. 22.
cap. 5. §. 11.*

*Antonin.
sum. part.
3. tit. 22.
cap. 5. §. 10.*

*Cypert.
pag. 182.
num. 8.*

2. Cor. 6.

nec ex finitis nisi finitū. 6. b. vñ tñ vnūqđqđ ē fm entitatē
 qđū includit. Si g̃ includit de entitate ifinitas entitates ē fm
 entitatē ifinitū. si g̃i p̃tinuo sūt ifinite ptes ip̃s erit ifinitū.
 ¶ Itē si i p̃tinuo eēt ifinite ptes oīs p̃tinua eēt eq̃lia sic
 qđ vnā p̃tinuū n̄ excederet aliū fm ptes. p̃ns ē falsū. qđ aīs.
 falsitas p̃tis p̃s. qm̃ nō vī pole qđ tot ptes sūt i mīllesima
 pte grani milij sic i toto vniuerso. nec est hoc mibi bñ capta
 bile. l̃z a multis oppo^o dicat. p̃ns pbat. Illa sūt eq̃lia qđ cō
 ponūtur ex p̃tib^o equalib^o magnitudie z multitudie. l̃z si in
 p̃tinuo existūt ptes ifinite actu cōponētur ex p̃tib^o equali
 bus multitudie z magnitudie. cū g̃ in q̃l̃z sūt ifinite ptes nō
 sūt ptes i vno q̃s i alio. qm̃ ifinitū nō excedit nec excedit ifini
 tū. z si sūt eq̃les i multitudie z magnitudie. qm̃ si ptes vnus
 eēt maiores q̃ ptes alteri^o ille maiores pnt diuidi i eq̃les
 ptes illis p̃tib^o cōtinui z i illo i quo excedūt maiores ptes ef
 femples q̃ ifinite. qđ est falsū. qm̃ i infinito nihil est maius.
 ¶ Et si dicat qđ tales nō eēt equales nec ieq̃les. qm̃ equa
 litas z inequalitas sūt passioēs quātitatis finite. ¶ Rñdeo
 z dico qđ l̃z nō sit eq̃litas qđ sit cōmēsuratio duarū quātitatū.
 qm̃ talis ē passio quātitatis finite ibi erit tñ eq̃litas. hoc est
 nō excessus. qm̃ ifinitū nec excedit ifinitū nec exceditur. g̃
 ptes vnus cōtinui nō excedūt ptes alteri^o cōtinui. nec totū
 excedit totū. ¶ Si at̃ vltra dicat qđ nō ē icōueniēs qđ sint
 i cōtinuo ifinite ptes ifinities. p̃ns. vñ. qm̃ ifinita magnitu
 do p̃tū nēcio accipit totā mltitudinē p̃tū. vñ vltra ifinitū
 i actu nihil ē. accepta g̃ semel multitudine ifinita partiū im
 pole ē qđ sint p̃tes. ¶ Et si dicat qđ i multitudine ifinita nō
 ē totū vī pars. Cōtra. talis multitudo ē diuisibilis. l̃z oē diui
 sibile bz ptes. qz nihil diuidit nisi i ea ex q̃b^o pponit. ¶ S̃z
 hic e vñ dubiū. qm̃ si situdo angelorū sub vna sp̃e possibiliū
 ē ifinita. certū ē at̃ qđ maior ē multitudo idiuiduorū possibi
 liū sub duab^o sp̃ibus q̃s sub vna tñ. g̃ ifinitū ē mai^o ifinito.
 ¶ Rñdeo z dico qđ nūq̃ ē possibilis mltitudo ifinita s̃z finita

me potētie. z isto mō act^o idē ē qđ in se existē z eē ex nihil.
 isto mō vnaq̃q̃ res creata ponit ex nihil z actū ita qđ nō ē
 vīute sue cāc tñ. Alio^o eē i actu idē ē qđ eē terminatū z cla
 us i sua p̃p̃ia ētate. z hoc mō accipit act^o ap̃bo. nono mō
 vbi dicit qđ act^o distiguit z sepat. ¶ Tūc ad rōes. ¶ Ad p̃m
 dico qđ l̃z actu ptes cōstituāt cōtinuū nō oīs qđ sint in actu
 s̃tictē terminato. sufficit. n. qđ dicāt actū p̃mo mō acceptū ē
 est qđ actu existāt extra nihil. ¶ Ad scōm dico. qđ p̃tes i
 cōtinuo sūt actu ens. tñ nō seq̃t qđ sint actu i suis realitat
 bus p̃p̃is clausē z terminatē. vñ oīs ista sūt vā. l̃z qđ ptes i cō
 tinuo sūt actu ens. z qđ actu cōstituūt cōtinuū z qđ sūt actu i
 tinuo. nō tñ seq̃t qđ sint i actu distincto nec terminato. n. a
 cipit ect^o fm qđ vt ē determinatio op̃ois toti^o. rō tñ accipit
 ibi act^o simplr. nō g̃ pnt actu cōstituere ifinitū. ¶ Ad tertū
 dico. qđ l̃z q̃l̃z ps i cōtinuo aī diuisione bēat formā nō tñ bē
 eā distictē qm̃ oēs ptes p̃currūt ad vnā formā totales ē
 ē i actu. sūt aut̃ multe forme i p̃o. ¶ Et qñ dī qđ for^o ē actus
 z act^o ē a for^o. Dico qđ act^o distict^o ē a forma totali z opletā
 si tñ a forma p̃iali. qm̃ imo eo qđ ps ē nō ē actu distincto z ter
 minato. nisi talis ps sit ip̃emet act^o. vñ l̃z vna ps vere negēt
 ab altera. pnta dicēdo bec nō ē illa. nō pp̃ hoc sūt distictē. l̃z
 distigibiles. ¶ Ad quartū dī. qđ cōtinuū ē diuisibile i ifini
 tū. z iō ē diuisibile i ptes quas bz. i ipo at̃ nō sūt ptes ifinite
 actu. l̃z finite i ifinitū sup̃te. z sic nō seq̃t qđ ei^o diuisio possit
 p̃sumari. ¶ Ex his g̃ qđ dī sūt in. z. b. i. q. de p̃tētia rerū.
 vbi bñ tractatū ē. vñ oēs ptes p̃tinui sint a deo cognite. ex
 his ē qđ dī sūt. z. b. q. d̃ ifinito. z ex his qđ dī sūt nūc recol
 lige hāc mām. i hac. n. mā oēs dubie loquunt^o z nūq̃ ab aliq̃
 doctore potui illā mām bñ itelligere. ¶ Quidā. n. bñ dicūt
 qđ sūt ifinities ifinite. Alter qđ i quol̃z sūt ifinite. ita qđ tot
 sūt ptes i mīllesima pte grani milij sicut i toto vniuerso. ego
 at̃ fm istā viā nō possū bñ euadere. qm̃ oporteat dare
 ifinito vīq̃quo de hac mā magis certū ē. qđ oīs ptes i cōtinuo
 sūt actu ens. z act^o ē a for^o. z act^o ē a forma totali z opletā.

et p̃p̃ia. z p̃p̃ia
 re. l̃z hoc ē ipo
 s̃z finite i
 uā: ita o
 dū. ¶
 act

diuidi claz est de se. sed qd sit ipse bare aliqua linea qd nō
possit diuidi in equales ptes. ps. qm oī linea data potest face
re de equalē. et ex illis duabz lineis pponere vna duplā ad
vtrāqz illaz: et quadruplā ad medietatē medietatis vni. et
de oīs lineis data pōt diuidi i duas lineas equales. s; pōt ps.
et si accipiat vna linea cōposita oīo ex indiuisibilibz pibus
data ex nouē: impossibile ē qd talis linea diuidat i duas ptes
qn sint i vna pte ptes qz i alia nisi nona ps diuideret. g. cē.
Alia rō demōstrat. ¶ Octaua rō. si cōtinuū pponeret ex in
diuisibilibz. cē. seqret qd indiuisibile diuideret. aut qd tota ro
mota nō ēēt mota tota. vtrūqz ē impole. g. cē. oīa pbat.
¶ Ad cui⁹ euidentiam suppono qd ptes extrītes supra extre
mā rote veloci⁹ mouerent qz qd sūt iux mediū. qz maiorē cir
culū hnt facere i eodē tpe aut i equatū. accipio g. qd ps indiu
isibilis extrema moueat p vnu arborū. tūc ps qd est iux me
diū mouet. aut nō. si non. g. tota rota nō mouet. qz nō oēs p
tes sue mouerent. si aut mouet p min⁹ qz ps cōtra sup extre
mū sed illō mouet p arborū vt suppositū ē. g. ista mouebit
p min⁹ qz p arborū. et sic indiuisibile ē diuisibile. ¶ Nono
arguo sic. si pminū cē. seqret qd indiuisibile diuideret. vel qd
totū celū nō moueret. vtrūqz ē ipole. g. cē. oīa pbat.
¶ Ad cui⁹ euidentia suppono. qd ptes celi qd sūt iux cogniti
uā circuli veloci⁹ mouerent qz ptes qd sūt iux poli. qz i eq
li tpe. i die nāli hnt facere maiorē circulū. si g. celū cōpon
tur ex indiuisibilibz accipio prem indiuisibile iux cognitiuā
qd mouet per vnu arborū. tūc indiuisibile qd ē iux polū
vel mouet. vel nō. si nō. g. totū celū non mouet simul. si mo
ueatur mouet nēcio per min⁹ qz per arborū. qz mouet tar
di⁹ qz pars epistēs iuxta cognitiuā. g. indiuisibile diuide: cē.
¶ Decio sic. si pminū pponeret ex indiuisibilibz cē. legatur qd
indiuisibile diuideret. vel qd mobile tardius trāset cōle spa
tiū veloci⁹: imobili. vel qd nullo mō moueat etiā dū moue
at. qd istoz iplicat contradictōem. g. illud ex quo istō seqr.

terius medij: sic qd sp accipiat fm medietatē. ¶ Ad cui⁹
perfectā euidentia ē intelligēdū qd dicunt ptes eiusdē pportio
nis et qd eiusdē qtitatis. ¶ 2^o quare sic appellatur. ¶ De p
oibus alijs modis ptermisus vnu modū imaginādi imagia
tus suz satis mihi claz. s. qd ptes eiusdē qtitatis dicunt il
le i qbus pōt reperiri aliq vna certa mēsurā ipsas potēs red
dere ita qd ex replicatōe b^o talis mēsure partes pnt redde
re totū. et p oīs pnti vtr sit vna qtitas. vt decem palmoz
pōt reperiri aliq certa mēsurā q reddat certas partes i nūe
ro. vt in qtitate decē palmoz vna palma p replicatiōe ei⁹
decies cōsumet totā illā magnitudinē. ¶ 3^o partes eiusdē
pportōis dicuntur esse ille qbus nō pōt repiri aliqua vna ta
lis mēsurā certa: p cuius replicatiōe reddūt oēs ille ptes et
cōsumat totū illud fm duas ptes. ¶ Quis rō est qm cū il
le ptes nō sint i numero certo et determinato. imo ponūt cō
muniter infinite. id qm i finio repugnat talis mēsurā et talis
cōsumatio. g. cē. 3^o quare sic appellat. ¶ Rūdeo. vbi sciē
dū qd cōparatōes q sūt i magnitudinibus declarāt p aliq
cōparatiōē factā i numeris: ita qd sicut in nūcis datū par
tes eiusdē pportōis et eiusdē qtitatis: ita i magnitudini
bus. ¶ Pro c^o euidentia sunt aliq intelligēda. p ē intelligēdū
qd pportio ē multiplex. Quēdā est pportio dupla vt qd cōti
net aliud bis. sic se hnt qtuor ad duo et sex ad tria. ¶ Alia ē
pportio sexgaltera et vocat emiola. i. eglatera ab Ari. i m
tis locis: et qd aliqd pntet aliud et medietatē illi: sic se hnt
tria ad duo et sex ad qtuor cē. ¶ Alia ē pportio sexgertia
qd aliqd pntet totū aliud et tria ptes eiusdē sicut se hnt q
tuor ad tria. Alia est pportio sexgquarta vt quādo aliqd cō
tinet aliud et quartā partē eius sic se hnt qnqz ad quatuor
sic multiplicatur pportōes i infinitū. ¶ 2^o notādū qd duplex
ē pportōalitas s; pbylosophū. s. et bico. s. geometrica et ari
metrica. ¶ In pportōe geometrica attēdit excessus n s; q
titatē s; s; pportōes vt sic se hnt sex ad qtuor: ita eodē