THE RELIGION OF PROTESTANTS A SAFE VVAY TO SALVATION.

OR

AN ANSVVER TO A BOOKE ENTITLED MERCY AND TRVTH, Or, Charity maintain'd by Catholiques, Which pretends to prove the Contrary.

By WILLIAM CHILLINGWORTH Master *of Arts of the Univerſity of* OXFORD.

Iſaac. Caſaubon. in Epiſt. ad Card. *Perron.* Regis IACOBI nomine ſcriptâ,

Rex arbitratur, rerum abſolutè neceſſariarum ad ſalutem, non magnum eſſe numerum. Quare exiſtimat ejus Majeſtas, nullam ad ineundam concordiam breviorem viam fore, quàm ſi diligenter ſeparentur neceſſaria à non neceſſariis, & ut de neceſſariis conveniat, omnis opera inſumatur: in non neceſſariis libertati Chriſtianæ locus detur. Simpliciter neceſſaria Rex appellat, quæ vel expreſſe verbum Dei præcipit credenda faciendave, vel ex verbo Dei neceſſariâ conſequentiâ vetus Eccleſia elicuit.---Si ad decidendas hodiernas Controverſias hæc diſtinctio adhiberetur, & jus divinum à poſitivo ſeu Eccleſiaſtico candidè ſepararetur; non videtur de iis quæ ſunt abſolutè neceſſaria, inter pios & moderatos viros, longa aut acris contentio futura. Nam & pauca illa ſunt, ut modò dicebamus, & fere ex æquo omnibus probantur, qui ſe Chriſtianos dici poſtulant. Atq; iſtam diſtinctionem Sereniſſ. Rex tanti putat eſſe momenti ad minuendas Controverſias, quæ hodie Eccleſiam Dei tantopere exercent, ut omnium pacis ſtudioſorum judicet officium eſſe, diligentiſſimè hanc explicare, docere, urgere.

OXFORD

Printed by LEONARD LICHFIELD, and are to be ſold by *John Clarke* under St *Peters* Church in *Corn-hill.*

Anno Salutis M. DC. XXXVIII.

TO THE MOST HIGH AND MIGHTY PRINCE, CHARLES

By the Grace of God, KING of great *Britaine, France & Ireland, Defendor of the Faith &c.*

May it pleaſe your moſt excellent Majeſty,

I Preſent, with all humility, to Your moſt ſacred hands, a Defence of that Cauſe which is & ought to be infinitely dearer to you, then all the world: Not doubting but upon this Dedication I ſhall be cenſur'd for a double boldneſſe; both for undertaking ſo great a Work, ſo far beyond my weak abilities, and againe, for preſenting it to ſuch a Patron, whoſe judgement I ought to fear more then any Adverſary. But for the firſt, it is a ſatisfaction to my ſelfe, and may be to others, that I was not drawn to it out of any vain opinion of my ſelfe, (whoſe perſonall defects are the only thing which I preſume to know,) but undertook it in obedience to Him, who ſaid, *Tu converſus confirma fratres*, not

to S. *Peter* only but to all men: being encouraged alſo to it by the goodneſſe of the Cauſe, which is able to make a weak man ſtrong. To the belief hereof I was not led partially or by chance, as many are, by the preiudice and prepoſſeſsion of their Country, Education, and ſuch like inducements, which if they lead to truth in one place, perhaps lead to error in a hundred; but having with the greateſt equality and indifferency, made enquiry and ſearch into the grounds on both Sides, I was willing to impart to others that ſatisfaction which was given to my ſelfe. For my inſcribing to it your Maieſties ſacred Name, I ſhould labour much in my excuſe of it from high preſumption, had it not ſome appearance of Title to your Maieſties Patronage & protection as being a Defence of that Book, which by ſpecial order from your Maty was written ſome years ſince, chiefly for the generall good, but peradventure not without ſome aime at the recovery of One of your meaneſt Subiects from a dangerous deviation, & ſo due unto your Maty, as the fruit of your own High humility and moſt Royall Charity. Beſides, it is in a manner nothing elſe, but a purſuance of, and a ſuperſtruction upon that bleſſed Doctrine, wherewith I have adorn'd & arm'd the Frontiſpice of my Book, which was ſo earneſtly recommended by your Royall Father of happy memory to all the lovers of Truth & Peace, that is to all that were like himſelfe, as the only hopefull meanes of healing the breaches of Chriſtendome, whereof the Enemy of ſoules makes ſuch peſtilent advantage. The luſtre of this bleſſed Doctrine I have here endeavoured to

uncloud

uncloud and unveile, and to free it from thoſe miſts and fumes which have been rais'd to obſcure it, by that Order, which envenomes even poiſon it ſelfe, and makes the Roman Religion much more malignant and turbulent then otherwiſe it would be: whoſe very Rule and Doctrine, obliges them to make all men, as much as lies in them, ſubjects unto Kings, and ſervants unto Chriſt, no farther then it ſhall pleaſe the Pope. So that whether Your Maieſty be conſidered, either as a Pious Sonne towards your Royall Father K. IAMES, or as a tender hearted & compaſſionate Sonne towards your diſtreſſed Mother, the Catholique Church, or as a King of your Subiects, or as a Servant unto Chriſt, this worke, (to which I can give no other commendation, but that it was intended to doe you ſervice in all theſe capacities,) may pretend not unreaſonably to your Gracious acceptance. Laſtly being a defence of that whole Church and Religion you profeſſe, it could not be ſo proper to any Patron as to the great Defendor of it, which ſtile your Maieſty hath ever ſo exactly made good, both in ſecuring it from all dangers, and in vindicating it (by the well ordering and rectifying this Church) from all the foule aſperſions both of Domeſtick & Forraine enemies, of which they can have no ground, but their own malice and want of Charity. But it is an argument of a deſpairing & loſt cauſe to ſupport it ſelfe with theſe impetuous out-cries and clamors, the faint refuges of thoſe that want better arguments; like that Stoick in *Lucian* that cried ὦ κατάρατε! *O damn'd villaine*, when he could ſay nothing elſe. Neither is it

credible the wiſer ſort of them ſhould believe this their own horrid aſſertion, That a God of goodneſſe ſhould damne to eternall torments, thoſe that love him and love truth, for errors which they fall into through humane frailty! But this they muſt ſay, otherwiſe their only great argument from their dāning us, & our not being ſo peremptory in damning them, becauſe we hope unaffected Ignorance may excuſe thē, would be loſt: & therefore they are engag'd to act on this Tragicall part, only to fright the ſimple and ignorant, as we doe litle children by telling them that bites, which we would not have them meddle with. And truely that herein they doe but act a part, and know themſelves to doe ſo, and deale with us here as they doe with the King of *Spain* at *Rome*, whom they accurſe and Excommunicate for faſhion ſake on *Maundy-Thurſday*, for detaining part of S. *Peters* Patrimony, and abſolve him without ſatisfaction on *Good-Friday*, methinkes their faltring and inconſtancy herein, makes it very apparent. For though for the moſt part, they ſpeak nothing but thunder and lightning to us, & damne us all without mercy or exception, yet ſometimes to ſerve other purpoſes, they can be content to ſpeak to us in a milder ſtrain, & tell us, as my adverſary does, more then once, *That they allow Proteſtants as much Charity as Proteſtants allow them.* Neither is this the only contradiction which I have diſcover'd in this uncharitable Work; but have ſhewed that by forgetting himſelfe, & retracting moſt of the principall grounds he builds upon, he hath ſav'd me the labour of a confutation: which

yet

yet I have not in any place found any ſuch labor or difficulty, but that it was undertakable by a man of very mean, that is, of my abilities. And the reaſon is, becauſe it is Truth I plead for; which is ſo ſtrong an argument for it ſelfe, that it needs only light to diſcover it: whereas it concernes Falſhood & Error to uſe diſguiſes and ſhadowings and all the fetches of Art and Sophiſtry, & therefore it ſtands in need of abler men, to give that a colour at leaſt, which hath no reall body to ſubſiſt by. If my endeavours in this kind may contribute any thing to this diſcovery, and the making plain that Truth (which my Charity perſwades mee the moſt part of them diſaffect only, becauſe it has not been well repreſented to them,) I have the fruit of my labour, and my wiſh; who deſire to live to no other end, then to doe ſervice to Gods Church and Your moſt Sacred Maieſty, in the quality of

Your MAIESTIE'S

moſt faithfull Subject, and moſt

humble and devoted Servant

WILLIAM CHILLINGWORTH.

MAndetur Typis hic Liber, cui Titulus The Religion of Proteſtants a ſafe way to Salvation: *In quo nihil occurrit à bonis Moribus, à Doctrinâ & Diſciplinâ in Eccleſiâ Anglicanâ aſſertis, alienum.*

RICH. BAYLIE Vicecan. OXON.

PErlegi hunc Librum, cui Titulus eſt The Religion of Proteſtants a ſafe way to Salvation: *In quo nihil reperio Doctrinæ vel Diſciplinæ Eccleſiæ Anglicanæ adverſum, ſed quamplurima quæ Fidem Orthodoxam egregiè illuſtrant, & adverſantia gloſſemata acutè, perſpicuè, & modeſtè diſſipant.*

IO. PRIDEAVX S.T.P.
Regius Oxon.

EGo Samuel Fell *Publicus Theol. Profeſſor in Univ.* Oxon. *& ordinarius Prælector* D. Marg. *Comitiſſ.* Richmondiæ, *perlegi Librum cui Titulus eſt,* The Religion of Proteſtants a ſafe way to Salvation: *In quo nihil reperio Doctrinæ vel Diſciplinæ Eccleſiæ Anglicanæ, aut bonis Moribus adverſum: ſed multa nervosè & modeſtè eventilata contra Adverſarios noſtræ Eccleſiæ & veritatis Catholicæ, quam felicitèr tuetur.* Dat. 14° Octob. An. 1637.

SAMVEL FELL.

THE PREFACE
TO THE AVTHOR OF CHARITY MAINTAINED.

WITH AN ANSWER TO HIS
Pamphlet entituled *a Direction to N.N.*

SIR

VPon the firſt newes of the publication of your Book, I uſed all diligence with ſpeed to procure it; and came with ſuch a mind to the reading of it, as S. *Auſtin* before he was a ſetled Catholique, brought to his conference with *Fauſtus* the Manichee. For as he thought that if any thing more then ordinary might be ſaid in defence of the Manichean Doctrine, *Fauſtus* was the man from whom it was to be expected: So my perſwaſion concerning you was,--*Si Pergama dextrâ defendi poſſunt, certè has defenſa videbo.* For I conceiv'd that among the Champions of the Roman Church, the Engliſh in reaſon muſt be the beſt, or equall to the beſt, as being by moſt expert Maſters train'd up purpoſely for this warre, and perpetually practiſed in it. Among the Engliſh, I ſaw the Ieſuites would yeeld the firſt place to none; and men ſo wiſe in their generation as the Ieſuits were, if they had any *Achilles* among them, I preſum'd, would make choice of him for this ſervice. And beſides, I had good aſſurance that in the framing of this building, though you were the only Architect, yet you wanted not the aſſiſtance of many diligent hands to bring you in choice materialls towards it; nor of many carefull and watchfull eyes to correct the errors of your worke, if any ſhould chance to eſcape you. Great reaſon therefore had I to expect great matters from you, and that your Book ſhould have in it the Spirit and Elixir of all that can be ſaid in defence of your Church and Doctrine; and to aſſure my ſelfe, that if my reſolution not to believe it, were not built upon the rock of evident grounds and reaſons, but only upon ſome ſandy and deceitfull appearances, now the wind and ſtorme & floods were cõming which would undoubtedly overthrow it.

2 Neither truly were you more willing to effect ſuch an alteration in me then I was to have it effected. For my deſire is to goe the right way to *eternall happineſſe*. But whether this way lye on the right

hand or the left, or ſtreight forwards; whether it be by following a living Guide, or by ſeeking my direction in a book, or by hearkening to the ſecret whiſper of ſome privat Spirit, to me it is indifferent. And he that is otherwiſe affected, and has not a travellers indifference, which *Epictetus* requires in all that would find the truth, but much deſires in reſpect of his eaſe, or pleaſure, or profit, or advancement, or ſatisfaction of friends, or any human conſideration, that one way ſhould be true rather then another; it is oddes but he will take his deſire that it ſhould be ſo, for an aſſurance that it is ſo. But I for my part, unleſſe I deceive my ſelfe, was and ſtill am ſo affected as I have made profeſſion: not willing I confeſſe to take any thing upon truſt, and to believe it without asking my ſelfe why; no, nor able to command my ſelfe (were I never ſo willing) to follow, like a ſheepe, every ſheepheard that ſhould take upon him to guide me; or every flock that ſhould chance to goe before me: but moſt apt and moſt willing to be led by reaſon to any way, or from it; and alwaies ſubmitting all other reaſons to this one, God hath ſaid ſo, therefore it is true. Nor yet was I ſo unreaſonable as to expect Mathematicall demonſtrations from you in matters plainly incapable of them, ſuch as are to be believed, and if we ſpeak properly, cannot be known; ſuch therefore I expected not. For as he is an unreaſonable Maſter, who requires a ſtronger aſſent to his concluſions then his arguments deſerve; ſo I conceive him a froward and undiſciplin'd Scholar, who deſires ſtronger arguments for a concluſion then the matter will bear. But had you repreſented to my underſtanding ſuch reaſons of your Doctrine, as being weighed in an even ballance, held by an even hand, with thoſe on the other ſide, would have turn'd the ſcale, and have made your Religion more credible then the contrary; certainly I ſhould have deſpiſed the ſhame of one more alteration, and with both mine armes and all my heart moſt readily have embraced it. Such was my expectation from you, and ſuch my preparation, which I brought with me to the reading of your book. Would you know now what the event was, what effect was wrought in me, by the peruſall and conſideration of it? To deal truly and ingenuouſly with you, I fell ſomewhat in my good opinion both of your ſufficiency & ſyncerity: but was exceedingly confirm'd in my ill opinion of the cauſe maintained by you. I found every where ſnares that might entrap, and colours that might deceive the ſimple; but nothing that might perſwade, and very little that might move an underſtanding man, and one that can diſcerne between diſcourſe and ſophiſtry. In ſhort, I was verily perſwaded that I plainly ſaw and could make it appear, to all diſ-paſſionate and unprejudicate Iudges, that a vein of ſophiſtry and calumny, did run clean through it from the begining to the end. And letting ſome friends underſtand ſo much, I ſuffered my ſelfe to be perſwaded by them, that it would not be either unproper for me, nor un-acceptable to God, nor peradventure altogether unſerviceable to his Church, nor juſtly offenſive to you (if you indeed were a lover of Truth, and not a maintainer of a Faction,) if ſetting aſide the ſecond Part, which was in a manner wholly em-

ployed

ployed in particular diſputes, repetitions and references, and in wranglings with D.*Potter* about the ſenſe of ſome ſupet-numerary quotations, and whereon the main queſtion no way depends, I would make a faire and ingenuous Anſwer to the firſt, wherein the ſubſtance of the preſent Controverſy is confeſſedly contained; and which, if it were clearly anſwered, no man would deſire any other anſwer to the ſecond. This therefore I undertook with a full reſolution to be an adverſary to your errors, but a friend and ſervant to your perſon: and ſo much the more a friend to your perſon, by how much the ſeverer and more rigid adverſary I was to your errors.

4 In this work my conſcience beares me witneſſe that I have according to your advice *proceeded alwayes with this conſideration, that I am to give a moſt ſtrict account of every line, and word that paſſeth under my pen*; and therefore have been preciſely carefull for *the matter* of my book to defend truth only, and only by Truth. And then ſcrupulouſly fearefull of ſcandalizing you or any man with *the manner* of handling it. From this rule ſure I am, I have not willingly ſwerved in either part of it, and that I might not doe it ignorantly, I have not only my ſelf examined mine owne work, perhaps with more ſeverity then I have done yours, (as conceiving it a baſe and unchriſtian thing to goe about to ſatisfie others with what I my ſelf am not fully ſatisfied;) But have alſo made it paſſe the fiery tryall of the exact cenſures of many underſtanding judges, alwaies heartily wiſhing that you your ſelfe had been of the *Quorum*. But they who did undergoe this burthen as they wanted not ſufficiencie to diſcover any heterodoxe doctrine, ſo I am ſure they have been very carefull to let nothing ſlip diſſonant from truth or from the authorized doctrine of the Church of England, and therefore whatſoever cauſeleſſe and groundleſſe jealouſy, any man may entertain concerning my Perſon, yet my book, I preſume, in reaſon and common equity ſhould be free from them: wherein I hope that little or nothing hath eſcap'd ſo many eyes, which being weighed in the ballance of the Sanctuary will be found too light. And in this hope I am much confirm'd, by your ſtrange carriage of your ſelfe in this whole buſineſſe. For though by ſome crooked and ſiniſter arts, you have got my Anſwer into your hands, now a yeare ſince and upwards, as *I* have been aſſured by ſome that know it, and thoſe of your own party; though you could not want every day faire opportunityes of ſending to me, and acquainting me with any exceptions, which, you conceived, might be juſtly taken to it, or any part of it, then which nothing could have been more welcome to me, yet hitherto you have not been pleaſed to acquaint mee with any one. Nay more, though you have been at ſundry times, and by ſeverall waies entreated and ſollicited, nay preſſ'd and importun'd by me, to joyne with me in a private diſcuſſion of the Controverſy between us, before the publication of my Anſwer, (becauſe I was extremely unwilling to publiſh any thing which had not paſſed all manner of tryals,) as deſiring not that I, or my Side, but that truth might overcome on which Side ſoever it was) though *I* have protcſted to you, and ſet it under my

hand, (which proteſtation by Gods help I would have made good) if you, or any other would undertake your cauſe, would give me a faire meeting, and chooſe out of your whole Book any one argument, wherof you were moſt confident, and by which you would be content the reſt ſhould be judged of, and make it appeare that I had not, or could not anſwer it, that I would deſiſt from the work which *I* had undertaken, and anſwer none at all; though by all the Arts which poſſibly I could deviſe, I have provoked you to ſuch a tryall, in particular by aſſuring you that if you refuſ'd it, the world ſhould be inform'd of your tergiverſation, notwithſtanding all this you have perpetually, and obſtinately declined it: which to my underſtanding is a very evident ſigne that there is not any truth in your cauſe, nor (which is impoſſible there ſhould bee) ſtrength in your arguments, eſpecially conſidering what our Saviour hath told us, *every one that doth evill hateth the light, neither commeth to the light, leaſt his deeds ſhould be reproved; but he that doth truth commeth to the light that his deeds may be made manifeſt that they are wrought in God.*

5 In the meane while though you deſpaired of compaſſing your deſire this honeſt way, yet you have not omitted to tempt me by baſe and unworthy conſiderations to deſert the cauſe which I had undertaken; letting me underſtand from you, by an acquaintance common to us both, how that *in caſe my worke ſhould come to light, my inconſtancy in religion* (ſo you miſcall my conſtancy in following that way to heaven which for the preſent ſeemes to me the moſt probable,) *ſhould bee to my great ſhame painted to the life*; that *my owne writings ſhould be producod againſt my ſelfe; that I ſhould bee urged to anſwer my owne motives againſt Proteſtantiſme, and that ſuch things ſhould be publiſhed to the world touching my beliefe,* (for my painter I muſt expect ſhould have great skill in perſpective) *of the doctrine of the Trinity, the Deity of our Saviour, and all ſupernaturall verities, as ſhould endanger all my benefices preſent or future:* that *this warning was given me, not out of feare of what I could ſay (for that Catholiques if they might wiſh any ill would beg the Publication of my booke, for reſpects obvious enough,) but out of a meer charitable deſire of my good and reputation:* and *that all this was ſaid upon a ſuppoſition that I was anſwering, or had a minde to anſwer Charity maintained; If not, no harme was done.* To which courteous premonition as I remember, I deſired the Gentleman, who dealt between us to return this anſwer, or to this effect, that I believed the Doctrine of the Trinity, the Deity of our Saviour, and all other ſuper-naturall verities revealed in Scripture, as truly and as heartily as your ſelf, or any man: and therefore herein your *Charity* was very much *miſtaken*; but much more and more uncharitably in conceiving me a man that was to be wrought upon with theſe *Terribiles viſu formæ*, thoſe carnall and baſe fears which you preſented to me, which were very proper motives for the Divell and his inſtruments to tempt poor ſpirited men out of the way of conſcience and honeſty, but very incongruous, either for Teachers of truth to make uſe of, or for Lovers of truth (in which Company I had been long agoe matriculated) to hear-

ken

ken to with any regard. But if you were indeed deſirous that I ſhould not anſwer *Charity maintained*, one way there was, and but one, whereby you might obtain your deſire; and that was by letting mee know when and where I might attend you, and by a fair conference, to be written down on both ſides, convincing mine underſtanding (who was reſolv'd not to be a *Recuſant* if I were *convicted*,) that any one part of it, any one argument in it, which was of moment and conſequence, and whereon the cauſe depends, was indeed unanſwerable. This was the effect of my anſwer which I am well aſſur'd was delivered: but reply from you I received none but this, that you would have no conference with me but in Print; and ſoone after finding me of proof againſt all theſe batteries, and thereby (I fear) very much enraged, you tooke up the reſolution of the furious Goddeſſe in the Poet, madded with the unſucceſſefulneſſe of her malice, *Flectere ſi nequeo ſuperos Acherontа movebo*!

6 For certainly thoſe indigne contumelies, that maſſe of portentous and execrable calumnies, wherewith in your Pamphlet of *Directions to N.N.* you have loaded not only my perſon in particular, but all the learned and moderate Divines of the Church of England, and all Proteſtants in generall, nay all wiſe men of all Religions but your own, could not proceed from any other fountain.

7 To begin with the laſt, you ſtick not in the beginning of your firſt Chapter, to faſten the imputation *of Atheiſme & irreligion upon all wiſe and gallant men, that are not of your own Religion.* In which uncharitable and unchriſtian judgment, void of all colour or ſhadow of probability, I know yet by experience that very many of the *Bigots* of your Faction are partakers with you. God forbid I ſhould think the like of you! Yet if I ſhould ſay, that in your Religion there want not ſome temptations unto, and ſome Principles of irreligion and Atheiſme, I am ſure I could make my aſſertion much more probable then you have done, or can make this horrible imputation.

8 For to paſſe by *firſt*, that which experience juſtifies, that where and when your Religion hath moſt abſolutely commanded, there and then Atheiſme hath moſt abounded; To ſay nothing *Secondly*, of your notorious and confeſſed forging of ſo many falſe miracles, and ſo many lying Legends, which is not unlikely to make ſuſpitious men to queſtion the truth of all; Nor to object to you *Thirdly*, the abundance of your weak and ſilly Ceremonies & ridiculous obſervances in your Religion, which in all probability cannot but beget ſecret contempt and ſcorne of it in wiſe and conſidering men, and conſequently Atheiſme and impiety, if they have this perſwaſion ſetled in them (which is too rife among you, and which you account a peece of *Wiſdome and Gallantry*) that if they be not of your Religion, they were as good be of none at all; Nor to trouble you *Fourthly* with this, that a great part of your Doctrine, eſpecially in the points conteſted, makes apparently for the temporall ends of the teachers of it; which yet I feare is a great ſcandall to many *Beaux Eſprits* among you: Onely I ſhould deſire you to conſider attentively when you conclude ſo often from the differen-

ces of Proteſtants, that they have no certainty of any part of their religion, no not of thoſe points wherein they agree, whether you doe not that which ſo magiſterially you direct me not to doe, that is, proceed *a deſtructive way, and object arguments againſt your adverſaries, which tend to the overthrow of all Religion?* And whether as you argue thus, *Proteſtants differ in many things, therefore they have no certainty of any thing*: So an Atheiſt or a Sceptique may not conclude as well, Chriſtians and the Profeſſors of all Religions differ in many things, therefore they have no certainty of any thing? Again I ſhould deſire you to tell me ingenuouſly, whether it be not too probable that your portentous Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation joyn'd with your fore-mention'd perſwaſion of, *no Papiſts no Chriſtians*, hath brought a great many others as well as himſelfe to *Averroes* his reſolution, *Quandoquidē Chriſtiani adorant quod comedunt, ſit anima mea cum Philoſophis?* Whether your requiring men upon only probable and *Prudentiall motives*, to yield a *moſt certaine aſſent* unto things in humane reaſon impoſſible, and telling them, as you doe too often, that they were as good not believe at all, as believe with any lower degree of faith, be not a likely way to make conſidering men ſcorne your Religion, (and conſequently all, if they know no other) as requiring things contradictory, and impoſſible to be performed? Laſtly, whether your pretence that there is no good ground to believe Scripture, but your Churches infallibility, joyn'd with your pretending no ground for this but ſome texts of Scripture, be not a faire way to make them that underſtand themſelves, believe neither Church nor Scripture?

9 Your calumnies againſt Proteſtants in generall are ſet downe in theſe words, Chap. 2. §. 2. *The very doctrine of Proteſtants if it bee followed cloſely, and with coherence to it ſelfe, muſt of neceſſity induce* Socinianiſme. *This I ſay confidently, and evidently prove, by inſtancing in one errror, which may well be tearmed the Capitall, and mother Hereſy, from which all other muſt follow at eaſe; I mean, their hereſy in affirming, that the perpetuall viſible Church of Chriſt, deſcended by a never interrupted ſucceſſion from our Saviour, to this day, is not infallible in all that it propoſeth to be believed, as revealed truths.*

For if the infallibility *of ſuch a publique* Authority *be once impeached; what remaines, but that every man is given over to his own* wit, *and* diſcourſe? *And talke not here, of holy Scripture. For if the true Church may erre, in defining what Scriptures be Canonicall; or in delivering the ſenſe and meaning thereof, we are ſtill devolved, either upon the* private ſpirit *(a foolery now exploded out of England, which finally leaving every man to his own conceits, ends in* Socinianiſme) *or elſe upon naturall wit, and judgement, for examining and determining, what Scriptures contain true or falſe doctrine, and in that reſpect, ought to be received, or rejected. And indeed, take away the authority of Gods Church, no man can be aſſured, that any one Book, or parcell of Scripture, was written by divine inſpiration; or that all the contents, are infallibly true; which are the direct errors of* Socinians. *If it were but for this reaſon alone, no man, who regards the eternall ſalvation of his ſoule, would live or dye in* Proteſtancy,

teſtancy, *from which, ſo vaſt abſurdities as theſe of the* Socinians *muſt inevitably follow. And it ought to be an unſpeakable comfort to all us Catholiques, while we conſider, that none can deny the infallible authority of our Church, but joyntly he muſt be left to his own wit and waies, and muſt abandon all* infuſed faith, *and true Religion, if he doe but underſtand himſelfe aright.*

In all which diſcourſe, the only true word you ſpeak is, *This I ſay confidently:* As for *proving evidently,* that I believe you reſerved for ſome other opportunity: for the preſent I am ſure you have been very ſparing of it.

10 You ſay indeed confidently enough, that *the denyall of the Churches infallibility is the Mother Hereſy, from which all other muſt follow at eaſe:* Which is ſo farre from being a neceſſary truth, as you make it, that it is indeed a manifeſt falſhood. Neither is it poſſible for the wit of man by any good, or ſo much as probable conſequence, from the deniall of the Churches Infallibility to deduce any one of the ancient Hereſies, or any one error of the Socinians, which are the Hereſies here entreated of. For who would not laugh at him that ſhould argue thus; Neither the Church of Rome, nor any other Church is infallible, *go,* The doctrine of *Arrius, Pelagius, Eutyches, Neſtorius, Photinus, Manichæus* was true Doctrine? On the other ſide, it may be truly ſayed and juſtified by very good and effectuall reaſon, that he that affirms with you, the Popes infallibility, puts himſelf into his hands and power to be led by him at his eaſe and pleaſure into all Hereſy, and even to Hell it ſelf, and cannot with reaſon ſay (ſo long as he is conſtant to his grounds) *Domine cur ita facis?* but muſt believe *white to be black and black to be white, vertue to be vice and vice to be vertue*; nay (which is a horrible but a moſt certain truth) Chriſt to be Antichriſt and Antichriſt to be Chriſt, if it be poſſible for the Pope to ſay ſo: Which I ſay and will maintain, howſoever you daube and diſguiſe it, is indeed to make men Apoſtate from Chriſt to his pretended Vicar, but reall enemy. For that name and no better (if we may ſpeak truth without offence) I preſume he deſerves, who under pretence of interpreting the law of Chriſt, (which Authority without any word of expreſſe warrant he hath taken upon himſelf,) doth in many parts evacuate and diſolve it: So dethroning Chriſt from his dominion over mens conſciences, and in ſtead of Chriſt, ſetting up himſelf. In as much as he that requires that his interpretations of any law ſhould be obeyed as true and genuine, ſeeme they to mens underſtandings never ſo diſſonant and diſcordant from it, (as the Biſhop of Rome does) requires indeed that *his interpretations* ſhould be the *Laws*; and he that is firmly prepared in mind to believe and receive all ſuch interpretations without judging of them, and though to his private judgment they ſeem unreaſonable, is indeed congruouſly diſpoſed to hold adultery a veniall ſin, and fornication no ſinne, whenſoever the Pope and his adherents ſhall ſo declare. And whatſoever he may plead, yet either wittingly or ignorantly he makes the Law and the Lawmaker both ſtales, and obeyes only the interpreter. As if I ſhould pretend that I ſhould ſubmit to the

Laws

Laws of the King of England, but ſhould indeed reſolve to obey them in that ſence which the King of France ſhould put upon them what ſoever it were; I preſume every underſtanding man would ſay that I did indeed obey the King of France and not the King of England. If I ſhould pretend to believe the Bible, but that I would underſtand it according to the ſence which the chiefe Mufty ſhould put upon it, who would not ſay that I were a Chriſtian in pretence only, but indeed a Mahumetan?

11 Nor will it be to purpoſe for you to pretend, that the precepts of Chriſt are ſo plain that it cannot be feared, that any Pope ſhould ever goe about to diſſolve them and pretend to be a Chriſtian: For, not to ſay that you now pretend the contrary, (to wit), *that the law of Chriſt is obſcure even in things neceſſary to be believed and done*; and by ſaying ſo, have made a fair way for any fowle interpretation of any part of it: certainly that which the Church of Rome hath already done in this kind is an evident argument, that (if ſhe once had this power unqueſtion'd and made expedite and ready for uſe, by being contracted to the Pope) ſhe may doe what ſhe pleaſeth with it. Who that had liv'd in the Primitive Church, would not have thought it as utterly improbable, that ever they ſhould have brought in the worſhip of Images and picturing of God, as now it is that they ſhould legitimate fornication? Why may we not think they may in time take away the whole Communion from the Laity, as well as they have taken away half of it? Why may we not think that any Text and any ſence may not be accorded, aſwell as the whole 14. *Ch.* of the *Ep.* of *S. Paul* to the *Corinth.* is reconcil'd to the Latine ſervice? How is it poſſible any thing ſhould be plainer forbidden, then the *worſhip of Angels*, in the *Ep.* to the *Coloſſians*? then *the teaching for Doctrines mens commands* in the Goſpell of *S. Mark*? And therefore ſeeing we ſee theſe things done which hardly any man would have believ'd, that had not ſeen them, why ſhould we not fear that this unlimited power may not be us'd hereafter with as litle moderation? Seeing devices have been invented how men may worſhip images without Idolatry, and kill innocent men under pretence of hereſie without murder, who knowes not that ſome tricks may not be hereafter deuis'd, by which lying with other mens wives ſhall be no Adultery, taking away other mens goods no theft? I conclude therefore, that if *Solomon* himſelf were here, and were to determine the difference, which is more likely to be mother of all Hereſy, The *deniall* of the *Churche's* or the *affirming* of the *Popes infallibility*, that he would certainly ſay *this is the mother, give her the child.*

12 You ſay again confidently, that *if this infallibility be once impeached, every man is given over to his own wit and diſcourſe:* which, if you mean, *diſcourſe*, not guiding it ſelfe by Scripture, but only by principles of nature, or perhaps by prejudices and popular errors, and drawing conſequences not by rule but chance, is by no means true; if you mean by diſcourſe, right reaſon, grounded on Divine revelation and common notions, written by God in the hearts of all men, and deducing

deducing, according to the never failing rules of Logick, conſequent deductions from them, if this be it, which you mean by *diſcourſe*, it is very meet & reaſonable & neceſſary that men, as in all their actions, ſo eſpecially in that of greateſt importance, the choice of their way to happineſſe, ſhould be left unto it: and he that followes this in all his opinions and actions, and does not only ſeeme to doe ſo, followes alwaies God; whereas he that followeth a Company of men, may oftimes follow a company of beaſts. And in ſaying this, I ſay no more then S. *Iohn* to all Chriſtians in theſe words, *Dearly beloved believe not every ſpirit, but try the ſpirits, whether they be of God, or no*: and the rule he gives them to make this tryall by, is to conſider whether they *confeſſe Ieſus to be the Chriſt*; that is, the Guide of their Faith, and Lord of their actions; not whether they acknowledge the Pope to be his Vicar: I ſay no more then S. *Paul* in exhorting all Chriſtians, *to try all things and to hold faſt that which is good*; then S. *Peter* in cõmanding all Chriſtians, *to be ready to give a reaſon of the hope that is in them*: then *our Saviour* himſelfe in forewarning all his followers, that *if they blindly followed blind guides, both leaders and followers ſhould fall into the ditch*; and again in ſaying even to the people, *Yea & why of your ſelves iudge ye not what is right?* And though by paſſion, or precipitation, or preiudice, by want of reaſon, or not uſing that they have, men may be and are oftentimes led into error and miſchiefe; yet that they cannot be miſguided by diſcourſe truly ſo called, ſuch as I have deſcribed, you your ſelfe have given them ſecurity. For what is diſcourſe, but drawing concluſions out of premiſes by good conſequence? Now the principles which we have ſetled, to wit, the *Scriptures*, are on all ſides agreed to be infallibly true. And you have told us in the fourth chap. of this Pamphlet, that *from truth no man can by good conſequence inferre falſhood*; Therefore by diſcourſe no man can poſſibly be led to error: but if he erre in his concluſions, he muſt of neceſſity either erre in his principles, (which here cannot have place,) or commit ſome error in his diſcourſe; that is indeed, not diſcourſe but ſeeme to doe ſo.

13 You ſay thirdly with ſufficient confidence, that *if the true Church may erre in defining what Scriptures be Canonicall, or in delivering the ſenſe thereof, then we muſt follow either the privat Spirit, or elſe naturall wit and iudgement, and by them examine what Scriptures containe true or falſe doctrine, and in that reſpect ought to be received or reiected*: All which is apparently untrue, neither can any proofe of it be pretended. For though the preſent Church may poſſibly erre in her judgement touching this matter, yet have we other directions in it, beſides the privat ſpirit, and the examination of the contents, (which latter way may conclude the negative very ſtrongly, to wit, that ſuch or ſuch a book cannot come from God, becauſe it containes irreconcileable contradictions, but the affirmative it cannot conclude, becauſe the contents of a book may be all true, and yet the book not written by divine inſpiration:) other direction therefore I ſay we have, beſides either of theſe three, & that is, the teſtimony of the Primitive Chriſtians.

 14.

14 You ſay Fourthly with convenient boldneſſe, That *this infallible Authority of your Church being denied, no man can be aſſur'd, that any parcell of Scripture was written by Divine inſpiration*: Which is an untruth, for which no proofe is pretended, and beſides, void of modeſty and full of impiety. The firſt, becauſe the experience of innumerable Chriſtians is againſt it, who are ſufficiently aſſur'd, that the Scripture is divinely inſpir'd, and yet deny the infallible authority of your Church or any other. The ſecond, becauſe if I cannot have ground to be aſſur'd of the divine authority of Scripture, unleſſe I firſt believe your Church infallible, then I can have no ground at all to believe it: becauſe there is no ground, nor can any be pretended why I ſhould believe your Church *infallible*, unleſſe I firſt beleeve the Scripture divine.

15 Fiftly and laſtly, You ſay with confidence in abundance, that *none can deny the infallible authority of your Church, but he muſt abandon all infus'd faith and true religion, if he doe but underſtand himſelfe*: Which is to ſay, agreeable to what you had ſaid before, and what out of the abundance of your hearts you ſpeak very often, *That all Chriſtians beſides you, are open Fooles, or conceal'd Atheiſts*. All this you ſay with notable confidence (as the manner of Sophiſters is, to place their confidence of prevailing in their confident manner of ſpeaking,) but then for the evidence you promiſed to maintaine this confidence, that is quite vaniſhed and become inviſible.

16 Had I a mind to recriminate now, and to charge Papiſts (as you doe Proteſtants) that they lead men to Socinianiſme, I could certainly make a much fairer ſhew of evidence then you have done. For I would not tell you, you deny the infallibility of the Church of England, *ergo* you lead to Socinianiſme, which yet is altogether as good an Argument as this; Proteſtants deny the infallibility of the Roman Church, *ergo* they induce Socinianiſme: Nor would I reſume my former Argument, and urge you, that by holding the Popes infallibility, you ſubmit your ſelfe to that capitall and Mother Hereſy, by advantage whereof, he may lead you at eaſe to believe *vertue vice*, and *vice vertue*, to believe Antichriſtianity Chriſtianiſme, and Chriſtianity Antichriſtian; he may lead you to Socinianiſme, to Turciſme, nay to the Divell himſelfe if he have a mind to it: But I would ſhew you that divers waies the Doctors of your Church doe the principall and proper work of the Socinians for thē, undermining the Doctrine of the Trinity, by denying it to be ſupported by thoſe pillars of the Faith, which alone are fit and able to ſupport it, I mean Scripture, and the Conſent of the ancient Doctors.

17 For *Scripture*, your men deny very plainly and frequently, that this Doctrine can be proved by it. See if you pleaſe this plainly taught, and urged very earneſtly by Cardinall *Hoſius*, *De Author. Sac. Scrip. l.3.p.53*. By *Gordonius Huntlaus*, *Contr. Tom. 1. Controv. 1. De verbo Dei C.19*. by *Gretſerus* and *Tanerus*, *in Colloquio Ratesbon*: And alſo by *Vega*, *Poſſevin*, *Wiekus*, and *Others*.

18 And then for *the Conſent of the Ancients*, that that alſo delivers

vers it not, by whom are we taught but by Papiſts only? Who is it that makes known to all the world, that *Euſebius* that great ſearcher and devourer of the Chriſtian libraries *was an Arrian?* Is it not your great *Achilles*, *Cardinall Perron*, in his 3. Book 2. Chap. of his Reply to K. *Iames?* Who is it that informs us that *Origen* (who never was queſtioned for any error in this matter, in or neere his time) *denied the Divinity of the Sonne and the Holy Ghoſt?* Is it not the ſame great Cardinall, in his Book *of the Euchariſt* againſt *M. du Pleſſis. l. 2. c. 7?* Who is it that pretends that *Irenæus hath ſaid thoſe things, which he that ſhould now hold, would be eſteem'd an Arrian?* Is it not the ſame *Perron* in his Reply to K. *Iames*, in the fift Chap. of his fourth obſervation? And does he not in the ſame place peach *Tertullian* alſo, & in a manner give him away to the Arrians? And pronounce generally of the *Fathers before the Councell of Nice*, That *the Arrians would gladly be tryed by them?* And are not your fellow Ieſuits alſo, even the prime men of your Order, prevaricators in this point as well as others? Doth not your friend M. *Fiſher*, or M. *Flued* in his book of the Nine Queſtions propoſed to him by K. *Iames* ſpeak dangerouſly to the ſame purpoſe, in his diſcourſe *of the Reſolution of Faith*, towards the end? Giving us to underſtand, *That the new Reformed Arrians bring very many teſtimonies of the ancient Fathers to prove that in this Point they did contradict themſelves and were contrary one to another: which places whoſoever ſhall read will cleerely ſee, that to common people they are unanſwerable, yea that common people are not capable of the anſwers that learned men yeeld unto ſuch obſcure paſſages.* And hath not your great Antiquary *Petavius*, in his Notes upon *Epiphanius in Hær. 69.* been very liberall to the Adverſaries of the Doctrine of the Trinity, and in a manner given them for Patrons and Advocates, firſt *Iuſtin Martyr*, and then almoſt all the Fathers before the Councell of Nice, whoſe ſpeeches he ſaies, touching this point, *cum Orthodoxæ fidei regula minime conſentiunt?* Hereunto I might adde that the Dominicans and Ieſuits between them in another matter of great importance, viz. *Gods Preſcience of future contingents*, give the Socinians the premiſes, out of which their concluſion doth unavoidably follow. For the Dominicans maintain on the one Side, that *God can foreſee nothing but what he Decrees:* The Ieſuits on the other Side, that *he doth not Decree all things:* And from hence the Socinians conclude (as it is obvious for them to doe) that *he doth not foreſee all things.* Laſtly, I might adjoyn this, that you agree with one conſent, and ſettle for a rule unqueſtionable, that no part of Religion can be repugnant to reaſon, whereunto you in particular ſubſcribe unawares in ſaying, *From truth no man can by good conſequence inferre Falſhood*, which is to ſay in effect, that Reaſon can never lead any man to error: And after you have done ſo, you proclaime to all the world (as you in this Pamphlet doe very frequently,) that *if men follow their Reaſon and diſcourſe*, they will (if they underſtand themſelves) be led to Socinianiſme. And thus you ſee with what probable matter I might furniſh out and juſtify my accuſation, if I ſhould charge you with leading men to Socinianiſme! Yet

I doe not conceive that I have ground enough for this odious imputation. And much leſſe ſhould you have charg'd Proteſtants with it, whom you confeſſe to abhorre and deteſt it: and who fight againſt it not with the broken reeds, and out of the paper fortreſſes of an imaginary Infallibility, which were only to make ſport for their Adverſaries; but with the *ſword of the Spirit, the Word of God*: of which we may ſay moſt truly, what *David* ſaid of *Goliah's* ſword, offered him by *Abilech, non eſt ſicut iſte, There is none comparable to it.*

19 Thus Proteſtants in generall, I hope, are ſufficiently vindicated from your calumny: I proceed now to doe the ſame ſervice for the Divines of England; whom you queſtion firſt in point of learning and ſufficiency, and then in point of conſcience and honeſty, as prevaricating in the Religion which they profeſſe, and inclining to Popery. Their Learning (you ſay) conſiſts only in *ſome ſuperficiall talent of preaching, languages, and elocution, and not in any deep knowledg of Philoſophy, eſpecially of Metaphyſicks, and much leſſe of that moſt ſolid, profitable, ſubtile,* &c. (O rē ridiculā *Cato* & jocoſā!) *ſuccinct method of School-Divinity*. Wherein you have diſcovered in your ſelf the true Genius and ſpirit of detraction. For taking advantage from that wherein envy it ſelf cannot deny but they are very eminent, and which requires great ſufficiency of ſubſtantiall learning, you diſparage them as inſufficient in all things elſe. As if forſooth, becauſe they diſpute not eternally, *Vtrū Chimæra bombinans in vacuo, poſſit comedere ſecundas Intentiones? Whether a Million of Angels may not ſit upon a needles point?* Becauſe they fill not their brains with notions that ſignify nothing, to the utter extermination of all reaſon and common ſence, and ſpend not an Age in weaving and un-weaving ſubtile cobwebs, fitter to catch flyes then Souls; therefore they have no deepe knowledge in the Acroamaticall part of learning! But I have too much honour'd the poorneſſe of this detraction to take notice of it.

20 The other Part of your accuſation ſtriks deeper, and is more cōſiderable: And that tels us that, *Proteſtantiſme waxeth weary of it ſelf; that the Profeſſors of it, they eſpecially of greateſt worth, learning, and authority, love temper and moderation: and are at this time more unreſolved where to faſten, then at the infancy of their Church*: That *their Churches begin to look with a new face: Their walls to ſpeak a new language: Their Doctrine to be altered in many things for which their Progenitors forſook the then Viſible Church of Chriſt: For example, the Pope not Antichriſt: Prayer for the dead: Limbus Patrum: Pictures: That the Church hath Authority in determining Controverſies of Faith, and to interpret Scripture, about Freewill, Predeſtination, Vniverſall grace*: That *all our works are not ſinnes: Merit of good works: Inherent Iuſtice: Faith alone doth not juſtify: Charity to be preferr'd before knowledge: Traditions: Commandements poſſible to be kept*: That *their thirty nine Articles are patient, nay ambitious of ſome ſence wherein they may ſeem Catholique*: That to *alleage the neceſſity of wife and children in theſe dayes is but a weak plea for a married miniſter to compaſſe a Benefice*: That *Calviniſme is at length accounted Hereſy, and litle leſſe then treaſon*: That *men in talk and writing*

ting uſe willingly the once fearfull names of Prieſts and Altars: That *they are now put in mind that for expoſition of Scripture they are by Canon bound to follow the Fathers: which if they doe with ſyncerity, it is eaſy to tell what doome will paſſe againſt Proteſtants; ſeeing by the confeſſion of Proteſtants, the Fathers are on the Papiſts ſide, which the Anſwerer to ſome ſo clearly demonſtrated, that they remain'd convinc'd: In fine, as the Samaritans ſaw in the Diſciples countenances that they meant to goe to Hieruſalem, ſo you pretend it is even legible in the fore-heads of theſe men, that they are even going, nay making haſt to Rome.* Which ſcurrilous libell void of all truth, diſcretion and honeſty, what effect it may have wrought, what credit it may have gain'd with credulous Papiſts, (who dream what they deſire, and believe their own dreams,) or with ill-affected, jealous, and weak Proteſtants, I can not tell: But one thing I dare boldly ſay, that you your ſelfe did never believe it.

21 For did you indeed conceive, or had any probable hope, that ſuch men as you deſcribe, men of worth of learning and authority too, were freinds and favourers of your Religion, & inclinable to your Party, can any man imagine that you would proclaim it, and bid the world take heed of them? *Sic notus Vlyſſes?* Doe we know the Ieſuites no better then ſo? What are they turned prevaricators againſt their own Faction? Are they likely men to betray and expoſe their own Agents and inſtruments, and to awaken the eyes of jealouſy, and to raiſe the clamor of the people againſt them? Certainly your Zeal to the Sea of Rome, teſtified by your *fourth Vow of ſpeciall obedience to the Pope*, proper to your Order, and your cunning carriage of all affairs for the greater advantage and advancement of that Sea, are clear demonſtrations that if you had thought thus, you would never have ſaid ſo. The truth is, they that run to extreams in oppoſition againſt you, they that pull downe your infallibility and ſet up their own, they that declaim againſt your tyranny, and exerciſe it themſelves over others, are the Adverſaries that give you greateſt advantage, and ſuch as you love to deale with: whereas upon men of temper & moderatiõ, ſuch as will oppoſe nothing becauſe you maintain it, but will draw as neere to you, that they may draw you to them, as the truth will ſuffer them: ſuch as require of Chriſtians to believe only in Chriſt, and will damne no man nor Doctrine without expreſſe and certaine warrant from gods word: upon ſuch as theſe you know not how to faſten; but if you chance to have conference with any ſuch, (which yet as much as poſſibly you can you avoid and decline,) you are very ſpeedily put to ſilence, and ſee the indefenſible weakneſſe of your cauſe laid open to all men. And this I verily believe, is the true reaſon that you thus rave and rage againſt them; as foreſeeing your time of prevailing, or even of ſubſiſting, would be ſhort, if other Adverſaries gave you no more advantage then they doe.

22 In which perſwaſion alſo I am much confirmed by conſideration of the ſillyneſſe and poorneſſe of thoſe ſuggeſtions, and partly of the apparent vanity and falſhood of them, which you offer in juſtification of this wicked calumny. For what if out of devotion towards

God; out of a deſire that he ſhould be worſhipped as *in Spirit and truth* in the firſt place, ſo alſo *in the beauty of holineſſe*? what if out of feare that too much ſimplicity and nakedneſſe in the publique Service of God may beget in the ordinary ſort of men a dull and ſtupid irreverence, and out of hope that the outward ſtate and glory of it, being well diſpoſ'd and wiſely moderated, may ingender, quicken, increaſe and nouriſh the inward reverence reſpect and devotion which is due unto Gods Soveraign Majeſty and power? what if out of a perſwaſion and deſire that Papiſts may be wonne over to us the ſooner, by the removing of this ſcandall out of their way; and out of an holy jealouſy, that the weaker ſort of Proteſtants might be the eaſier ſeduced to them by the magnificence and pomp of their Church-ſervice in caſe it were not removed? I ſay, what if out of theſe conſiderations, the Governors of our Church, more of late then formerly, have ſet themſelves to adorn and beautifie the places *where Gods honour dwells*, and to make them as heavenly as they can with earthly ornaments? Is this a ſigne that they are warping towards Popery? Is this Devotion in the Church of England an argument that ſhee is comming over to the Church of Rome? Sir *Edwin Sands*, I preſume every man will grant, had no inclination that way; yet he forty years ſince highly commended this part of devotion in Papiſts, and makes no ſcruple of propoſing it to the imitation of Proteſtants: Litle thinking that they who would follow his counſell, and endeavour to take away this diſparagement of Proteſtants, and this glorying of Papiſts, ſhould have been cenſur'd for it as making way and inclining to Popery. His words to this purpoſe are excellent words, and becauſe they ſhew plainly, that what is now practis'd was approv'd by Zealous Proteſtants ſo long agoe, I will here ſet them down.

Survey of Religion. *Init.*

23 *This one thing I cannot but highly commend in that ſort and Order: They ſpare nothing which either coſt can perform in enriching, or skill in adorning the Temple of God, or to ſet out his Service with the greateſt pompe and magnificence that can be deviſed. And although, for the moſt part, much baſeneſſe and childiſhneſſe is predominant in the Maſters and contrivers of their Ceremonies, yet this outward ſtate and glory being well diſpoſed, doth ingender, quicken, increaſe, and nouriſh the inward reverence, reſpect and devotion, which is due unto Soveraign Majeſty and Power. And although I am not ignorant that many men well reputed have embraced the thrifty opinion of that Diſciple who thought all to be waſted that was beſtowed upon Chriſt in that ſort, and that it were much better beſtowed upon him on the poor, (yet with an eye perhaps that themſelves would be his quarter Almoners,) notwithſtanding I muſt confeſſe, it will never ſink into my heart, that in proportion of reaſon, the allowance for furniſhing out of the ſervice of God ſhould be meaſured by the ſcant and ſtrict rule of meere neceſſity, (a proportion ſo low that nature to other moſt bountifull in matter of neceſſity, hath not fayled no not the moſt ignoble creatures of the world,) and that for our ſelves no meaſure of heaping but the moſt we can get, no rule of expence but to the utmoſt pompe we liſt: Or that God himſelf had ſo inrich'd the lower parts of the world*

with

with ſuch wonderfull varieties of beauty and glory, that they might ſerve only to the pampering of mortall man in his pride; and that in the Service of the high creator Lord and giver (the outward glory of whoſe higher pallace may appear by the very lamps that we ſee ſo farre of burning gloriouſly in it) only the ſimpler, baſer, cheaper, leſſe noble, leſſe beautifull, leſſe glorious things ſhould be imployed. Eſpecially ſeeing as in Princes courts, ſo in the ſervice of God alſo, this outward ſtate and glory, being well diſpos'd, doth (as I have ſaid) ingender, quicken, increaſe and nouriſh the inward reverence, reſpect and devotion, which is due to ſo Soveraign majeſty and power. Which thoſe whom the uſe thereof cannot perſwade unto, would eaſily by the want of it be brought to confeſſe; for which cauſe I crave leave to be excuſed by them herein, if in Zeal to the common Lord of all, I chooſe rather to commend the vertue of an enemy then to flatter the vice and imbecility of a freind. And ſo much for this matter.

24 Again, what if the names of *Prieſts* and *Altars* ſo frequent in the ancient Fathers, though not in the now Popiſh ſenſe, be now reſum'd and more commonly uſed in England then of late times they were: that ſo the colourable argument of their conformity, which is but nominall, with the ancient Church, and our inconformity, which the Governors of the Church would not have ſo much as nominall, may be taken away from them; and the Church of England may be put in a ſtate, in this regard more juſtifiable againſt the Roman then formerly it was, being hereby enabled to ſay to Papiſts (whenſoever theſe names are objected,) we alſo uſe the names of *Prieſts* and *Altars*, and yet believe neither the corporall Preſence, nor any Proper and propitiatory Sacrifice?

25 What if Proteſtants be now put in mind, that for expoſition of Scripture, they are bound by a Canon *to follow the ancient Fathers*: which whoſoever doth with ſyncerity, it is utterly impoſſible he ſhould be a Papiſt? And it is moſt falſely ſaid by you, that you know that to ſome Proteſtants, I cleerly demonſtrated, or ever ſo much as undertook, or went about to demonſtrate the contrary. What if the Centuriſts be cenſur'd ſomewhat roundly by a Proteſtant Divine for affirming, that *the keeping of the Lords day was a thing indifferent for two hundred yeares*? Is there in all this or any part of it any kind of proofe of this ſcandalous calumny? Certainly if you can make no better arguments then theſe, and have ſo little judgement as to think theſe any, you have great reaſon to decline conferences, and *Signior Con* to prohibite you from writing books any more.

26 As for the points of Doctrine wherein you pretend that theſe Divines begin of late to falter, and to comply with the Church of Rome, upon a due examination of particulars it will preſently appear, Firſt, that part of them alwaies have been, and now are held conſtantly one way by them; as the Authority of the Church in determining Controverſies of faith, though not the infallibility of it: That there is Inherent Iuſtice, though ſo imperfect that it cannot juſtify: That there are Traditions, though none neceſſary: That charity is to be preferr'd before knowledge: That good Works are not properly meritorious

And:

And laſtly, that faith alone juſtifies, though that faith juſtifies not which is alone. And ſecondly, for the remainder that they, every one of them, have been anciently without breach of charity diſputed among Proteſtants, ſuch for example were the Queſtions about the Popes being the Antichriſt, The lawfulneſſe of ſome kind of prayers for the dead, the Eſtate of the Fathers ſoules, before Chriſts aſcention; Freewill, Predeſtination, Vniverſall grace: The Poſſibility of keeping Gods commandements. The uſe of Pictures in the Church: Wherein that there hath been anciently diverſity of opinion amongſt Proteſtants, it is juſtifyed to my hand by a witneſſe, with you, beyond exception, even your great friend M. *Brerely*, *whoſe care, exactneſſe and fidelity* (you ſay in your Preface) *is ſo extraordinary great.* Conſult him therefore: Tract. 3. Sect. 7. of his *Apology*: And in the 9. 10. 11. 14. 24. 26. 27. 37. Subdiviſions of that *Section*, you ſhall ſee as in a mirror, your ſelfe prov'd an egregious calumniator, for charging Proteſtants with innovation and inclining to Popery, under pretence forſooth, that their Doctrine beginnes of late to be altered in theſe points. Whereas, M. *Brerely* will informe you, they have been anciently, and even from the begining of the Reformation, controverted amongſt them, though perhaps the ſtream and current of their Doctors runne one way, and only ſome brooke or rivulet of them the other.

27 And thus my Friends, I ſuppoſe are cleerely vindicated, from your ſcandalls and calumnies: It remaines now that in the laſt place I bring my ſelfe fairely off from your foule aſperſions, that ſo my perſon may not be (as indeed howſoever it ſhould not be) any diſadvantage or diſparagement to the cauſe, nor any ſcandall to weake Chriſtians.

28 Your injuries then to me (no way deſerved by me, but by differing in opinion from you, wherein yet you ſurely differ from me as much as I from you,) are eſpecially three. For *firſt* upon heerelay, & refuſing to give me oportunity of begetting in you a better underſtanding of me, you charge me with a great number of falſe and impious doctrines, which I will not name in particular, becauſe I will not aſſiſt you ſo farre in the ſpreading of my own undeſerved defamation: but whoſoever teaches or holds them *let him be Anathema!* The ſumme of them all caſt up by your ſelfe, in your firſt chap. is this, *Nothing ought or can be certainly believed, farther then it may be proved by evidence of Naturall reaſon:* (where I conceive Naturall reaſon is oppos'd to ſupernaturall Revelation) and whoſoever holds ſo *let him be Anathema!* And moreover to clear my ſelfe once for all, from all imputations of this nature, which charge me injurioufly with deniall of Supernaturall Verities, I profeſſe ſyncerely, that I believe all thoſe Books of Scripture, which the Church of England accounts Canonicall, to be the Infallible word of God: I believe all things evidently contained in them; all things evidently, or even probably deducible from them: I acknowledge all that to be Hereſy, which by the Act of Parliament *primo of* Q. ELIZ. is declar'd to be ſo, & only to be ſo: And though in ſuch points which may be held diverſly of divers men *ſalvâ Fidei*

compage

compage. I would not take any mans liberty from him, and humbly beſeech all men, that they would not take mine from me! Yet thus much I can ſay (which I hope will ſatisfy any man of reaſon,) that whatſoever hath been held neceſſary to ſalvation, either by the Catholique Church of all ages, or by the conſent of Fathers, meaſur'd by *Vincentius Lyrinenſis* his rule, or is held neceſſary either by the Catholique Church of this age, or by the conſent of Proteſtants, or even by the Church of England, that, againſt the Socinians, and all others whatſoever, I doe verily believe and embrace.

29 Another great and manifeſt injury you have done me, in charging me to have forſaken your Religion, *becauſe it conduc'd not to my temporall ends*, and ſuted not with my deſires and deſignes: Which certainly is a horrible crime, & whereof if you could convince me, by juſt and ſtrong preſumptions, I ſhould then acknowledge my ſelfe to deſerve that opinion, which you would faine induce your credents unto, that I chang'd not your Religion for any other but for none at all. But of this great fault my conſcience acquits me, and God, who only knowes the hearts of all men, knowes that I am innocent! Neither doubt I but all they who know me, and amongſt them many Perſons of place and quality, will ſay they have reaſon in this matter to be my compurgators. And for you, though you are very affirmative in your accuſation, yet you neither doe, nor can produce any proof or preſumption for it, but forgeting your ſelfe, (as it is Gods will oftimes that ſlanderers ſhould doe) have let fall ſome paſſages which being well weighed, will make conſidering men apt to believe, that you did not believe your ſelfe. For how is it poſſible, you ſhould believe that I deſerted your Religion for ends, & againſt the light of my conſcience, out of a deſire of preferment, and yet out of ſcruple of conſcience, ſhould refuſe (which alſo you impute to me,) to ſubſcribe the 39 Articles, that is, refuſe to enter at the only common dore, which here in England leads to preferment? Again how incredible is it that you ſhould believe, that I forſooke the profeſſion of your Religion, as not ſuting with my deſires and deſignes, which yet reconciles the enjoying of the pleaſures and profits of ſinne here, with the hope of happineſſe hereafter, and propoſes as great hope of great temporall advancements to the capable ſervants of it, as any, nay more then any Religion in the world; and inſtead of this ſhould chooſe Socinianiſme, a Doctrine, which howſoever erroneous in explicating the myſteries of Religion, and allowing greater liberty of opinion in ſpeculative matters, then any other Company of Chriſtians doth or they ſhould doe, yet certainly which you, I am ſure, will pretend and maintaine to explicate the Lawes of Chriſt with more rigor, and leſſe indulgence and condeſcendence to the deſires of fleſh and blood then your Doctrine doth! And beſides, ſuch a Doctrine by which no man in his right mind, can hope for any honour or preferment either in this Church or State or any other! All which cleerely demonſtrates that this foule and falſe aſperſion, which you have caſt upon mee, proceeds from no other fountaine, but a heart abounding with the gall and bit-

terneſſe of uncharitableneſſe, and even blinded with malice towards me, or elſe from a perverſe zeale to your ſuperſtition, which ſecretly ſuggeſts this perſwaſion to you, That for the Catholique cauſe nothing is unlawfull, but that you may make uſe of ſuch indirect and crooked arts as theſe, to blaſt my reputation, and to poſſeſſe mens minds with disaffection to my perſon, leaſt otherwiſe peradventure they might with ſome indifference hear reaſon from me. God I hope which bringeth light out of darkneſſe, will turne your counſells to fooliſhneſſe, and give all good men grace to perceive how weak and ruinous that Religion muſt be, which needs ſupportance from ſuch tricks and devices! So I call them becauſe they deſerve no better name: For what are all theſe Perſonall matters, which hitherto you have ſpoke of, to the buſineſſe in hand? If it could be prov'd, that Cardinall *Bellarmine* was indeed a Iew, or that Cardinall *Perron* was an Atheiſt, yet I preſume you would not accept of this for an anſwer to all their writings in defence of your Religion. Let then my actions and intentions and opinions be what they will, yet I hope truth is nevertheleſſe truth, nor reaſon ever the leſſe Reaſon becauſe I ſpeak it. And therefore the Chriſtian Reader, knowing that his Salvation or damnation depends upon his impartiall and ſincere judgment of theſe things, will guard himſelf I hope from theſe impoſtures, and regard not the perſon but the cauſe and the reaſons of it; not who ſpeakes but what is ſpoken: Which is all the favour I deſire of him, as knowing that I am deſirous not to perſwade him, unleſſe it be truth whereunto I perſwade him.

30 The third and laſt part of my Accuſation was, that I anſwer out of *Principles which Proteſtants themſelves will profeſſe to deteſt*: which indeed were to the purpoſe if it could be juſtified. But, beſides that it is confuted by my whole Book, and made ridiculous by the Approbations premis'd unto it, it is very eaſy for mee out of your own mouth and words to prove it a moſt injurious calumny. For what one concluſion is there in the whole fabrick of my diſcourſe, that is not naturally deducible out of this one Principle, That *all things neceſſary to ſalvation are evidently contain'd in Scripture*? Or what one Concluſion almoſt of importance is there in your Book, which is not by this one cleerly confutable? Grant this, and it will preſently follow in oppoſition to your firſt Concluſion, and the argument of your firſt Ch: that amongſt men of different opinions, touching the obſcure and controverted Queſtions of Religiō, ſuch as may with probability be diſputed on both Sides (and ſuch as are the diſputes of Proteſtants;) Good men and lovers of truth of all Sides may bee ſav'd; becauſe all neceſſary things being ſuppos'd evident, concerning them, with men ſo qualified, there will be no difference: There being no more certain ſigne that a Point is not evident, then that honeſt and underſtanding and indifferent men, and ſuch as give themſelves liberty of judgment, after a mature conſideration of the matter differ about it.

31 Grant this, and it will appear *Secondly*, that the means whereby the revealed Truths of God are conveyed to our underſtanding, and which are to determine all Controverſies in Faith, neceſſary to be determined,

termined, may be, for any thing you have ſaid to the contrary, not a Church but the Scripture; which contradicts the Doctrine of your *Second Chapter.*

32 Grant this, and the diſtinction of points Fundamentall and not Fundamentall, will appear very good and pertinent. For thoſe truths will be fundamentall, which, are evidently delivered in Scripture and commanded to be preach't to all men; Thoſe not fundamentall which are obſcure. And nothing will hinder but that the Catholique Church may erre in the latter kind of the ſaid points: becauſe Truths not neceſſary to the Salvation, cannot be neceſſary to the being of a Church; and becauſe it is not abſolutely neceſſary that God ſhould aſſiſt his Church any farther then to bring her to Salvation; neither will there be any neceſſity at all of any infallible Guide, either to conſigne unwritten Traditions, or to declare the obſcurities of the faith. Not for the former end, becauſe this Principle being granted true, nothing unwritten can be neceſſary to be conſign'd. Nor for the latter, becauſe nothing that is obcſure can be neceſſary to be underſtood, or not miſtaken. And ſo the diſcourſe of your whole *Third Chap:* will preſently vaniſh.

33 Fourthly, for the Creed's containing the Fundamentals of ſimple belief, though I ſee not how it may be deduc'd from this princple, yet the granting of this plainly renders the whole diſpute touching the Creed unneceſſary. For if all neceſſary things of all ſorts, whether of ſimple belief or practice be confeſs'd to bee cleerly contain'd in Scripture, what imports it whether thoſe of one ſort bee contain'd in the Creed?

34 Fiftly let this be granted, and the immediate Corollary in oppoſition to your fift Ch: will be and muſt be, That, not Proteſtants for rejecting, but the Church of Rome for impoſing upon the Faith of Chriſtians, Doctrines unwritten and unneceſſary, and for diſturbing the Churches peace and dividing Vnity for ſuch matters, is in a high degree preſumptuous and Schiſmaticall.

35 Grant this ſixtly, and it will follow unavoidably that Proteſtants cannot poſſibly be Heretiques, ſeeing they believe all things evidently contain'd in Scripture, which are ſuppos'd to be all that is neceſſary to be believed: and ſo your *Sixt Chapter* is cleerly confuted.

36 Grant this laſtly, and it will be undoubtedly conſequent, in contradiction of your *ſeaventh Chapter*, that no man can ſhew more charity to himſelf then by continuing a Proteſtant, ſeeing Proteſtants are ſuppos'd to believe, and therefore may accordingly practiſe, at leaſt by their Religion are not hindred from practiſing and performing all things neceſſary to Salvation.

37 So that the poſition of this one Principle, is the direct overthrow of your whole Book, and therefore I needed not, nor indeed have I made uſe of any other. Now this principle, which is not only the corner ſtone or chief Pillar, but even the baſe, and adequate foundation of my Anſwer; and which while it ſtands firme and unmoveable, cannot but bee the ſupporter of my Book and the certain ruine of yours, is

ſo farre from being, according to your pretence, deteſted by all Proteſtants, that all Proteſtants whatſoever, as you may ſee in their Harmony of confeſſions, unanimouſly profeſſe and maintain it. And you your ſelfe, C. 6. § 30. plainly confeſſe as much, in ſaying, *The whole Edifice of the faith of Proteſtants is ſetled on theſe two Principles: Theſe particular Books are Canonicall Scripture: And the ſenſe and meaning of them is plain and evident at leaſt in all points neceſſary to Salvation.*

38 And thus your venome againſt me is in a manner ſpent, ſaving only that there remain two litle impertinencies, whereby you would diſable me from being a fit advocate for the cauſe of Proteſtants. The firſt, becauſe I refuſe to ſubſcribe the Artic. of the Ch. of England: The ſecond becauſe I have ſet down in writing motives which ſometime induc'd mee to forſake Proteſtantiſme, and hitherto have not anſwered them.

39 By the former of which objections it ſhould ſeeme, that either you conceive the 39 Articles the common Doctrine of all Proteſtants, and if they be, why have you ſo often upbraided them with their many and great differences? Or elſe that it is the peculiar defence of the Church of England, and not the common cauſe of all Proteſtants, which is here undertaken by me: which are certainly very groſſe miſtakes. And yet why hee who makes ſcruple of ſubſcribing the truth of one or two Propoſitions may not yet bee fit enough to maintain that thoſe who doe ſubſcribe them are in a ſaveable condition, I doe not underſtand. Now though I hold not the Doctrine of all Proteſtants abſoluetly true, (which with reaſon cannot bee requir'd of mee while they hold contradictions,) yet I hold it free from all impiety, and from all error deſtructive of Salvation, or in it ſelf damnable: And this I think in reaſon may ſufficiently qualifie me, for a maintainer of this aſſertion, that *Proteſtancie deſtroies not Salvation.* For the Church of England, I am perſwaded that the conſtant Doctrine of it is ſo pure and Orthodoxe, that whoſoever believes it and lives according to it, undoubtedly he ſhall be ſaved; and that there is no error in it which may neceſſitate or warrant any man to diſturbe the peace or renounce the Communion of it. This in my opinion is all intended by Subſcription, and thus much if you conceive mee not ready to ſubſcribe, your *Charity* I aſſure you is much *miſtaken.*

40 Your other objection againſt me is yet more impertinent and frivolous then the former: Vnleſſe perhaps it be a juſt exception againſt a Phyſitian, that himſelf was ſometimes in, and recover'd himſelf from that diſeaſe which he undertakes to cure; or againſt a guide in a way, that at firſt before hee had experience himſelf miſtook it, and afterwards, found his error and amended it. That noble writer *Michael de Montai'gne*, was ſurely of a farre different mind; for hee will hardly allow any Phyſitian competent, but only for ſuch diſeaſes as himſelf had paſſ'd through: And a farre greater then *Montai'gne*, even he that ſaid, *Tu converſus confirma fratres*, gives us ſufficiently to underſtand that they which have themſelves beene in ſuch a ſtate as to need converſion, are not thereby made incapable of, but rather engag'd

and

and oblig'd unto, and qualified for this charitable function.

41 Neither am I guilty of that ſtrange and prepoſterous zeale (as you eſteeme it) which you impute to me; for having been ſo long careleſſe in removing this ſcandall againſt Proteſtants, and anſwering my own Motives, and yet now ſhewing ſuch fervor in writing againſt others. For neither are they other Motives, but the very ſame for the moſt part with thoſe which abuſed me, againſt which this Book which I now publiſh, is in a manner wholly imployed: And beſides, though you Ieſuits take upon you to have ſuch large and univerſall intelligence of all ſtate affaires and matters of importance, yet I hope ſuch a contemptible matter, as an anſwer of mine to a litle peece of paper, may very probably have been written and eſcaped your obſervation. The truth is, I made an anſwer to them three yeares ſince and better, which perhaps might have been publiſhed, but for two reaſons: one becauſe the Motives were never publique, untill you made them ſo; the other, becauſe I was loath to proclaime to all the world ſo much weakneſſe as I ſhewed, in ſuffering my ſelfe to be abus'd by ſuch ſilly Sophiſmes; All which proceed upon miſtakes and falſe ſuppoſitions, which unadviſedly I took for granted; as when I have ſet down the Motives in order by ſubſequent Anſwers to them I ſhall quickly demonſtrate, and ſo make an end. The Motives then were theſe.

1 *Becauſe perpetuall viſible profeſſion, which could never be wanting to the Religion of Chriſt, nor any part of it, is apparently wanting to Proteſtant Religion, ſo farre as concernes the points in conteſtation.*

2 *Becauſe* Luther *and his followers, ſeparating from the Church of* Rome, *ſeparated alſo from all Churches, pure or impure, true or falſe then being in the world; upon which ground I conclude, that either Gods promiſes did faile of performance, if there were then no Church in the world, which held all things neceſſary, and nothing repugnant to Salvation; or elſe that* Luther *and his Sectaries, ſeparating from all Churches then in the world, and ſo from the true, if there were any true, were* damnable Schiſmaticks.

3 *Becauſe, if any credit may be given to as creditable records, as any are extant, the Doctrine of Catholicks hath been frequently confirmed, and the oppoſite doctrine of Proteſtants, confounded with ſupernaturall and divine Miracles.*

4 *Becauſe many points of Proteſtant doctrine, are the damned opinions of Hereticks, condemned by the Primitive Church.*

5 *Becauſe the Prophecies of the old Teſtament, touching the converſion of Kings and Nations to the true Religion of Chriſt, have been accompliſhed in and by the Catholicke* Roman *Religion, and the Profeſſors of it; and not by Proteſtant Religion, and the Profeſſors of it.*

6 *Becauſe the doctrine of the Church of* Rome *is conformable, and the doctrine of Proteſtants contrary, to the doctrine of the Fathers of the Primitive Church, even by the confeſſion of Proteſtants themſelves; I meane, thoſe fathers, who lived within the compaſſe of the firſt 600. years; to whom Proteſtants themſelves doe very frequently, and very confidently appeale.*

7 *Becauſe the firſt pretended Reformers had neither extraordinary* Commiſſion *from God, nor ordinary* Miſſion *from the Church, to preach Proteſtant Doctrine.*

8 *Becauſe* Luther, *to preach againſt the Maſſe (which containes the moſt materiall points now in controverſy) was perſwaded by reaſons ſuggeſted to him by the Divell himſelfe, diſputing with him. So himſelfe profeſſeth in his Book* de Miſſa Privata. *That all men might take heed of following him, who profeſſeth himſelfe to follow the Divell.*

9 *Becauſe the Proteſtant cauſe is now, and hath been from the beginning, maintained with groſſe falſifications, and Calumnies; whereof their prime Controverſy writers, are notoriouſly, and in high degree guilty.*

10 *Becauſe by denying all humane authority, either of Pope, or Councells, or Church, to determine Controverſies of Faith, they have aboliſhed all poſſible meanes of ſuppreſſing Hereſy, or reſtoring unity to the Church.*

Theſe are the Motives; now my Anſwers to them follow briefly and in order.

43 To the firſt: God hath neither decreed nor foretold, that his true Doctrine ſhould *de facto* be alwaies viſibly profeſſed, without any mixture of falſhood.

To the ſecond: God hath neither decreed nor foretold, that there ſhall be alwaies a viſible company of men free from all error in it ſelfe damnable. Neither is it alwaies of neceſſity Schiſmaticall to ſeparate from the externall communion of a Church, though wanting nothing neceſſary: For if this Church ſuppos'd to want nothing neceſſary, require me to profeſſe againſt my conſcience, that I believe ſome error, though never ſo ſmall and innocent, which I doe not believe, and will not allow me her communion but upon this condition, In this caſe, the Church for requiring this condition is Schiſmaticall, and not I for ſeparating from the Church.

To the third: If any credit may be given to Records farre more creditable then theſe, the Doctrine of Proteſtants, that is the Bible hath been confirm'd, and the Doctrine of Papiſts, which is in many points plainly oppoſite to it, confounded with ſupernaturall and divine Miracles, which for number and glory outſhine Popiſh pretended Miracles, as much as the Sunne doth an *Ignis fatuus*, thoſe I mean which were wrought by our Saviour Chriſt and his Apoſtles. Now this book, by the confeſſion of all ſides confirm'd by innumerous Miracles, foretels me plainly, that in after ages great ſignes and wonders ſhall be wrought in confirmation of falſe doctrine, and that I am not to believe any doctrine which ſeemes to my underſtanding repugnant to the firſt, though an Angell from Heaven ſhould teach it; which were certainly as great a Miracle as any that was ever wrought in atteſtation of any part of the doctrine of the Church of Rome: But that true doctrine ſhould in all ages have the teſtimony of Miracles, that I am no where taught; So that I have more reaſon to ſuſpect and be afraid of pretended Miracles, as ſignes of falſe doctrine, then much to regard them as certain arguments of the truth. Beſides, ſetting aſide the Bible

ble, & the Tradition of it, there is as good ſtory for Miracles wrought by thoſe who lived and died in oppoſition to the Doctrine of the Roman Church, (as by S. *Cyprian*, *Colmannus*, *Columbanus*, *Aidanus* and others,) as there is for thoſe that are pretended to be wrought by the members of that Church. Laſtly, it ſeemes to me no ſtrange thing that God in his Iuſtice ſhould permit ſome true Miracles to be wrought to delude them, who have forged ſo many as apparently the profeſſors of the Roman Doctrine have to abuſe the World.

To the fourth: All thoſe were not [a] Heretiques which by *Philaſtrius*, *Epiphanius*, or *S. Auſtine* were put in the Catalogue of Heretiques.

To the fift: Kings and Nations have been and may be converted by men of contrary Religions.

To the ſixt: The Doctrine of Papiſts, is confeſs'd by Papiſts contrary to the Fathers in many points.

To the ſeaventh: The Paſtors of a Church cannot but have authority from it, to preach againſt the abuſes of it whether in Doctrine or practice, if there be any in it: Neither can any Chriſtian want an ordinary commiſſion from God to doe a neceſſary work of Charity after a peaceable manner, when there is no body elſe that can or will doe it. In extraordinary caſes extraordinary courſes are not to be diſallowed. If ſome Chriſtian Lay-man ſhould come into a country of Infidels, & had ability to perſwade them to Chriſtianity, who would ſay he might not uſe it for want of Commiſſion!

To the eighth: *Luthers* conference with the Divell might be, for ought I know, nothing but a melancholy dreame: If it were reall, the Divell might perſwade Luther from the Maſſe, hoping by doing ſo to keep him conſtant to it: Or that others would make his diſwaſion from it an Argument for it, (as we ſee Papiſts doe) and be afraid of following Luther, as confeſſing himſelfe to have been perſwaded by the Divell.

To the ninth: *Illiacos intra muros peccatur & extra.* Papiſts are more guilty of this fault then Proteſtants. Even this very author in this very Pamphlet hath not ſo many leaves as falſifications and calumnies.

To the tenth: Let all men believe the Scripture and that only, and endeavour to believe it in the true ſenſe, and require no more of others, and they ſhall finde this not only a better, but the only meanes to ſuppreſſe Hereſy, and reſtore Unity. For he that believes the Scripture ſincerely, and endeavours to believe it in the true ſenſe, cannot poſſibly be an Heretique: And if no more then this were requir'd of any man, to make him capable of the Churches Communion, then all men ſo qualified, though they were different in opinion, yet notwithſtanding any ſuch difference, muſt be of neceſſity one in Communion.

[a] See this acknowledg'd by Bellar: *de Script: Eccleſ. in Philaſtrio*: by *Petavius Animad in Epiph. de inſcrip operis* By S. Auſtin, *Lib. de Hæreſ. Hær. 88.*

The Preface to the

READER.

GIVE me leave (good Reader) to informe thee by way of Preface, of three points. The firſt concernes *D. Potters Anſwere to Charity Miſtaken.* The ſecond relates to this *Reply* of mine. And the third containes ſome *Premonitions*, or *Preſcriptions*, in caſe *D. Potter*, or any in his behalfe thinke fit to rejoyne.

A generall conſideration of D. Potters Anſwere.

2. For the firſt point concerning *D. Potters Anſwere*, I ſay in generall, reſerving particulars to their proper places, that in his whole Booke he hath not ſo much as once truly and really fallen upon the point in queſtion, which was, Whether both Catholiques and Proteſtants can be ſaved in their ſeverall profeſſions. And therefore *Charity Miſtaken* judiciouſly preſſing thoſe particulars, wherein the difficulty doth preciſely conſiſt, proves in generall, that there is but one true Church; that all Chriſtians are obliged to harken to her; that ſhee muſt be ever viſible, and infallible; that to ſeparate ones ſelfe from her communion is Schiſme; and to diſſent from her doctrine is Hereſie, though it be in points never ſo few, or never ſo ſmall in their own nature; and therefore that the diſtinction of points fundamentall, and not fundamentall, is wholy vaine, as it is applied by Proteſtants. Theſe (I ſay) and ſome other generall grounds *Charity Miſtaken* handles, and out of them doth cleerely evince, that any leaſt difference in faith cannot ſtand with ſalvation on both ſides: and therefore ſince it is apparent, that Catholiques and Proteſtants diſagree in very many points of faith, they both cannot hope to be ſaved without repentance: and conſequently, as we hold, that Proteſtancy unrepented *deſtroies Salvation*; ſo muſt they alſo believe that we cannot be ſaved, if they judge their own Religion to be true, and ours to be falſe. And whoſoever diſguizeth this truth, is an enemy to ſoules, which he deceives with ungrounded falſe hopes of ſalvation, indifferent Faiths, and Religions. And this, *Charity Miſtaken* performed exactly, according to that which appeares to have been his deſigne, which was not to deſcend to particular diſputes, as *D. Potter* affectedly does, namely, Whether or no the Roman Church be the only true Church of Chriſt; and much leſſe whether Generall Councells be infallible; whether the Pope may erre in his Decrees common to the whole Church; whether he be above a Generall Councell; whether all points of faith be contained in Scripture; whether Faith be reſolved into the authority of the Church, as into his laſt *formall Object*, and *Motive*; and leaſt of all did he diſcourſe of Images, Communion under both kinds, publique ſervice in an unknown Tongue, Seven Sacraments, Sacrifice of the Maſſe, Indulgences, and Index Expurgatorius: all which and divers other articles *D. Potter* (as I ſaid) drawes by violence into his Book: and he might as well have brought in Pope *Ioan*, or Antichriſt, or the Iewes who are permitted to live in Rome, which are common Themes for men that want better matter, as *D. Potter* was forced to fetch in the aforeſaid Controverſies, that ſo he might dazle the eyes, and diſtract the mind of the Reader, and hinder him from perceiving that in his whole Anſwere he uttered nothing to the purpoſe, and point in queſtion: which if he had followed cloſely, I dare well ſay, he might have diſpatched his whole Book in two or three ſheets of paper. But the truth is, he was loath to affirme plainely, that generally both Catholiques and Proteſtants may be ſaved: and yet ſeeing it to be moſt evident that Proteſtants cannot pretend to have any true Church before *Luther*, except the Roman, and ſuch as agreed with her, and conſequently that they cannot hope for Salvation, if they deny it to us; he thought beſt to avoid this difficulty by confuſion of language, and to fill up his Book with points which make nothing to the purpoſe. Wherein he is leſſe excuſable, be-

cauſe he muſt graunt, that thoſe very particulars to which he digreſſeth, are not fundamentall errors, though it ſhould be granted that they be errors, which indeed are Catholique verities. For ſince they be not fundamentall, not deſtructive of ſalvation, what imports it whether we hold them or no, for as much as concernes our poſſibility to be ſaved?

3 In one thing only he will perhaps ſeeme to have touched the point in queſtion, to wit, in his diſtinction of points fundamentall, and not fundamentall: becauſe ſome may thinke, that a difference in points which are not fundamentall breakes not the Vnity of Faith, and hinders not the hope of ſalvation in perſons ſo diſagreeing. And yet in this very diſtinction, he never ſpeaks to the purpoſe indeed, but only ſaies, that there are ſome points ſo fundamentall, as that all are obliged to know and *believe* them explicitely, but never tells us, whether there be any other points of faith, which a man may deny or *disbelieve*, though they be ſufficiently preſented to his underſtanding, as truths revealed, or teſtified by almighty God; which was the only thing in queſtion. For if it be damnable, as certainly it is, to deny, or disbelieve any one truth witneſſed by almighty God, though the thing be not in it ſelf of any great conſequence, or moment; and ſince of two diſagreeing in matters of faith, one muſt neceſſarily deny ſome ſuch truth; it clearly followes that amongſt men of different Faiths, or Religions, one only can be ſaved, though their difference conſiſt of divers, or but even one point, which is not in his own nature fundamentall, as I declare at large in divers places of my firſt part. So that it is cleere, *D. Potter* even in this his laſt refuge and diſtinction, never comes to the point in queſtion, to ſay nothing that he himſelfe doth quite overthrow it, and plainly contradict his whole deſigne, as I ſhew in the third Chapter of my *firſt Part.*

4 And as for *D. Potters* manner of handling thoſe very points, which are utterly beſide the purpoſe, it conſiſts only in bringing vulgar mean objections, which have been anſwered a thouſand times, yea, and ſome of them are cleerely anſwered even in *Charity Miſtaken*; but he takes no knowledge at all of any ſuch anſweres, and much leſſe doth he apply himſelfe to confute them. He alleadgeth alſo Authors with ſo great corruption and fraud, as I would not have believed, if I had not found it by cleere, and frequent experience. In his ſecond *Edition*, he hath indeed left out one or two groſſe corruptions, amongſt many others no leſſe notorious, having as it ſeemes been warned by ſome friends, that they could not ſtand with his credit: but even in this his ſecond *Edition* he retracts them not at all, nor declares that he was miſtaken in the *Firſt*, and ſo his reader of the firſt *Edition* ſhall ever be deceived by him, though withall he read the *Second*. For preventing of which inconvenience, I have thought it neceſſary to take notice of them, and to diſcover them in my *Reply*.

5. And for concluſion of this point I will only ſay, that *D. Potter* might well have ſpared his paines if he had ingeniouſly acknowledged, where the whole ſubſtance, yea and ſometime the very words and phraſes of his book may be found in farre briefer manner, namely, in a *Sermon* of *D. Vſhers* preached before our late ſoveraigne Lord *King Iames* the 20. of Iune 1624. at *Wanſted*, containing *A Declaration of the Vniverſality of the Church of Chriſt, and the Vnity of Faith, profeſſed therein*, which Sermon having been roundly and wittily confuted by a Catholike Divine, under the name of *Paulus Veridicus*, within the compaſſe of about 4. ſheets of Paper, *D. Potters Anſwere to Charity Miſtaken* was in effect confuted before it appeared. And this may ſuffice for a generall Cenſure of his Anſwere to *Charity Miſtaken*.

Concerning my Reply.

6 For the ſecond, touching my *Reply*: if you wonder at the Bulke thereof, compared either with *Charity Miſtaken*, or *D Porters Anſwere*, I deſire you to conſider well of what now I am about to ſay, and then I hope you will ſee, that I was caſt upon a meere neceſſity of not being ſo ſhort, as otherwiſe might peradventure be deſired. *Charity Miſtaken* is ſhort I grant, and yet very full, and large, for as much as concerned his deſigne, which you ſee was not to treat of particular Controverſies in Religion, no not ſo much as to debate, whether or no the Roman Church be the only true Church of Chriſt, which indeed would have required a larger Volume, as I have underſtood there was one then comming forth, if it had not been prevented by the Treatiſe of *Charity Miſtaken*, which ſeemed to make the other intended worke a little leſſe ſeaſonable at that time. But *Charity Miſtaken* proves only in Generall out of ſome Vniverſall Principles, well backed and made good by choice & ſolid authorities, that of two diſagreeing in points of Faith, one only without repentance can be ſaved; which ayme exacted no great bulk. And as for *D. Potters Anſwere*, even that alſo is not ſo ſhort as it may ſeem. For if his marginall notes printed in a ſmall letter were transferred into the Text, the Book would appear to be of ſome bulk: though indeed it might have been very ſhort, if he had kept himſelfe to the point treated by *Charity Miſtaken*, as ſhall be declared anon. But contrarily, becauſe the queſtion debated betwixt *Charity Miſtaken* and *D. Potter*, is a point of the higheſt conſequence that can be imagined, and in regard that there is not a more pernitious Hereſy, or rather indeed ground of Atheiſme, then a perſwaſion that men of different Religions may be ſaved, if otherwiſe forſooth they lead a kind of civill and morall life: I conceaved, that my chief endeavour was not to be employed in anſwering *D Potter*, but that it was neceſſary to handle the Queſtion it ſelfe ſomewhat at large, and not only to prove in generall, that both Proteſtants and Catholikes cannot be ſaved; but to ſhew alſo, that Salvation cannot be hoped for out of the Catholique Roman Church; and yet withall, not to omit to anſwere all the particulars of *D. Potters* Book which may any way import,

port. To this end I thought it fit, to divide my *Reply* into *two Parts*; in the former whereof, the main queſtion is handled by a continued diſcourſe without ſtepping aſide to confute the particulars of *D. Potters Anſwere*, though yet ſo, as that even in this firſt *Part*, I omit not to anſwere ſuch paſſages of his, as I find directly in my way, and naturally belong to the points whereof I treat: and in the ſecond *Part* I anſwere *D. Potters* Treatiſe, *Section* by *Section*, as they lye in order. I heer therefore intreat the Reader, that if heartily he deſire ſatisfaction in this ſo important queſtion, he doe not content himſelfe with that which I ſay to *Doctor Potter* in my ſecond *Part*, but that he take the *Firſt* before him, eyther all, or at leaſt ſo much as may ſerve moſt to his purpoſe of being ſatisfied in thoſe doubts which preſſe him moſt. For which purpoſe I have cauſed a Table of the Chapters of the firſt *Part*, together with their Titles and Arguments, to be prefixed before my Reply.

7. This was then a chiefe reaſon why I could not be very ſhort. But yet there wanted not alſo divers other cauſes of the ſame effect. For there are ſo ſeverall kinds of Proteſtants through the difference of Tenets which they hold, as that if a man convince but one kind of them, the reſt will conceive themſelves to be as truly unſatisfied, and even unſpoken to, as if nothing had been ſaid therein at all. As for example, ſome hold a neceſſity of a perpetuall viſible Church, and ſome hold no ſuch neceſſity. Some of them hold it neceſſary to be able to prove it diſtinct from ours; and others, that their buſineſſe is diſpatched when they have proved ours to have been alwaies viſible: for then they will conceive that theirs hath been ſo: & the like may be truly ſaid of very many other particulars. Beſides it is *D. Potters* faſhion, (wherein as he is very far from being the firſt, ſo I pray God he prove the laſt of that humour) to touch in a word many triviall old objections, which if they be not all anſwered, it will, and muſt ſerve the turne, to make the more ignorant ſort of men believe, and brag, as if ſome maine unanſwerable matter had been ſubtily and purpoſely omitted; and every body knowes that ſome objection may be very plauſibly made in few words, the cleere and ſolid anſwere whereof will require more leaves of paper then one. And in particular *D. Potter* doth couch his corruption of Authors within the compaſſe of ſo few lines, and with ſo great confuſedneſſe and fraud, that it requires much time, paines, and paper to open them ſo diſtinctly, as that they may appear to every mans eye. It was alſo neceſſary to ſhew, what *D. Potter* omits in *Charity Miſtaken*, and the importance of what is omitted, and ſometimes to ſet down the very words themſelves that are omitted, all which could not but adde to the quantity of my *Reply*. And as for the *quality* thereof, I deſire thee (good Reader) to believe, that whereas nothing is more neceſſary then books for anſwering of books: yet I was ſo ill furniſhed in this kind, that I was forced to omit the examination of divers Authors cited by *D. Potter*, meerely upon neceſſity; though I did very well perceive by moſt apparant circumſtances, that I muſt probably have been ſure inough to find them plainly miſalleadged, and much wronged: and for the few which are examined, there hath not wanted ſome difficulties to doe it. For the times are not for all men alike; and *D. Potter* hath much advantage therein. But truth is truth, and will ever be able to juſtify it ſelf in the midſt of all difficulties which may occurre. As for me, when I alledge Proteſtant Writers as well domeſticall as forraine, I willingly and thankfully acknowledge my ſelfe obliged for divers of them to the author of the Book entituled, *The Proteſtants Apology for the Roman Church*, who calls himſelfe *Iohn Brerely*, whoſe care, exactneſſe, and fidelity is ſo extraordinary great, as that he doth not only cite the Bookes, but the Editions alſo, with the place and time of their printing, yea and often the very page, and line where the words are to be had. And if you happen not to finde what he cites, yet ſuſpend your judgment, till you have read the corrections placed at the end of his book; though it be alſo true, that after all diligence and faithfulneſſe on his behalfe, it was not in his power to amend all the faults of the print: in which prints we have difficulty enough for many evident reaſons, which muſt needs occur to any prudent man.

8. And for aſmuch as concernes the manner of my *Reply*, I have procured to doe it without all bitterneſſe, or gall of invective words, both for as much as may import either Proteſtants in generall, or *D. Potters* perſon in particular; unles, for example, he will call it bitterneſſe for me to terme a groſſe impertinency, a *ſleight*, or a *corruption*, by thoſe very names, without which I doe not know how to expreſſe the things: and yet therein I can truly affirme that I have ſtudied how to deliver them in the moſt moderate way, to the end I might give as little offence as poſſibly I could, without betraying the Cauſe. And if any unfit phraſe may peradventure have eſcaped my pen (as I hope none hath) it was beſide, and againſt my intention, though I muſt needs profeſſe, that *D. Potter* gives ſo many and ſo juſt occaſions of being round with him, as that perhaps ſome will judge me to have been rather remiſſe, then moderate. But ſince in the very title of my *Reply* I profeſſe to *maintaine Charity*, I conceive that the exceſſe will be more excuſable amongſt all kinds of men, if it fall to be in mildneſſe, then if it had appeared in too much zeale. And if *D. Potter* have a mind to charge me with ignorance or any thing of that nature, I can, and will eaſe him of that labour, by acknowledging in my ſelfe as many and more perſonall defects, then he can heap upon me. Truth only and ſyncerity I ſo much valew and profeſſe, as that he ſhall never be able to prove the contrary in any one leaſt paſſage or particle againſt me.

Rules to be obſerved if *D. Potter* intend a Rejoynder.

9. In the third and laſt place, I have thought fit to expreſſe my ſelfe thus. If *D. Potter*, or any other reſolve to anſwere my *Reply*; I deſire that he will obſerve ſome things which may tend

to his owne reputation, the ſaving of my unneceſſary paines, and eſpecially to the greater advantage of truth. I wiſh then that he would be carefull to conſider, wherein the point of every difficulty conſiſts, and not impertinently to ſhoot at Rovers, and affectedly miſtake one thing for another. As for example, to what purpoſe (for as much as concernes the queſtion betweene *D. Potter* and *Charity Miſtaken*) doth he ſo often and ſeriouſly labour to proue, that faith is not reſolved into the authority of the Church, as into the formall *Obiect* and *Motiue* thereof? Or that all points of Faith are contained in Scripture? Or that the Church cannot make new Articles of Faith? Or that the Church of *Rome*, as it ſignifies that particular Church or Dioceſſe, is not all one with the univerſall Church? Or that the Pope as a private Doctor may erre? With many other ſuch points as will eaſily appeare in their proper places. It will alſo be neceſſary for him not to put certaine Doctrines upon us, from which he knowes we diſclaime as much as himſelfe.

10 I muſt in like manner intreat him not to recite my reaſons and diſcourſes by halfes, but to ſet them down faithfully and entirely, for as much as in very deed concernes the whole ſubſtance of the thing in queſtion; becauſe the want ſometime of one word, may chance to make void, or leſſen the force of the whole argument. And I am the more ſolicitous about giving this particular caveat, becauſe I finde how ill he hath complied with the promiſe which he made in his Preface to the Reader, not to omit *without anſwere any one thing of moment in all the diſcourſe of Charity Miſtaken.* Neither will this courſe be a cauſe that his *Reioynder* grow too large, but it will be occaſion of brevity to him, and free me alſo from the paines of ſetting downe all the words which he omits, and himſelfe of demonſtrating that what he omitted was not materiall. Nay I will aſſure him, that if he keep himſelfe to the point of every difficulty, and not weary the Reader, and overcharge his margent, with unneceſſary quotations of Authors in Greek and Latin, and ſometime alſo in Italian and French, together with proverbs, ſentences of Poets, and ſuch grammaticall ſtuffe, nor affect to cite a multitude of our Catholique Schoole divines to no purpoſe at all; his Book will not exceed a competent ſize, nor will any man in reaſon be offended with that length which is regulated by neceſſity. Againe before he come to ſet downe his anſwere, or propoſe his Arguments, let him conſider very well what may be replied, and whether his own objections may not be retorted againſt himſelfe, as the Reader will perceiue to haue hapned often to his diſadvantage in my *Reply* againſt him. But eſpecially I expect, and Truth it ſelfe exacts at his hand, that he ſpeak cleerly and diſtinctly, and not ſeek to walk in darkneſſe, ſo to delude and deceiue his Reader, now ſaying, and then denying, and alwaies ſpeaking with ſuch ambiguity, as that his greateſt care may ſeeme to conſiſt in a certaine art to find a ſhift, as his occaſions might chance, either now, or heereafter to require, and as he might fall out to be urged by diverſity of ſeverall arguments. And to the end it may appeare, that I deale plainely, as I would haue him alſo doe, I deſire that he declare himſelfe concerning theſe points.

11 Firſt, whether our Saviour Chriſt haue not alwaies had, and be not ever to haue a viſible true Church on earth: and whether the contrary doctrine be not a damnable Hereſy.

12 Secondly, what viſible Church there was before *Luther*, diſagreeing from the *Roman* Church, and agreeing with the pretended Church of Proteſtants.

13 Thirdly, Since he will be forced to grant that there cã be aſſigned no viſible true Church of Chriſt, diſtinct from the Church of Rome, and ſuch Churches as agreed with her when *Luther* firſt appeared, whether it doe not follow that ſhee hath not erred fundamentally; becauſe every ſuch errour deſtroies the nature and being of the Church, and ſo our Saviour Chriſt ſhould haue had no viſible Church on earth.

14 Fourthly, if the *Roman* Church did not fall into any fundamentall errour, let him tell us how it can be *damnable* to liue in her Communion, or to maintaine errours, which are knowne and confeſſed, not to be fundamentall, or *damnable*.

15 Fiftly, if her Errours were not damnable, nor did exclude ſalvation, how can they be excuſed from *Schiſme*, who forſooke her Communion upon pretence of errours, which were not damnable.

16 Sixtly, if *D. Potter* haue a minde to ſay, that her Errours are damnable, or fundamentall, let him doe us ſo much charity, as to tell us in particular what thoſe fundamentall errours be. But he muſt ſtill remember (and my ſelfe muſt be excuſed, for repeating it) that if he ſay the Roman Church erred fundamentally, he will not be able to ſhew, that Chriſt our Lord had any viſible Church on earth, when *Luther* appeared: and let him tell us how Proteſtants had, or can haue any Church which was univerſall, and extended her ſelfe to all ages, if once he grant, that the Roman Church ceaſed to be the true Church of Chriſt; and conſequently how they can hope for Salvation, if they deny it to us.

17 Seaventhly, whether any one Errour maintained againſt any one Truth, though never ſo ſmall in it ſelfe, yet ſufficiently propounded as teſtified or revealed by almighty God, doe not deſtroy the Nature and Vnity of Faith, or at leaſt is not a grievous offence excluding Salvation.

18 Eightly, if this be ſo, how can *Lutherans*, *Calviniſts*, *Zuinglians*, and all the reſt of diſagreeing Proteſtants, hope for ſalvation, ſince it is manifeſt that ſome of them muſt needs erre againſt ſome ſuch truth as is teſtified by almighty God, either fundamentall, or at leaſt not fundamentall.

19 Ninthly, we conſtantly urge, and require to haue a particular Catalogue of ſuch points as he

he calls fundamentall: A Catalogue, I ſay, in *particular*, and not only ſome *generall* definition, or deſcription, wherein Proteſtants may perhaps agree, though wee ſee that they differ when they come to aſſigne what points in particular be fundamentall; and yet upon ſuch a particular Catalogue much depends: as for example in particular, Whether or no a man doe not erre in ſome point fundamentall or neceſſary to ſalvation; and whether or no *Lutherans*, *Calviniſts*, and the reſt doe diſagree in fundamentalls, which if they doe, the ſame Heaven cannot receiue them all.

20 Tenthly, and laſtly, I deſire that in anſwering to theſe points, he would let us knowe diſtinctly, what is the doctrine of the Proteſtant Engliſh Church concerning them; and what he utters only as his owne private opinion.

21 Theſe are the Queſtions which for the preſent I finde it fit and neceſſary for me to aske of *D. Potter*, or any other who will defend his cauſe, or impugne ours. And it will be in vaine to ſpeake vainely, and to tell me, that a Foole may aske more queſtions in an houre, then a wiſe man can anſwer in a yeare; with ſuch idle Proverbs as that. For I aske but ſuch queſtions as for which he giues occaſion in his Book, and where he declares not himſelfe but after ſo ambiguous and confuſed a manner, as that Truth it ſelfe can ſcarce tell how to convince him ſo, but that with ignorant and ill-judging men he will ſeeme to haue ſomewhat left to ſay for himſelfe, though Papiſts (as he calls them) and Puritans ſhould preſſe him contrary waies at the ſame time: and theſe queſtions concerne things alſo of high importance, as whereupon the knowledge of Gods Church, and true Religion, and conſequently Salvation of the ſoule depends. And now becauſe hee ſhall not taxe me with being like thoſe men in the Goſpell, whom our bleſſed Lord and Saviour charged with laying heavy burdens upon other mens ſhoulders, who yet would not touch them with their finger: I oblige my ſelfe to anſwer upon any demaund of his, both to all theſe Queſtions, if he finde that I haue not done it already, and to any other, concerning matter of faith that he ſhall aske. And I will tell him very plainely, what is Catholique doctrine, and what is not, that is, what is defined or what is not defined, and reſts but in diſcuſſion among Divines.

22 And it will be here expected, that he performe theſe things, as a man who profeſſeth learning ſhould doe, not flying from queſtions which concerne things as they are conſidered in their owne nature, to accidentall, or rare circumſtances of ignorance, incapacity, want of meanes to be inſtructed, erroneous conſcience, and the like, which being very various and different, cannot bee well comprehended under any generall Rule. But in delivering generall doctrines we muſt conſider things as they be *ex natura rei*, or *per ſe loquendo* (as Divines ſpeak) that is, according to their natures, if all circumſtances concure proportionable thereunto. As for example ſome may for a time haue invincible ignorance, even of ſome fundamentall article of faith, through want of capacity, inſtruction, or the like, and ſo not offend either in ſuch ignorance or errour, and yet we muſt abſolutely ſay, that errour in any one fundamentall point is damnable, becauſe ſo it is; if we conſider things in themſelues, abſtracting from accidentall circumſtances in particular perſons: as contrarily if ſome man judge ſome act of vertue, or ſome indifferent action to be a ſinne, in him it is a ſinne indeed, by reaſon of his erroneous conſcience; and yet we ought not to ſay abſolutely, that vertuous, or indifferent actions are ſinnes: and in all ſciences we muſt diſtinguiſh the generall Rules from their particular Exceptions. And therefore when, for example, he anſwers to our demand, whether he hold that Catholiques may be ſaved, or whether their pretended errours be fundamentall and damnable, he is not to change the ſtate of the queſtion, and haue recourſe to Ignorance, and the like, but to anſwer concerning the errours being conſidered what they are apt to be in themſelues, and as they are neither increaſed nor diminiſhed, by accidental circumſtances.

23 And the like I ſay of all the other points, to which I once againe deſire an anſwere without any of theſe, or the like ambiguous termes, *in ſome ſort*, *in ſome ſenſe*, *in ſome degree*, which may be explicated afterward as ſtrictly or largely as may beſt ſerue his turne; but let him tell vs roundly and particularly, in what ſort, in what ſenſe, in what degree he underſtands thoſe, & the like obſcure mincing phraſes. If he proceed ſolidly after this manner, and not by way of meere words, more like a Preacher to a vulgar Auditor, then like a learned man with a pen in his hand, thy patience ſhall be the leſſe abuſed, and truth will alſo receiue more right. And ſince we haue already laid the grounds of the queſtion, much may be ſaid hereafter in few words, if (as I ſaid) he keep cloſe to the reall point of every difficulty without wandring into impertinent diſputes, multiplying vulgar and threed-bare objections and arguments, or labouring to proue what no man denies, or making a vaine oſtentation by citing a number of Schoolemen, which every Puny brought up in Schooles is able to doe; and if he cite his Authors with ſuch ſincerity, as no time need be ſpent in opening his corruptions, and finally if he ſet himſelfe a worke with this conſideration, that we are to giue a moſt ſtrict accompt to a moſt juſt, and unpartiall Iudge, of every period, line, and word that paſſeth under our pen. For if at the latter day we ſhall be arraigned for every idle word which is ſpoken, ſo much more will that be done for every idle word which is written, as the deliberation wherewith it paſſeth makes a man guilty of more malice, and as the importance of the matter which is treated of in bookes concerning true faith and religion, without which no Soule can be ſaved, makes a mans Errours more materiall, then they would be, if queſtion were but of toyes.



The Anſwere to the

PREFACE.

To the Firſt, and Second.§. If beginings be ominous (as they ſay they are,) *D. Potter* hath cauſe to look for great ſtore of uningenuous dealing from you; the very firſt words you ſpeak of him *viz. That he hath not ſo much as once truly and really fallen upon the point in queſtion*, being a moſt unjuſt and immodeſt imputation.

2 For firſt, the point in queſtion, was not, that which you pretend, *Whether both Papiſts and Proteſtants can be ſaved in their ſeverall Profeſſions?* But, *Whether you may without uncharitablenesſe affirme that Proteſtancy unrepented deſtroyes Salvation?* And that this is the very queſtion is moſt apparent and unqueſtionable, both from the title of *Charity Miſtaken*, and from the Arguments of the three firſt Chapters of it, and from the title of your own Reply. And therefore if *D. Potter* had joyned iſſue with his Adverſary only thus farre, and not medling at all with *Papiſts*, but leaving them to *ſtand or fall to their own maſter*, had prou'd *Proteſtants* living and dying ſo *capable of Salvation*, I cannot ſee how it could juſtly be charged upon him, that he *had not once truly and really fallen upon the point in Queſtion.* Neither may it be ſaid that your Queſtion here and mine, are in effect the ſame, ſeeing it is very poſſible that the true Anſwere to the one might have been Affirmative, and to the other Negative. For there is no incongruity but it may be true *That You and We cannot both be ſaved*: And yet as true, *That without uncharitableneſſe you cannot pronounce us damned.* For all ungrounded and unwarrantable ſentencing men to damnation, is either in a propriety of ſpeech uncharitable, or elſe (which for my purpoſe is all one,) it is that which Proteſtants mean, when they ſay, Papiſts for damning them are uncharitable. And therefore though the *Author of C. M.* had prov'd as ſtrongly as he hath done weakly, *that one Heaven could not receive Proteſtants and Papiſts both*, yet certainly, it was very haſtily and unwarrantably, & therefore uncharitably concluded, that Proteſtants were the part that was to be excluded. As, though Iewes and Chriſtians cannot both be ſaved, yet a Iew cannot juſtly, and therefore not charitably pronounce a Chriſtian damned.

But

3 But then ſecondly, to ſhew your dealing with him very injurious; I ſay he doth ſpeak to this very Queſtion very largely, and very effectually; as by confronting his worke and *Charity Miſt.* together, will preſently appear. *Charity M.* proves you ſay in generall, *That there is but one Church. D. Potter* tels him, *His labour is loſt in proving the unity of the Catholique Church, whereof there is no doubt or controverſy:* & herein I hope you will grant he anſweres right & to the purpoſe. *C. M.* proves (you ſay) ſecondly, *That all Chriſtians are obliged to harken to the Church. D. Potter* anſweres, *It is true: yet not abſolutely in all things, but only when ſhe commands thoſe things which God doth not countermand.* And this alſo I hope is to his purpoſe, though not to yours. *C. M.* proves, you ſay thirdly, *That the Church muſt be ever viſible and infallible.* For her *Viſibility, D. Potter* denyes it not; and as for her *Infallibility*, he grants it in *Fundamentalls* but *not in Superſtructures.* C.M. proves you ſay fourthly, *That to ſeparate ones ſelfe from the Churches Communion, is ſchiſme. D. Potter* grants it, with this exception, *unleſſe there be neceſſary cauſe to doe ſo*; unleſſe the conditions of her Communion be apparently unlawfull. C. M. proves, you ſay laſtly, *That to diſſent from her doctrine is hereſy, though it be in points never ſo few, and never ſo ſmall, and therefore that the diſtinction of points fundamentall and unfundamentall, as it is applyed by Proteſtants is wholy vaine.* This D. *Potter* denyes, ſhewes the Reaſons, brought for it, weak and unconcluding; proves the contrary by reaſons unanſwerable: and therefore that *The diſtinction of points into fundamentall and not fundamentall, as it is applied by Proteſtants, is very good.* Vpon theſe grounds you ſay, C.M. cleerely evinces *That any leaſt difference in faith cannot ſtand with ſalvation, and therefore ſeeing Catholiques and Proteſtants diſagree in very many points of faith, they both cannot hope to be ſaved without Repentance,* you muſt mean, without an explicit and particular repentance, and dereliction of their errors; for ſo C.M. hath declared himſelfe p. 14. where he hath theſe words, *We may ſafely ſay that a man who lives in Proteſtancy, and who is ſo farre from Repenting it, as that he will not ſo much as acknowledge it to be a ſinne, though he be ſufficiently enform'd thereof, &c.* From whence it is evident, that in his judgement there can be no repentance of an errour, without acknowledging it to be a ſinne: And to this D. *Potter* juſtly oppoſes: *That both ſides, by the confeſſion of both ſides, agree in more points then are ſimply and indiſpenſably neceſſary to Salvation, and differ only in ſuch as are not preciſely neceſſary: That it is very poſſible, a man may dye in errour, and yet dye with Repentance, as for all his ſinnes of ignorance, ſo in that number, for the errours in which he dies: with a repentance though not explicite and particular which is not ſimply required, yet implicite and generall which is ſufficient: ſo that he cannot but hope conſidering the goodneſſe of God, that the truth's retained on both ſides, eſpecially thoſe of the neceſſity of repentance from dead workes and faith in Ieſus Chriſt, if they be put in practiſe, may be an antidote againſt the errors held on either ſide; to ſuch he meanes, & ſaies, as being diligent inſeeking truth, and deſirous to find it, yet miſſe of it through humane*

frailty

frailty and dye in errour. If you will but attentively conſider & compare the undertaking of C.M. and D. *Potters* performance in all theſe points, I hope you will be ſo ingenuous as to acknowledge, that you have injurd him much in imputing tergiverſation to him, and pretending that *through his whole book he hath not once truly and really fallen upon the point in Queſtion.* Neither may you or C.M. conclude him from hence (as covertly you doe,) *An enemy to ſoules by deceiving them with ungrounded falſe hopes of Salvation*; ſeeing the hope of ſalvation cannot be ungrounded, which requires and ſuppoſes beliefe and practiſe of all things abſolutely neceſſary unto ſalvation, and repentance of thoſe ſinnes and errours which we fall into by humane frailty: Nor a *friend to indifferency in Religions*, ſeeing he gives them only hope of pardon of Errors who are deſirous, and according to the proportion of their opportunities and abilities induſtrious to find the truth, or at leaſt truly repentant, that they have not been ſo. Which doctrine is very fit to excite men to a conſtant and impartiall ſearch of truth, and very farre from teaching them that it is indifferent what Religion they are of, and without all controverſy very honourable to the goodneſſe of God, with which how it can conſiſt, not to be ſatisfied with his ſervants true endeavours to know his will and doe it, without full and exact performance, I leave it to you and all good men to judge.

4 As little Iuſtice me thinkes you ſhew, in quarrelling with him for deſcending to the particular diſputes here mentioned by you. For to ſay nothing that many of theſe Queſtions are immediatly and directly pertinent to the buſineſſe in hand, as the 1. 2. 3. 5. 6. and all of them fall in of themſelves into the ſtream of his diſcourſe, and are not drawn in by him, and beſides are touched for the moſt part, rather then handled; to ſay nothing of all this, you know right well, if he conclude you erroneous in any one of all theſe, be it but in the *Communion in one kind*, or the *Language of your ſervice*; the infallibility of your Church is evidently overthrown: And this being done, I hope there will be *no ſuch neceſſity of hearkning to her in all things: It will be very poſſible to ſeperate from her communion in ſome things, without ſchiſme, and from her doctrine ſo farre as it is erroneous without hereſy: Then all that ſhe propoſes will not be, eo ipſo, fundamentall, becauſe ſhee propoſes it*: and ſo preſently all *Charity Miſtaken* will vaniſh into ſmoak, and clouds and nothing.

5 You ſay *he was loath to affirme plainly, that generally both Catholiques & Proteſtants may be ſaved*: which yet is manifeſt he doth affirme plainly, of Proteſtants throughout his book; & of erring Papiſts that have *ſyncerely ſought the Truth and failed of it, and dye with a generall repentance*: p. 77. 78. And yet you deceive your ſelfe if you conceive he had any other neceſſity to doe ſo, but only that he thought it true. For we may and doe pretend that before *Luther there were many true Churches, beſides the Roman*, which agreed not with her: in particular, *The greek Church*. So that what you ſay is evidently true, is indeed evidently falſe. Beſides if he had had any neceſſity to make uſe of you in this matter, he needed not for this end to ſay that now

in

in your Church Salvation may be had; but onely that before *Luthers* time it might be: Then when your meanes of knowing the Truth were not ſo great, and when your ignorance might be more invincible, and therefore more excuſable. So that you may ſee if you pleaſe, it is not for ends, but for the loue of truth, that we are thus charitable to you.

6 Neither is it materiall that theſe particulars he ſpeakes againſt, are not *fundamentall errours*, for though they be not *deſtructiue of ſalvation*, yet the convincing of them, may be, and is *deſtructiue enough of his Adverſaries aſſertion:* and if you be the man I take you for, you will not deny they are ſo. For certainly no Conſequence can be more palpable then this; The Church of *Rome* doth erre in this or that, therefore it is not infallible. And this perhaps you perceiu'd your ſelfe; & therefore demanded not, *Since they be not fundamentall, what imports it whether we hold them or no, ſimply*: But, *for as much as concernes our poſſibility to be ſaved.* As if we were not bound by the loue of God & the loue of truth to be zealous in the defence of all Truths, that are any way profitable, though not ſimply neceſſary to ſalvation. Or as if any good man could ſatisfie his conſcience without being ſo affected and reſolv'd. Our Saviour himſelfe having aſſur'd us, [a] That *hee that ſhall breake one of his leaſt Commandements* (ſome whereof you pretend are concerning veniall ſinnes, and conſequently the keeping of them not neceſſary to ſalvation) *and ſhall ſo teach men, ſhall be called the leaſt in the kingdome of Heaven.* [a] Mat. 5. 19.

7 But then it imports very much, though not for the *poſſibilitie that you may be ſaved*, yet for the *probabilitie that you will be ſo*: becauſe the holding of theſe errours, though it did not *merit*, might yet *occaſion* damnation. As the doctrine of Indulgences may take away the feare of Purgatory, and the doctrine of Purgatorie the feare of Hell; as you well knowe it does too frequently. So that though a godly man might be ſaved *with theſe* errours, yet *by meanes of them*, many are made vicious and ſo damn'd. *By them* I ſay, though *not for them*. No godly Layman who is verily perſwaded that there is neither impietie nor ſuperſtition in the uſe of your Latine ſervice, ſhall be damn'd, I hope, for being preſent at it; yet the want of that devotion which the frequent hearing the Offices underſtood, might happily beget in them, the want of that inſtruction and edification which it might afford them, may very probably hinder the ſalvation of many which otherwiſe might haue been ſaved. Beſides, though the matter of an Errour may bee onely ſomething profitable, not neceſſary, yet the neglect of it may be a damnable ſinne. As not to regard veniall ſinnes is in the doctrine of your Schooles, mortall. Laſtly, as veniall ſinnes, you ſay, diſpoſe men to mortall; ſo the erring from ſome profitable, though leſſer truth, may diſpoſe a man to errour in greater matters. As for example: The Beleife of the Popes infallibility is, I hope, not unpardonably damnable to every one that holds it; yet if it be a falſehood (as moſt certainely it is) it puts a man into a very congruous diſpoſition to beleiue *Antichriſt*, if he ſhould chance to get into that See.

8 To the Third. *In his diſtinctions of points fundamentall and not fundamentall,*

damentall, he may ſeeme, you ſay, to haue touched the point, but does not ſo indeed. Becauſe though he ſaies there are ſome points ſo fundamentall, as that all are oblig'd to belieue them explicitely, yet he tells you not, whether a man may disbeleiue any other points of faith, which are ſufficiently preſented to his underſtanding, as Truths revealed by Almighty God. Touching which matter of *Sufficient Propoſall*, I beſeech you to come out of the Clouds, and tell us roundly and plainely, what you meane by *Points of faith ſufficiently propounded to a mans underſtanding, as Truths revealed by God.* Perhaps you meane ſuch, as the perſon to whom they are propoſ'd, underſtands ſufficiently to be truths revealed by God. But how then can he poſſibly chooſe but belieue them? Or how is it not an apparent contradiction, that a man ſhould disbelieue what himſelfe underſtands to be a Truth; or any Chriſtian what he underſtands or but belieues to be teſtified by God? *Dr Potter* might well thinke it ſuperfluous to tell you *This is damnable*; becauſe indeed it is impoſſible. And yet one may very well think, by your ſaying, as you doe hereafter, *That the impietie of hereſie conſiſts in calling Gods truth in queſtion*, that this ſhould be your meaning. Or doe you eſteeme all thoſe things *ſufficiently preſented to his underſtanding as Divine truths*, which by you, or any other man, or any company of men whatſoever, are declared to him to be ſo? I hope you will not ſay ſo: For this were to oblige a man to belieue all the Churches, and all the men in the world, whenſoever they pretend to propoſe divine Revelations. *D. Potter*, I aſſure you from him, would never haue told you this neither. Or doe you meane by *ſufficiently propounded as Divine Truths*, all that your Church propounds for ſuch? That you may not neither; For the Queſtion betweene us is this; *Whether your Churches Propoſition be a ſufficient Propoſition?* And therefore to ſuppoſe this, is to ſuppoſe the queſtion; which you knowe in Reaſoning is alwaies a fault. Or Laſtly, doe you mean (for I knowe not elſe what poſſibly you can meane,) by *ſufficiently preſented to his underſtanding as revealed by God*; that which all things conſidered, is ſo propos'd to him, that he might and ſhould and would belieue it to be true and revealed by God, were it not for ſome voluntary and avoidable fault of his owne that interpoſeth it ſelfe betweene his underſtanding and the truth preſented to it? This is the beſt conſtruction that I can make of your words; and if you ſpeake of truths thus propos'd, and rejected, let it be as damnable, as you pleaſe, to deny or disbelieue them. But then I cannot but be amaz'd to heare you ſay, That *D. Potter never tells you whether there be any other points of faith, beſides thoſe which we are bound to belieue explicitely, which a man may deny or disbelieue, though they be ſufficiently preſented to his underſtanding as truths revealed or teſtified by Almighty God*; ſeeing the light it ſelfe is not more cleare then *D. Potters* Declaration of himſelfe for the Negatiue in this Queſtion. p. 245. 246. 247. 248. 249. 250. of his Book. Where he entreats at large of this very Argument, beginning his diſcourſe thus. "*It ſeemes fundamentall to the "faith, and for the ſalvation of every member of the Church, that he ac-"knowledge and belieue all ſuch points of faith, as whereof he may be con-*

vinced

"vinced that they belong to the doctrine of Ieſus Chriſt.
" To this conviction he requires three things. *Cleare Revelation; Suffi-*
" *cient Propoſition, and Capacity & underſtanding in the hearer. For want*
" *of cleare Revelation, he frees the Church before Chriſt & the Diſciples of*
" *Chriſt from any damnable errour, though they believed not thoſe things*
" *which he that ſhould now deny were no Chriſtian. To ſufficient Propo-*
" *ſition, he requires two things. 1. That the points be perſpicuouſly laid open*
" *in themſelues. 2. So forcibly, as may ſerue to remoue reaſonable doubts to*
" *the contrary, and to ſatisfie a teachable minde concerning it, againſt the*
" *principles in which he hath been bred to the contrary. This Propoſition*
" *he ſaies is not limited to the Pope or Church, but extended to all meanes*
" *whatſoever, by which a man may be convinced in conſcience, that the*
" *matter propoſed is divine Revelation; which he profeſſes to be done ſuf-*
" *ficiently, not only when his conſcience doth expreſly beare witneſſe to the*
" *truth; but when it would doe ſo, if it were not choaked, and blinded by*
" *ſome unruly and unmortified luſt in the will. The difference being not*
" *great between him that is wilfully blind, & him that knowingly gaine-*
" *ſaieth the Truth. The third thing he requires is Capacity and Abilitie*
" *to apprehend the Propoſall, and the Reaſons of it: the want whereof ex-*
" *cuſeth fooles and madmen, &c. But where there is no ſuch impediment,*
" *and the will of God is ſufficiently propounded, there (* ſaith hee*) hee that*
" *oppoſeth is convinced of errour; and he who is thus convinced is an He-*
" *retique: and hereſie is a work of the Fleſh which excludeth from ſalva-*
" *tion,* (he meanes without Repentance,) *And hence it followeth, that it*
" *is fundamentall to a Chriſtians faith, and neceſſary for his ſalvation,*
" *that he believe all revealed truths of God, whereof he may be convinced*
" *that they are from God.* This is the Concluſion of Dr *Potters* diſ-courſe; many paſſages whereof you take notice of in your ſubſequent diſputations, and make your advantage of them. And therefore I cannot but ſay againe, that it amazeth me to heare you ſay, that he declines this Queſtion and never tells you *whether or no there bee any other points of faith, which being ſufficiently propounded as divine Revelations may be denied and diſbelieved.* Hee tells you plainely there are none ſuch: and therefore you cannot ſay, that he tels you not whether there be any ſuch. Againe, it is almoſt as ſtrange to mee, why you ſhould ſay, this was the only thing in queſtion, *Whether a man may deny or disbelieue any point of faith, ſufficiently preſented to his underſtanding as a truth revealed by God.* For to ſay that any thing is a thing in queſtion, me thinks at the firſt hearing of the words, imports, that it is by ſome affirm'd, and deni'd by others. Now you affirme I grant, but what Proteſtant ever denied, that it was a ſinne to giue God the lye? Which is the firſt and moſt obvious ſenſe of theſe words. Or which of them ever doubted, that to disbelieue is then a fault, when the matter is ſo propoſed to a man, that he might and ſhould, and were it not for his owne fault, would beleiue it? Certainly he that queſtions either of theſe, juſtly deſerues to haue his wits call'd in queſtion. Produce any one Proteſtant that ever did ſo, and I will giue you leaue to ſay it is the only thing in queſtion. But then I muſt tell you, that your enſu-

ing Argument, viz: *To deny a truth witneſſed by God is damnable, But of two that diſagree one muſt of neceſſity deny ſome ſuch truth, Therefore one only can be ſaved*; is built upon a ground cleane different from this poſtulate. For though it be alwaies a fault to deny what either I doe know, or ſhould knowe to be teſtified by God; yet that which by a cleanly conveyance you put in the place hereof, *To deny a truth witneſſed by God* ſimply, without the circumſtance of *being knowne or ſufficiently propoſed*, is ſo farre from being certainely damnable, that it may be many times done without any the leaſt fault at all. As if God ſhould teſtifie ſomething to a man in the *Indies*, I that had no aſſurance of this teſtification ſhould not be oblig'd to beleiue it. For in ſuch caſes the Rule of the Law has place, *Idem eſt non eſſe & non apparere*: not to be at all and not to appeare to me, is to me all one. *If I had not come and ſpoken unto you* (ſaith our Saviour) *you had had no ſinne?*

10 As little neceſſitie is there for that which followes: *That of two diſagreeing in a matter of faith one muſt deny ſome ſuch truth.* Whether by [ſuch] you underſtand, *Teſtified at all by God*; or *teſtified and ſufficiently propounded*. For it is very poſſible the matter in controverſie may be ſuch a thing wherein God hath not at all declared himſelfe, or not ſo fully and clearely as to oblige all men to hold one way; and yet be ſo overvalued by the parties in variance, as to bee eſteemed a matter *of faith*, and one of thoſe things of which our Saviour ſaies, *He that beleeveth not ſhall be damn'd*. Who ſees not that it is poſſible two Churches may excommunicate and damne each other for keeping Chriſtmaſſe tenne daies ſooner or later; as well as *Victor* excommunicated the Churches of *Aſia*, for differing from him about Eaſter day? And yet I beleiue you will confeſſe, that God had not then declared himſelfe about Eaſter; nor hath now about Chriſtmaſſe. Anciently ſome good Catholique Biſhops excommunicated and damned others for *holding there were Antipodes*: and in this queſtion I would faine know on which ſide was the ſufficient propoſall. *The contra-Remonſtrants* differ from the *Remonſtrants* about the point of predetermination as a matter of faith: I would knowe in this thing alſo, which way God hath declar'd himſelfe; whether for Predetermination or againſt it. *Stephen Biſhop of Rome* held it as a matter of faith & Apoſtolique tradition, *That Heretiques gaue true Baptiſme*: Others there were, and they as good Catholiques as hee, that held that this was neither matter of *Faith* not matter of *Truth*. *Iuſtin Martyr* and *Irenæus* held the doctrine of the *Millenaries* as a matter of *faith*: and though *Iuſtin Martyr* deny it, yet you, I hope, will affirme, that ſome good Chriſtians held the contrary. S^t *Auguſtine*, I am ſure, held *the communicating of Infants* as much Apoſtolique tradition, as the Baptiſing of them: whether the Biſhop and the Church of *Rome* of his time, held ſo too, or held otherwiſe, I deſire you to determine. But, ſure I am, the Church of *Rome* at this preſent holds the contrary. The ſame S. *Auſtin* held it no matter of faith that the *Biſhops of Rome were Iudges of Appeales* from all parts of the Church Catholique, no not in *Major cauſes and Major Perſons*: whether the Biſhop or Church of *Rome* did then hold

the

the contrary doe you reſolve me; but now I am reſolv'd they doe ſo. In all theſe differences, the point in queſtion is eſteem'd and propos'd by one ſide at leaſt as a matter of *faith*, and by the other rejected as not ſo: and either this is to diſagree in matters of faith, or you will have no meanes to ſhew that we doe diſagree. Now then to ſhew you how weak and ſandy the foundation is, on which the whole fabrick both of your Book and Church depends, anſwer mee briefly to this *Dilemma*. Eyther in theſe oppoſitions one of the oppoſite Parts err'd damnably, and denyed Gods truth ſufficiently propounded, or they did not. If they did, then they which doe deny Gods truth ſufficiently propounded may goe to heaven; and then you are raſh and uncharitable in excluding us, though we were guilty of this fault. If not, then there is no ſuch neceſſity, that of two diſagreeing about a matter of faith, one ſhould deny Gods truth ſufficiently propounded. And ſo the Major and Minor of your Argument, are prov'd falſe. Yet, though they were as true as Goſpell, and as evident as Mathematicall Principles, the concluſion (ſo impertinent is it to the Premiſes) might ſtill be falſe. For that which naturally iſſues from theſe propoſitions is not. *Therefore one only can be ſaved:* But, *Therefore one of them does ſomething that is damnable.* But with what Logick or what Charity you can inferre either as the immediat production of the former premiſes, or as a Corollary from this concluſion, Therefore *one only can be ſaved*, I doe not underſtand; unleſſe you will pretend that this conſequence is good, ſuch a one doth ſomething damnable, therefore he ſhall certainly be damned: which whether it be not to overthrow the Article of our Faith, which promiſes remiſſion of ſinnes upon repentance, and conſequently to ruine the Goſpell of Chriſt, I leave it to the Pope and the Cardinalls to determine. For if againſt this it be alleadged, that no man can repent of the ſinne wherein he dies: This muche I have already ſtopped, by ſhewing that if it be a ſinne of Ignorance, this is no way incongruous.

11 *To the fourth.* You proceed in ſleighting and diſgracing your Adverſary, *Pretending his objections are mean and vulgar, and ſuch as have been anſwered a thouſand times.* But if your cauſe were good, theſe Arts would be needleſſe. For though ſome of his objections have been often ſhifted by men * that make a profeſſion of deviſing ſhifts and evaſions to ſave themſelves and their Religion from the preſſure of truth, by men that are reſolv'd they will ſay ſomething, though they can ſay nothing to purpoſe; yet I doubt not to make it appear, that neither by others have they beene truly and really ſatisfied; and that the beſt Anſwere you give them, is to call them *Mean and vulgar objections.*

12 *To the Fift. But this paines might have been ſpared: For the ſubſtance of his diſcourſe is in a Sermon of D. Vſhers, and confuted four yeares ago by Paulus Veridicus.* It ſeemes then the ſubſtance of your Reply is in *Paulus Veridicus*, and ſo your paines alſo might well have been ſpared. But had there been no neceſſity to help and peece out your confuting his Arguments with diſgracing his perſon, (which yet you cannot doe) you would have conſidered, that to them who compare

* I mean the Divines of Doway: whoſe profeſſion we have in your Belgick *Expurgatorius* p. 12. *in cenſura Bertrami*, in theſe words. Seeing in other ancient Catholiques, we tolerate extenuate & excuſe very many errors, and deviſing ſome ſhift often deny the, and put upon them a convenient ſenſe when they are objected to us in diſputations and conflicts with our adverſaries; we ſee no reaſon why *Bertram* may not deſerve the ſame equity.

pare D. *Potters* Book,& the Arch-Biſhops Sermon,this aſperſion will preſently appear a poore detraction, not to be anſwered but ſcorn'd. To ſay nothing that in D. *Potter*, being to anſwere a book by expreſſe Command from Royall Authority, to leave any thing materiall unſaid; becauſe it had been ſaid before, eſpecially being ſpoken at large, and without any relation to the Diſcourſe which he was to Anſwere, had been a ridiculous vanity and foule prevarication.

13. *To the ſixt.* In your ſixt *parag.* I let all paſſe ſaving only this, *That a perſwaſion that men of different Religions* (you muſt mean, or elſe you ſpeak not to the point, Chriſtians of divers Opinions and Communions) *may be ſaved, is a moſt pernitious hereſy, and even a ground of Atheiſme.* What ſtrange extractions Chymiſtry can make I know not; but ſure I am, he that by reaſon would inferre this concluſion, *That there is no God*; from this ground, *That God will ſave men in different Religions*, muſt have a higher ſtrain in Logick, then you or I have hitherto made ſhew of. In my apprehenſion, the other part of the contradiction, *That there is a God*, ſhould much rather follow from it. And whether contradictions will flow from the ſame fountaine, let the Learned judge. Perhaps you will ſay you intended not to deliver here a poſitive and meaſur'd truth, and which you expected to be call'd to account for; but only a high and tragicall expreſſion of your juſt deteſtation of the wicked doctrine againſt which you write. If you mean ſo, I ſhall let it paſſe: only I am to advertize the leſſe-wary Reader, that paſſionate expreſſions, and vehement aſſeverations are no arguments; unleſſe it be, of the weakneſſe of the cauſe that is defended by them, or the man that defends it. And to remember you of what *Boethius* ſaies of ſome ſuch things as theſe, *---Nubila mens eſt hæc ubi regnant.* For my part I am not now in Paſſion; neither will I ſpeak one word which I think I cannot juſtify to the full: and I ſay and will maintaine, that to ſay, *That Chriſtians of different Opinions and Communions (ſuch I mean, who hold all thoſe things that are ſimply neceſſary to Salvation) may not obtain pardon for the Errours wherein they dye ignorantly, by a generall Repentance; is ſo farre from being a ground of Atheiſme, that to ſay the contrary, is to croſſe in Diameter a main Article of our Creed, and to overthrow the Goſpell of Chriſt.*

14 *To the Seaventh and Eight.* To the two next Paragraphes, I have but two words to ſay. The one is, that I know no Proteſtants that *hold it neceſſary to be able to prove a Perpetuall Viſible Church diſtinct from Yours.* Some perhaps undertake to doe ſo, as a matter of curteſy; but I believe you will be much to ſeeke for any one that holds it neceſſary. For though you ſay that Chriſt hath promiſed there ſhall be a Perpetuall Viſible Church; yet you your ſelves doe not pretend that he hath promiſed there ſhall be Hiſtories and Records alwaies extant of the Profeſſors of it in all ages: nor that he hath any where enjoyned us to read thoſe Hiſtories that we may be able to ſhew them.

14 The other is. That *Breerelie's* great exactneſſe, which you magnify ſo and amplify, is no very certaine demonſtration of his fidelity. A Romance may be told with as much variety of circumſtances, as a true Story.

To

16 *To the Ninth and Tenth.* Your deſires that I would in this rejoynder; *Avoid impertinencies. Not impoſe doctrines upon you which you diſclayme: Set down the ſubſtance of your Reaſons faithfully and entirely: Not weary the reader with unneceſſary quotations: Object nothing to you which I can anſwere my ſelfe, or which may be return'd upon my ſelfe: and laſtly, (which you repeat again in the end of your Preface) ſpeak as clearly and diſtinctly and univocally as poſſibly I can,* are all very reaſonable, and ſhall be by me moſt punctually and fully ſatisfied. Only I have Reaſon to complain, that you give us rules only and not good example in keeping them. For in ſome of theſe things I ſhall have frequent occaſion to ſhew, that *Medice cura teipſum,* may very juſtly be ſaid unto you; eſpecially for objecting what might very eaſily have been anſwered by you, and may be very juſtly returned upon you.

17 To your enſuing demands, though ſome of them be very captious and enſnaring; yet I will give you as clear and plain and ingenuous Anſwers as poſſibly I can.

18 *To the Eleventh.* To the firſt then, about *the Perpetuity of the viſible Church,* my Anſwer is: That I believe our Saviour, ever ſince his Aſcention, hath had in ſome place or other a Viſible true Church on earth: I mean a company of men, that profeſſed at leaſt ſo much truth as was abſolutely neceſſary for their Salvation. And I believe that there will be ſomewhere or other ſuch a Church to the Worlds end. But the contrary doctrine I doe at no hand believe to be a damnable hereſy.

19 *To the twelfth.* To the ſecond, what *Viſible Church there was before Luther diſagreeing from the Roman?* I anſwere, that before *Luther* there were many Viſible Churches in many things diſagreeing from the Roman: But not that the whole Catholique Church diſagreed from her, becauſe ſhe her ſelfe was a Part of the Whole, though much corrupted. And to undertake to name a Catholique Church diſagreeing from her, is to make her no Part of it, which we doe not, nor need not pretend. And *for men agreeing with Proteſtants in all points,* wee will then produce them, when you ſhall either prove it neceſſary to be done, which you know we abſolutely deny; or when you ſhall produce a perpetuall ſucceſſion of Profeſſors, which in all points have agreed with you, and diſagreed from you in nothing. But this my promiſe, to deal plainly with you, I conceive, & ſo intended it to be very like his, who undertook to drink up the Sea, upon condition, that he, to whom the promiſe was made, ſhould firſt ſtop the Rivers from running in. For this unreaſonable requeſt which you make to us is to your ſelves ſo impoſſible, that in the very next Age after the Apoſtles, you will never be able to name a man, whom you can prove to have agreed with you in all things, nay (if you ſpeak of ſuch, whoſe Works are extant and unqueſtioned) whom we cannot prove to have diſagreed from you in many things. Which I am ſo certain of, that I will venture my credit, and my life upon it.

20 *To the Thirteenth.* To the third, *Whether, ſeeing there cannot be aſſign'd any viſible true Church diſtinct from the Roman, it followes not that*

that ſhe err'd not fundamentally. I ſay in our ſence of the word *Fundamentall*, it does follow. For if it be true, that there was then no Church diſtinct from the Roman, then it muſt be, either becauſe there was no Church at all, which we deny: Or becauſe the Roman Church was the whole Church, which we alſo deny: or becauſe ſhe was a Part of the Whole, which we grant. And if ſhe were a true part of the Church, then ſhe retained thoſe truths which were ſimply neceſſary to Salvation, and held no errours which were inevitably and unpardonably deſtructive of it. For this is preciſely neceſſary to conſtitute any man or any Church a member of the Church Catholique. In our ſence therefore of the word *Fundamentall*, I hope ſhee erred not fundamentally: but in your ſence of the word, I fear ſhe did. That is, ſhe held ſomething to be Divine Revelation, which was not; ſomething not to be which was.

21 *To the fourteenth.* To the fourth. *How it could be damnable to maintain her errors, if they were not fundamentall?* I anſwere. 1. Though it were not damnable, yet if it were a fault, it was not to be done. For a veniall ſinne, with you is not damnable; yet you ſay, it is not to be committed for the procuring any good. *Non eſt faciendum malum vel minimum, ut eveniat bonum vel maximum.* 2. It is damnable to mantaine an error againſt conſcience, though the errour in it ſelfe, and to him that believes it, be not damnable. Nay the profeſſion not only of an errour, but even of a truth, if not believ'd, when you think on it again, I believe you will confeſſe to be a mortall ſinne; unleſſe you will ſay, Hypocriſie and Simulation in Religion is not ſo. 3. Though we ſay the errors of the Roman Church were not deſtructive of Salvation, but pardonable even to them that dyed in them, upon a generall repentance: yet we deny not but in *themſelves they were damnable.* Nay, the very ſaying they were pardonable, implies they needed pardon, and therefore in themſelves were damnable: damnable *meritoriouſly*, though not *effectually.* As a poyſon may be deadly in it ſelfe, and yet not kill him, that together with the poyſon takes an antidote: or as felony may deſerve death and yet not bring it on him that obtaines the Kings pardon.

22 *To the fifteenth.* To the fift. *How they can be excus'd from Schiſme, who forſook her Communion upon pretence of errours which were not damnable!* I anſwere. All that we forſake in you, is only the beliefe, and practice, and profeſſion of your Errors. Hereupon, you caſt us out of your Communion. And then with a ſtrange, and contradictious, and ridiculous hypocriſy, complain that we forſake it. As if a man ſhould thruſt his friend out of doores, and then be offended at his departure. But for us not to forſake the beliefe of your Errors, having diſcovered them to be Errors, was impoſſible; and therefore to doe ſo could not be damnable, believing them to be Errors. Not to forſake the practice and profeſsion of them, had been damnable hypocriſie; ſuppoſing that (which you vainly runne away with, and take for graunted) thoſe errors in themſelves were not damnable. Now to doe ſo, and as matters now ſtand, not to forſake your Communion, is appa-

rently

rently contradictious: ſeeing the condition of your Communion is, that we muſt profeſſe to believe all your doctrines not only not to be damnable errors (which will not content you,) but alſo to be certain and neceſſary and revealed truths. So that to demand why we forſake your Communion upon pretence of Errors which were not damnable, is in effect to demand why we forſooke it upon our forſaking it! For to pretend that there are Errors in your Church though not damnable, is *ipſo facto* to forſake your Communion, and to doe that which both in your account, and as you think in Gods account, puts him as does ſo, out of your Communion. So that either you muſt free your Church, from requiring the belief of any errour whatſoever, damnable and not damnable, or whether you will or no you muſt free us from Schiſme. For ſchiſme there cannot be in leaving your communion, unleſſe we were obliged to continue in it. Man cannot be obliged by Man, but to what either formally or virtually he is obliged by God, for all juſt power is from God. God the eternall truth neither can nor will obliege us to believe any the leaſt and the moſt innocent falſhood to be a divine truth, that is, to erre; nor, to profeſſe a known errour, which is to lye. So that if you require the belief of any errour among the conditions of your Communion, our obligation to communicate with you ceaſeth, and ſo the imputation of ſchiſme to us, vaniſheth into nothing: but lies heavy upon you for making our ſeperation from you juſt and neceſſary, by requiring unneceſſary and unlawfull conditions of your Communion. Hereafter therefore, I intreat you, let not your demand be, how could we forſake your Communion without Schiſme, ſeeing you err'd not damnably? But how we could doe ſo without Schiſme, ſeeing you err'd not at all? which if either you doe prove, or we cannot diſprove it, we will (I at leaſt will for my part) returne to your Communion, or ſubſcribe my ſelfe Schiſmatique. In the mean time, μένωμεν ὅπως ἐσμέν.

23 Yet notwitſtanding all your Errors we doe not renounce your Communion *totally* and abſolutely, but only leave Communicating with you in the practiſe and profeſſion of your Errors. The tryall whereof will be to propoſe ſome forme of worſhipping God, taken wholly out of Scripture; and herein if we refuſe to joyn with you, then, and not till then, may you juſtly ſay we have utterly and abſolutely abandoned your Communion.

24 *To the ſixteenth.* Your ſixt demand I have already ſatisfied in my anſweres to the *Second* and the *Fourth*: and in my reply, *Ad* § 2. toward the end. And though you ſay *your repeating muſt be excuſed*, yet I dare not be ſo confident, and therefore forbear it.

25 *To the ſeaventeenth.* To the ſeaventh, *Whether errour againſt any one truth ſufficiently propounded as teſtified by God, deſtroy not the Nature and Vnity of Faith, or at leaſt, is not a grievous offence excluding ſalvation!* I anſwere, if you ſuppoſe, as you ſeem to doe the propoſition ſo ſufficient, that the party to whom it is made is convinc'd that it is from God, ſo that the denyall of it involves alſo with it the denyall of Gods veracity; any ſuch errour deſtroyes both faith and

ſalvation. But if the Propoſall be only ſo ſufficient, not, that the party to whom it is made is convinc'd, but only that he ſhould, and but for his own fault would have been convinc'd of the divine verity of the doctrine propoſed: The crime then is not ſo great, for the beliefe of Gods veracity may well conſiſt with ſuch an Errour. Yet a fault I confeſſe it is (and without Repentance) damnable, if all circumſtances conſidered the propoſall be ſufficient. But then I muſt tell you that the propoſall of the preſent Roman Church is only pretended to be ſufficient for this purpoſe, but is not ſo: eſpecially all the Rayes of the Divinity, which they pretend to ſhine ſo conſpicuouſly in her propoſalls, being ſo darkned and even extinguiſhed with a cloud of contradiction, from Scripture, Reaſon, and the Ancient Church.

26 *To the Eighteenth.* To the eight. *How of diſagreeing Proteſtants, both parts may hope for ſalvation, ſeeing ſome of them muſt needs erre againſt ſome Truth teſtified by God?* I anſwere, 1. The moſt diſagreeing Proteſtants that are, yet thus farre agree, that theſe books of Scripture which were never doubted of in the Church, are the undoubted word of God, and a perfect rule of faith. 2. That the ſenſe of them, which God intended, whatſoever it is, is certainly true. So that they believe implicitely even thoſe very truths againſt which they erre; and why an implicit faith in Chriſt and his Word, ſhould not ſuffice as well as an implicit faith in your Church, I have deſired to be reſolved by many of your Side, but never could. 3. That they are to uſe their beſt endeavours to beleive the Scripture in the true ſenſe and to live according to it. This if they performe (as I hope many on all Sides doe) truly and ſyncerely, it is impoſſible but that they ſhould believe aright in all things neceſſary to ſalvation; that is, in all thoſe things which appertain to the Covenant between God and man in Chriſt, for ſo much, is not only plainly but frequently contained in Scripture. And believing aright touching the Covenant, if they for their parts perform the condition required of them, which is ſyncere obedience, why ſhould they not expect that God will performe his promiſe and give them ſalvation? For, as for other things which lye without the Covenant, and are therefore leſſe neceſſary, if by reaſon of the ſeeming conflict which is oftentimes between Scripture and Reaſon, and Authority on the one ſide, and Scripture, Reaſon, and Authority on the other; if by reaſon of the variety of tempers, abilities, educations, & unavoidable prejudices, whereby mens underſtandings are variouſly form'd and faſhion'd, they doe embrace ſeverall Opinions, whereof ſome muſt be erroneous; to ſay that God will damne them for ſuch errors, who are lovers of him, and lovers of truth, is to rob man of his comfort, and God of his goodneſſe; it is to make Man deſperate and God a Tyrant. *But they deny Truths teſtified by God, and therefore ſhall be damn'd.* Yes, if they knew them to be thus teſtified by him, and yet would deny them, that were to give God the lye, and queſtionleſſe damnable. But if you ſhould deny a truth which God had teſtified but only to a man in the *Indies*, (as I ſaid before) and this teſtification you had never heard of, or at leaſt had no ſufficient reaſon to be-

lieve

lieve that God had ſo teſtified, would not you think it a hard caſe to be damned for ſuch a denyall? Yet conſider I pray a little more attentively the difference between them, and you will preſently acknowledge, the queſtion between them is not at any time, or in any thing, Whether God ſaies true or no? or whether he ſaies this or no? But ſuppoſing he ſaies this, and ſaies true, whether he meanes this or no? As for example, between *Lutherans*, *Calviniſts*, and *Zwinglians*, it is agreed that Chriſt ſpake theſe words, *This is my Body*; and that whatſoever he meant in ſaying ſo is true: But what he meant and how he is to be underſtood, that's the queſtion. So that though ſome of them deny a truth by God intended, yet you can with no reaſon or juſtice accuſe them of denying the truth of Gods Teſtimony, unleſſe you can plainly ſhew that God hath declared, and that plainly and clearly, what was his meaning in theſe words. I ſay *plainly and clearly*. For he that ſpeaks obſcurely and ambiguouſly, and no where declares himſelfe plainly, ſure he hath no reaſon to be much offended if he be miſtaken. When therefore you can ſhew, that in this and all other their Controverſies, God hath interpoſed his Teſtimony on one ſide or other; ſo that either they doe ſee it, and will not; or were it not for their own voluntary and avoidable fault, might and ſhould ſee it and doe not; let all ſuch Errors be as damnable as you pleaſe to make them. In the mean while, if they ſuffer themſelves neither to be betraid into their errors, nor kept in them by any ſin of their will; if they doe their beſt endeavour to free themſelves from all errors, and yet faile of it through humane frailty; ſo well am I perſwaded of the goodneſſe of God, that if in me alone, ſhould meet a confluence of all ſuch errors of all the Proteſtants in the World, that were thus qualified, I ſhould not be ſo much afraid of them all, as I ſhould be to ask pardon for them. For, whereas that which you affright us with of calling Gods Veracitie in Queſtion, is but a Panicke feare, a fault that no man thus qualified, is, or can be guilty of; to ask pardon of ſimple and purely involuntary errors is tacitely to imply that God is angry with us for them, and that were to impute to him the ſtrange tyranny of *requiring brick, when he gives no ſtraw; of expecting to gather, where he ſtrew'd not; to reap where he ſowed not*: of being offended with us for not doing what he knowes we cannot doe. This I ſay upon a ſuppoſition that they doe their beſt endeavours to know Gods will and doe it; which he that denyes to be poſſible knowes not what he ſaies; for he ſaies in effect, That men cannot doe, what they can doe; for to doe what a man can doe, is to doe his beſt endeavour. But becauſe this ſuppoſition, though certainly poſſible, is very rare, and admirable, I ſay ſecondly, that I am verily perſwaded, that God will not impute errors to them, as ſinnes, who uſe ſuch a meaſure of induſtry, in finding truth, as humane *prudence* and ordinary *diſcretion* (their abilities and oportunities, their diſtractions and hindrances, and all other things conſidered) ſhall adviſe them unto, in a matter of ſuch conſequence. But if herein alſo we faile, then our errors begin to be malignant, and juſtly imputable, as offences againſt God, and that love of

his truth which he requires in us. You will ſay then, that for thoſe erring *Proteſtants*, which are in this caſe, which evidently are farre the greater part, they ſinne damnably in erring, and therefore there is little hope of their Salvation. To which I anſwer, that the conſequence of this Reaſon, is ſomewhat ſtrong againſt a *Proteſtant*; but much weakned by coming out of the mouth of a *Papiſt*. For all ſinnes with you are not damnable; and therefore Proteſtants errors might be ſinnes, and yet not damnable. But yet out of courteſy to you, we will remove this rubbe out of your way; and for the preſent ſuppoſe them *mortall ſinnes*; and is there then no hope of Salvation, for him that commits them? Not, you will ſay, if he dye in them without repentance; and ſuch Proteſtants you ſpeak of, *who without repentance dye in their errors.* Yea but what if they dye in their errors with repentance? then I hope you will have Charity enough to think they may be ſaved. *Charity Miſt.* takes it indeed for granted, that this ſuppoſition is deſtructive of it ſelfe; and that it is impoſſible, and incongruous that a man ſhould repent of thoſe errors wherein he dies; or dye in thoſe whereof he repents. But it was wiſely done of Him to take it for granted; for moſt certainly He could not have ſpoken one word of ſenſe for the confirmation of it. For ſeeing *Proteſtants* believe, as well as you, Gods infinite and moſt admirable perfections in himſelfe, more then moſt worthy of all poſſible love: ſeeing they believe, as well as you, his infinite goodneſſe to them, in creating them of nothing; in creating them according to his own image; in creating all things for their uſe and benefit; in ſtreaming down his favours on them every moment of their lives; in deſigning them, if they ſerve him, to infinite and eternall happineſſe; in redeeming them, not with corruptible things, but the pretious blood of his beloved ſonne: ſeing they believe, as well as you, his infinite goodneſſe, and patience towards them, in expecting their converſion; in wooing, alluring, leading, and by all meanes, which his wiſdome can ſuggeſt unto him, and mans nature is capable of, drawing them to Repentance & Salvation: Seeing they believe theſe things as well as you, and for ought you know, conſider them as much as you, (and if they doe not, it is not their Religion, but They that are too blame,) what can hinder, but that the conſideration of Gods moſt infinite goodneſſe to them, and their own almoſt infinite wickedneſſe againſt him, Gods ſpirit cooperating with them, may raiſe them to a true and ſyncere and a cordiall love of God? And ſeeing ſorrow for having injur'd or offended the perſon beloved, or when we fear we may have offended him, is the moſt naturall effect of true love; what can hinder, but that love which hath oftimes conſtrained them, to lay down their lives for God (which our Saviour aſſures us is the nobleſt ſacrifice we can offer,) may produce in them an univerſall ſorrow for all their ſinnes, both which they know they have committed, and which they fear they may haue? In which number, their being negligent, or not diſpaſſionate, or not unprejudicate enough in ſeeking the truth, and, the effect thereof, their errors, if they be ſinnes, cannot but be compriz'd. In a word, what

In the place above quoted.

ſhould

ſhould hinder, but that, that Prayer-- *Delicta ſua quis intelligit? who can underſtand his faults? Lord cleanſe thou me from my ſecret ſinnes*, may be heard and accepted by God, as well from a *Proteſtant* that dies in ſome errours, as from a *Papiſt* that dies in ſome other ſins of Ignorance, which perhaps he might more eaſily haue diſcovered to bee ſinnes, then a Proteſtant could his errours to be errours? As well from a Proteſtant, that held ſome errour, which (as he conceived) Gods word, and his reaſon, (which is alſo in ſome ſort Gods word) led him unto; as from a *Dominican*, who perhaps took up his opinion upon truſt, not becauſe he had reaſon to beleiue it true, but becauſe it was the opinion of his *Order*; for the ſame man if hee had light upon another Order, would in all probabilitie, haue beene of the other opinion. For what elſe is the cauſe, that generally *all the Dominicans are of one opinion, and all the Ieſuits of the other?* I ſay, from a *Dominican* who took up his opinion upon truſt; and that ſuch an opinion (if we beleiue the writers of your Order) as if it be granted true, it were not a point matter, what opinions any man held, or what actions any man did, for the beſt would be as bad as the worſt, & the worſt as good as the beſt. And yet ſuch is the partialitie of your Hypocriſie, that of diſagreeing Papiſts, neither ſhall deny the truth teſtified by God, but both may hope for ſalvation: but of diſagreeing Proteſtants (though they differ in the ſame thing,) one ſide muſt deny Gods Teſtimony and bee incapable of ſalvation. That a *Dominican* through culpable negligence, living and dying in his errour, may repent of it, though hee knowes it not; or be ſaued though he doe not: But if a Proteſtant doe the very ſame thing, in the very ſame point, and die in his errour, his caſe is deſperate. The ſumme of all that hath been ſaid to this Demand is this. 1. That no erring Proteſtant denies any truth teſtified by God, under this formalitie, *as teſtified by him*; nor which they know or beleiue to be teſtified by him. And therefore it is a horrible calumnie in you to ſay, *They call Gods Veracitie in queſtion.* For Gods undoubted and unqueſtion'd Veracitie, is to them the ground why they hold all they doe hold: neither doe they hold any opiniō ſo ſtifly, but they will forgoe it rather then this one, *That all which God ſaies is true.* 2. God hath not ſo clearely and plainly declared himſelfe in moſt of theſe things which are in controverſie between Proteſtants, but that an honeſt man, whoſe heart is right to God, and one that is a true louer of God, and of his truth, may by reaſon of the conflict of contrary Reaſons on both ſides, very eaſily, and therefore excuſably miſtake, and embrace errour for truth, and reject truth for errour. 3, If any Proteſtant or Papiſt be betrayed into, or kept in any Errour, by any ſinne of his will (as it is to be fear'd many millions are) ſuch Errour is, as the cauſe of it, ſinfull and damnable: yet not excluſiue of all hope of ſalvation, but pardonable if diſcover'd, upon a particular explicite repentance; if not diſcover'd, upon a generall and implicite repentance for all Sinnes knowne and unknowne: in which number all ſinfull Errours muſt of neceſſity be contained.

17 *To the 9. To the ninthteenth*, Wherein you are ſo urgent for a *particular*

lar Catalogue of Fundamentalls: I anſwer almoſt in your owne words, that we alſo conſtantly urge and require to haue a particular Catalogue of your Fundamentals, whether they be written Verities, or unwritten Traditions, or Church Definitions? all which, you ſay, integrate the materiall Obiect of your Faith: In a word of all ſuch points as are defin'd and ſufficiently propoſed; ſo that whoſoever denies, or doubts of any of them, is certainly in the ſtate of damnation. A Catalogue I ſay in particular of the Propoſals: and not only ſome generall definition, or deſcription, under which you lurke deceitfully, of what and what only is ſufficiently propoſed: wherein yet you doe not very well agree. For many of you hold the Popes propoſall *Ex Cathedra*, to be ſufficient and obligeing: Some a Councel without a Pope: Some, of neither of them ſeverally, but only both together: Some not this neither in matter of manners, which *Bellarmine* acknowledges, & tells us it is all one in effect, as if they denied it ſufficient in matter of faith: Some not in matter of faith, neither think this propoſall infallible, without the acceptation of the Church univerſall: Some deny the infallibility of the Preſent Church, and only make the Tradition of all ages the *infallible Propounder*. Yet if you were agreed *what and what only is the Infallible Propounder*, this would not ſatisfie us; nor yet to ſay *that All is fundamentall which is propounded ſufficiently by him*. For though agreeing in this, yet you might ſtill diſagree *whether ſuch or ſuch a Doctrine were propounded or not: or if propounded, whether ſufficiently, or only unſufficiently*. And it is ſo knowne a thing, that in many points you doe ſo, that I aſſure my ſelfe you will not deny it. Therefore we conſtantly urge and require a particular and perfect Inventory of all theſe Divine Revelations, which you ſay *are ſufficiently propounded, & that ſuch a one to which all of your Church will ſubſcribe as neither redundant, nor deficient*; which when you giue in with one hand, you ſhall receiue a particular Catalogue of ſuch Points as I call *Fundamentall*, with the other. Neither may you think mee unreaſonable in this demand, ſeeing upon ſuch a particular Catalogue of your ſufficient Propoſalls as much depends, as upon a particular Catalogue of our Fundamentalls. As for example. Whether or no a man doe not erre in ſome point defined and ſufficiently propoſed: and whether or no thoſe that differ among you, differ in Fundamentalls; which if they doe *One Heaven* (by your owne Rule) *cannot receiue them All*. Perhaps you will here complaine, that this is not to ſatisfie your demand, but to avoid it, and to put you off as the *Areopagites* did hard cauſes *ad diem longiſſimum*, and bid you come againe a hundred yeares hence: To deale truly, I did ſo intend it ſhould be. Nether can you ſay my dealing with you is injurious, ſeeing I require nothing of you, but that, what you require of others, you ſhould ſhew it poſſible to be done, and juſt and neceſſary to be required. For, for my part, I haue great reaſon to ſuſpect, it is neither the one nor the other. For whereas the Verities which are delivered in Scripture, may be very fitly divided into *ſuch as were written becauſe they were neceſſary to be beleived*, Of which ranke are thoſe only which conſtitute and make up the Covenant be-

This great diverſity of opinions among you, touching this matter, if any mã doubt of it, let him read *Franciſcus Picus Mirandula in l. Theorem. in Expoſit. Theor. quarti.* and *Th. Waldenſis. Tom. 3. De Sacramentalibus. doct. 3. fol. 5.* and hee ſhall bee fully ſatisfied that I haue done you no injury.

tween

tween God and Man in Chriſt: and then *ſuch as are neceſſary to be beleived not in themſelues but only by accident, becauſe they were written.* Of which rank are many matters of Hiſtory, of Prophecy, of myſtery, of Policy, of Oeconomie, & ſuch like, which are evidently not *intrinſecall* to the Covenant. Now to ſever exactly & punctually theſe Verities one from the other: what is *neceſſary in it ſelfe* & antecedently to the writing, from what is but only profitable in it ſelfe, and *neceſſary only becauſe written*, is a buſineſſe of extreame great difficultie, and extreame little neceſſitie. For firſt he that will goe about to diſtinguiſh eſpecially in the Story of our Saviour, what was written becauſe it was *profitable*, from what was written becauſe *neceſſary*, ſhall find an intricate peece of buſineſſe of it, & almoſt impoſſible that he ſhould be certaine he hath done it, when he hath done it. And then it is apparently unneceſſary to goe about it, ſeeing he that beleiues all, certainly beleiues all that is neceſſary. And he that doth not beleiue all (I meane all the undoubted parts of the undoubted Books of Scripture) can hardly belieue any, neither haue we reaſon to beleiue he doth ſo. So that, that Proteſtants giue you not a Catalogue of Fundamentalls, it is not from Tergiverſation (as you ſuſpect, who for want of Charitie to them alwaies ſuſpect the worſt,) but from Wiſdome and Neceſſity. For they may very eaſily erre in doing it; becauſe though all which is neceſſary be plaine in Scripture, yet all which is plaine is not therefore written becauſe it was neceſſary. For what greater neceſſity was there that I ſhould know S. *Paul left his Cloak at Troas*, then thoſe *Worlds of Miracles*, which our Saviour did, which were never written. And when they had done it, it had been to no purpoſe; There being, as matters now ſtand, as great neceſſitie, of believing thoſe truths of Scripture, which are not Fundamentall, as thoſe that are. You ſee then what reaſon we haue to decline this hard labour, which you a rigid Taskemaſter haue here put upon us. Yet inſteed of giving you a Catalogue of Fundamentalls, with which I dare ſay you are reſolu'd before it come, never to be ſatisfied, I will ſay that to you, which if you pleaſe may doe you as much ſervice; and this it is. That it is ſufficient for any mans ſalvation that he belieue the Scripture: That he endeavour to beleiue it in the true ſenſe of it, as farre as concernes his dutie: And that he conforme his life unto it either by Obedience or Repentance. Hee that does ſo (and all Proteſtants according to the *Dictamen* of their Religion ſhould doe ſo,) may be ſecure that he cannot erre fundamentally. And they that doe ſo cannot differ in Fundamentals. So that notwithſtanding their differences, & your preſumption, *the ſame Heaven may receiue them All.*

28 *To the twentieth.* Your tenth & laſt requeſt is, *to know diſtinctly what is the doctrine of the Proteſtant Engliſh Church, in theſe points; and what my private opinion.* Which ſhall be ſatisfied when the Church of England hath expreſſed her ſelfe in them; or when you haue told us what is the doctrine of your Church, in the Queſtion of *Predetermination*, or the *Immaculate Conception.*

29 *To the 21 & 22.* Theſe anſwers I hope in the judgement of indifferent

ferent men are ſatisfactory to your Queſtions, though not to you; For I haue either anſwer'd them, or given you a reaſon why I haue not. Neither, for ought I can ſee, *haue I ſlitted from things conſidered in their owne nature, to accidentall or rare Circumſtances*, But told you my opinion plainely what I thought of your Errours in themſelues: and what as they were qualified or malignified with good or bad circumſtances. Though I muſt tell you truly, that I ſee no reaſon, the Queſtion being of the damnableneſſe of Errour, *why you ſhould eſteeme ignorance, incapacitie, want of meanes to be inſtructed, accidentall* and rare *Circumſtances:* As if knowledge, capacitie, having meanes of Inſtruction, concerning the truth of your Religion or ours, were not as rare & unuſuall in the adverſe part of either, as Ignorance, Incapacitie, and want of meanes of inſtruction. Eſpecially how erroneous Conſcience can be a rare thing in thoſe that erre, or how unerring Conſcience is not much more rare, I am not able to apprehend. So that to conſider men of different Religions (the ſubject of this Controverſie) in their owne nature and *without circumſtances*, muſt be to conſider them, neither as ignorant, nor as knowing: neither as having, nor as wanting meanes of Inſtruction: neither as with Capacity, nor without it: neither with erroneous, nor yet with unerring conſcience. And then what judgement can you pronounce of them, all the goodneſſe and badneſſe of an Action depending on the Circumſtances. Ought not a Iudge being to giue ſentence of an Action, to conſider all the Circumſtances of it, or is it poſſible he ſhould judge rightly that does not ſo? Neither is it to purpoſe, *That Circumſtances being various, cannot be well comprehended under any generall rule:* For though under any generall rule they cannot, yet under many generall rules they may be comprehended. The Queſtion here is, you ſay, *whether men of different Religions may be ſaved?* Now the ſubject of this Queſtion is an ambiguous terme and may be determined and inveſted with diverſe and contrary Circumſtances: and accordingly contrary judgements are to be given of it. And who then can be offended with D. *Potter* for diſtinguiſhing before he defines, (the want whereof is the cheife thing that makes defining dangerous?) Who can finde fault with him for ſaying, *If, through want of meanes of inſtruction, incapacitie, invincible or probable ignorance a man dye in errour, he may be ſaved. But if he be negligent in ſeeking Truth, unwilling to find it, either doth ſee it and will not, or might ſee it and will not, that his caſe is dangerous, & without repentance deſperate.* This is all that D. *Potter* ſaies: neither raſhly damning all that are of a different opinion from him, not ſecuring any that are in matter of Religion ſinfully, that is, willingly erroneous. The Author of this Reply (I will abide by it) ſaies the very ſame thing, neither can I ſee what adverſary he hath in the maine Queſtion but his owne ſhaddow; and yet I know not out of what frowardneſſe findes fault with D. *Potter* for affirming that which himſelfe affirmes: and to cloude the matter, whereas the Queſtion is, *whether men by ignorance, dying in errour may be ſaved*, would haue them conſidered *neither as erring, nor ignorant*. And when the queſtion is, whether *The errors of Papiſts bee*

damnable:

damnable: to which we anſwer. That to them that doe or might knowe them to be errours, they are damnable, to them that doe not, they are not. *He tels us that this is to change the State of the Queſtion*, whereas indeed it is to ſtate the Queſtion, and free it from ambiguity before you anſwer it: *and to haue recourſe to Accidentall Circumſtances*; as if Ignorance were accidentall to error, or as if a man could be conſidered as in errour, and not be conſidered as in ignorance of the Truth from which he erres! Certainly Errour againſt a Truth, muſt needs preſuppoſe a neſcience of it: unleſſe you will ſay, that a man may at once reſolue for a Truth and reſolue againſt it, aſſent to it, and diſſent from it, knowe it to be true, and beleiue it not to be true. Whether Knowledge & Opinion touching the ſame thing, may ſtand together, is made a Queſtion in the Schooles: But hee that would queſtion, whether knowing a thing and doubting of it, much more, whether knowing it to be true & believing it to be falſe, may ſtand together, deſerues without queſtion no other Anſwer but laughter. Now if Errour & knowledge connot conſiſt, then Errour and Ignorance muſt be inſeparable. He then that profeſſeth your errours may well be conſidered either as knowing or as Ignorant. But him that does erre indeed, you can no more conceiue without ignorance, then Long without Quantity, Vertuous without Qualitie, a Man, and not a living Creature, to haue gone ten miles, and not to haue gone fiue, to ſpeak ſenſe, and not to ſpeake. For as the latter in all theſe is implied in the former, ſo is Ignorance of a Truth, ſuppoſed in errour againſt it. Yet ſuch a man, though not conceaueable without Ignorance ſimply, may be very well conſidered either as with, or without voluntary and ſinfull Ignorance. And he that will giue a wiſe anſwer to this Queſtion, Whether a Papiſt dying a Papiſt may be ſaved, according to Gods ordinary proceeding; muſt diſtinguiſh him according to theſe ſeverall conſiderations, and ſay, Hee may be ſaved, If his ignorance were either invincible, or at leaſt unaffected and probable: if otherwiſe, without repentance he cannot.

To the reſt of this Preface, I haue nothing to ſay, ſaving what hath been ſaid, but this, That it is no juſt exception to an argument to call it vulgar and thredbare. Truth can neither be too common nor ſuperannuated, nor Reaſon ever worne out. Let your Anſwers be ſolid & pertinent, and we will never finde fault with them for being old or common.



THE FIRST PART.

The State of the Queſtion; with a ſummary of the reaſons for which amongſt men of different Religions, one ſide only can be ſaved.

CHAP. I.

Quis tulerit Gracchum &c.

NEver is Malice more indiſcreet, then when it chargeth others with imputation of that, to which it ſelfe becomes more liable, even by that very act of accuſing others. For, though guiltineſſe be the effect of ſome errour, yet uſually it begets a kind of Moderation, ſo far forth, as not to let men caſt ſuch aſperſions upon others, as muſt apparantly reflect upon themſelves. Thus cannot the Poet endure, that *Gracchus*, who was a factious and unquiet man, ſhould be inveighing againſt *Sedition*: and the Roman Oratour rebukes Philoſophers; who, to waxe glorious, ſuperſcribed their Names upon thoſe very bookes which they entitled, *Of the contempt of glory*. What then ſhall we ſay of *D. Potter*, who in the *Title*, and *Text* of his whole book doth ſo tragically charge *Want of Charity on all ſuch Romaniſts, as dare affirme, that Proteſtancy deſtroyeth Salvation*; while he himſelfe is in act of pronouncing the like heavy doom againſt Roman Catholiques? For, not ſatisfied with much uncivill language, in affirming the Roman Church *many* (a) *wayes to have plaid the Harlot, and in that regard deſerved a bill of divorce from Chriſt, and deteſtation of Chriſtians*; in ſtyling her, that *proud* (b) *and curſt Dame of Rome, which takes upon her to revell in the Houſe of God*; in talking of an *Idoll* (c) to be worſhipped at Rome; he comes at length to thunder out this fearfull ſentence againſt her: *For that* (d) Maſſe *of Errors* (ſaith he) *in iudgement and practiſe, which is proper to her, and wherein ſhe differs from us, we iudge a reconciliation impoſſible, and to us (who are convicted in conſcience of her corruptions) damnable.* And in another place he ſaith: *For us who* (e) *are convinced in conſcience, that ſhe erres in many things, a neceſſity lyes upon us, even under pain of damnation, to forſake her in thoſe Errors.* By the acerbity of which Cenſure, he doth not only make himſelfe guilty of that, which he judgeth to be a haynous offence in others, but freeth us alſo from all colour of crime by this his unadviſed recrimination. For, if Roman Catholikes be likewiſe *convicted in conſcience* of the Errors of Proteſtants; they may, and muſt, in conformity to the *Doctor's* own rule, judge a reconciliation with them to be alſo *damnable*. And thus, all the *Want of Charity* ſo deeply charged on us, diſſolves it ſelfe into this poore wonder, *Roman Catholiques believe in their conſcience, that the Religion which they profeſſe, is true, and the contrary falſe.*

a *Pag.* 11.
b *Ibid.*
c *Pag.* 4. *Edit.* 1.
d *Pag.* 20.
e *Pag.* 81.

2. Nevertheleſſe, we earneſtly deſire, and take care, that our doctrine may not be defamed by miſinterpretation. Far be it from us, by way of inſultation, to apply it againſt Proteſtants, otherwiſe then as they are comprehended under the generality of thoſe who are divided from the only one true Church of Chriſt our Lord, within the Communion whereof he hath confined ſalvation. Neither doe we underſtand, why our moſt deere Countrymen ſhould be offended if the Vniverſality be particularized under the name of *Proteſtants*, firſt given (g) to certain *Lutherans*, who *proteſting* that they would ſtand out againſt the Imperiall decrees, in defence of the Confeſſion exhibited at *Ausburge*, were termed *Proteſtants*, in regard of ſuch their *proteſting*: which *Confeſſio Auguſtana* diſclaiming from, and being diſclaymed by *Calviniſts*, and *Zwinglians*, our naming or exemplifying a generall doctrine under the particular name of Proteſtantiſme, ought not in any particular manner to be odious in England.

g *Sleidan. l.* 6. *fol.* 84.

3 Moreover, our meaning is not, as miſinformed perſons may conceive, that we give Proteſtants over to reprobation; that we offer no prayers in hope of their ſalvation; that we hold their caſe

caſe deſperate. God forbid! We hope, we pray for their Converſion; and ſometimes we find happy effects of our charitable deſires. Neither is our Cenſure immediatly directed to particular perſons. The Tribunall of particular Iudgement is Gods alone. When any man eſteemed a Proteſtant, leaveth to live in this world, we doe not inſtantly with precipitation avouch, that he is lodged in Hell. For we are not alwaies acquainted with what ſufficiency or meanes he was furniſhed for inſtruction; we doe not penetrate his capacity to underſtand his Catechiſt, we have no revelation what light might have cleered his errours, or Contrition retracted his ſinnes, in the laſt moment before his death. In ſuch particular caſes, we wiſh more apparent ſignes of ſalvation, but doe not give any dogmaticall ſentence of perdition. How greivous ſinnes, *Diſobedience*, *Schiſme*, and *Hereſy* are, is well knowne. But to diſcerne how farre the naturall malignity of thoſe great offences might be checked by Ignorance, or by ſome ſuch leſſening circumſtance, is the office rather of *Prudence* then of *Faith*.

4 Thus we allow Proteſtants as much Charity, as D. *Potter* ſpares us, for whom, in the words above mentioned, and elſe where, he (h) makes *Ignorance* the beſt hope of ſalvation. Much leſſe comfort, can we expect from the fierce doctrine of thoſe chiefe Proteſtants, who teach that for many ages before *Luther*, Chriſt had no viſible Church upon earth. Not theſe men alone, or ſuch as they, but even the 39. Articles, to which the Engliſh Proteſtant Clergy ſubſcribes, cenſure our beliefe ſo deeply, that Ignorance can ſcarce, or rather not at all, excuſe us from damnation. Our doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*, is affirmed to be *repugnant* to the plaine words of (i) Scripture; our *Maſſes* to be blaſphemous (k) *Fables*, with much more to be ſeen in the *Articles* themſelves. In a certaine Confeſſion of the Chriſtian faith, at the end of their books of Pſalmes collected into Meeter, and printed *Cum privilegio Regiæ Regali*, they call us *Idolaters*, and *limmes of Antichriſt*; and having ſet downe a Catalogue of our doctrines, they conclude, that for them we ſhall after the Generall Reſurrection be *damned to unquenchable fire*.

h *See pag.* 39.

i *Art.* 28.

k *Art.* 31.

5 But yet leaſt any man ſhould flatter himſelfe with our charitable Mitigations, and thereby wax careleſſe in ſearch of the true Church, we deſire him to read the *Concluſion* of the *Second Part*, where this matter is more explained.

6 And becauſe we cannot determine, what *Judgment* may be eſteemed *raſh*, or *prudent*, except by weighing the reaſons upon which it is grounded, we will heere, under one aſpect, preſent a Summary of thoſe Principles, from which we infer, that Proteſtancy in it ſelfe unrepented deſtroyes Salvation: intending afterward to prove the truth of every one of the grounds, till, by a concatenation of ſequels, we fall upon the *Concluſion*, for which we are charged with *Want of Charity*.

7 Now, this is our gradation of reaſons. Almighty God, having ordained Mankind to a ſupernaturall *End* of eternall felicity, hath in his holy Providence ſetled competent and convenient *Meanes*, whereby that end may be attained. The univerſall grand Origen of all ſuch means, is the Incarnation and Death of our Bleſſed Saviour, whereby he merited internall grace for us; and founded an *externall* viſible Church, provided and ſtored with all thoſe helps which might be neceſſary for Salvation. From hence it followeth, that in this Church amongſt other advantages, there muſt be ſome effectuall meanes to beget, and conſerve faith, to maintaine Vnity, to diſcover and condemne Hereſies, to appeaſe and reduce Schiſmes, and to determine all Controverſies in Religion. For without ſuch meanes, the Church ſhould not be furniſhed with helps ſufficient to ſalvation, nor God afford ſufficient meanes to attayne that End, to which himſelfe ordained Mankind. This meanes to decide Controverſies in faith and Religion (whether it ſhould be the holy Scripture, or whatſoever elſe) muſt be indued with an Vniverſall Infallibility, in whatſoever it propoundeth for a divine truth, that is, as revealed, ſpoken, or teſtifyed by Almighty God, whether the matter of its nature, be great or ſmall. For if it were ſubject to errour in any one thing, we could not in any other yield it infallible aſſent; becauſe we might with good reaſon doubt, whether it chanced not to erre in that particular.

8 Thus farre all muſt agree to what wee have ſaid, unleſſe they have a mind to reduce *Faith* to *Opinion*. And even out of theſe grounds alone, without further proceeding, it undenyably followes, that of two men diſſenting in matters of faith, great or ſmall, few or many, the one cannot be ſaved without repentance, unleſſe Ignorance accidentally may in ſome particular perſon plead excuſe. For in that caſe of contrary beliefe, one muſt of neceſſity be held to oppoſe Gods word, or Revelation ſufficiently repreſented to his underſtanding by an infallible Propounder; which oppoſition to the Teſtimony of God is undoubtedly a damnable ſin, whether otherwiſe, the thing ſo teſtified, be in it ſelfe great or ſmall. And thus wee have already made good, what was promiſed in the argument of this Chapter, that *amongſt men of different Religions*, one is only capable of being ſaved.

9 Nevertheleſſe, to the end that men may know in particular what is the ſaid infallible meanes upon which we are to rely in all things concerning Fayth, and accordingly may be able to judge in what ſafety or danger, more or leſſe they live; and becauſe D. *Potter* deſcendeth to divers particulars about Scriptures and the Church &c. we will goe forward, and prove, that although Scripture be in it ſelfe moſt ſacred, infallible, and divine; yet it alone cannot be *to us a Rule*, or Iudge, fit an able to end all doubts and debates eraergent in matters of Religion; but that there muſt be ſome externall, viſible, publique, living Iudge, to whom all ſorts of perſons both learned

and unlearned, may without danger of errour, have recourſe; and in whoſe Iudgment they may reſt, for the interpreting and propounding of Gods Word or Revelation. And this living Iudge, we will moſt evidently prove to be no other, but that Holy, Catholique, Apoſtolique, and Viſible Church, which our Saviour purchaſed with the effuſion of his moſt precious bloud.

10 If once therefore it be granted, that the Church is that means, which God hath left for deciding all Controverſies in faith, it manifeſtly will follow, that ſhee muſt be infallible in all her determinations, whether the matters of themſelves be great or ſmall; becauſe as we ſaid above, it muſt be agreed on all ſides, that if that meanes which God hath left to determine Controverſies were not infallible in all things propoſed by it as truths revealed by Almighty God, it could not ſettle in our minds a firme, and infallible beliefe of any one.

11 From this Vniverſall infallibility of Gods Church it followeth, that whoſoever wittingly denyeth any one point propoſed by her, as revealed by God, is injurious to his divine Majeſty, as if he could either deceive, or be deceived in what he teſtifieth. The averring whereof, were not a *fundamentall* error, but would overthrow the very foundation of all fundamentall points, and therefore without repentance could not poſſibly ſtand with ſalvation.

12 Out of theſe grounds, we will ſhew, that although the diſtinction of points *fundamentall*, and not *fundamentall*, be good and uſefull, as it is delivered and applied by Catholique Divines, to teach what principall Articles of faith, Chriſtians are obliged *explicitely* to believe: yet that it is impertinent to the preſent purpoſe of excuſing any man from grievous ſinne, who knowingly *diſbelieves*, that is, believes the contrary of that which Gods Church propoſeth as divine Truth. For it is one thing not to know explicitly ſome thing teſtifyed by God, & another poſitively to oppoſe what we know he hath teſtified. The former may often be excuſed from ſin, but never the latter, which only is the caſe in Queſtion.

13 In the ſame manner ſhall be demonſtrated, that to alleadge the *Creed*, as containing all Articles of faith neceſſary to be explicitely believed, is not pertinent to free from ſinne the voluntary deniall of any other point knowen to be defined by Gods Church. And this were ſufficient to overthrow all that *D. Potter* alleadgeth, concerning the *Creed*: though yet by way of Supererogation, we will prove, that there are divers important matters of Faith which are not mentioned at all in the Creed.

14 From the aforeſaid maine principle, that God hath alwaies had, and alwaies will have on earth, a Church *Viſible*, within whoſe Communion Salvation muſt be hoped, and *infallible*, whoſe definitions we ought to believe; we will prove, that *Luther*, *Calvin* and all other, who continue the diviſion in Communion, or Faith, from that Viſible Church, which at, and before *Luther's* appearance, was ſpread over the world, cannot be excuſed from *Schiſme* and *Hereſy*, although they oppoſed her faith but in *one only* point; whereas it is manifeſt, they diſſent from her, in *many* and weighty matters, concerning as well *beliefe*, as practiſe.

15 To theſe reaſons drawne from the vertue of *Faith*, we will adde one other taken from *Charitas propria*, the Vertue of *Charity*, as it obligeth us, not to expoſe our ſoule to hazard of perdition, when we can put our ſelves in a way much more ſecure, as we will prove, that of the Roman Catholiques to be.

16 We are then to prove theſe points. Firſt, that the infallible meanes to determine controverſies in matters of faith, *is the viſible* Church of Chriſt. Secondly, that the diſtinction of points *fundamentall*, and *not fundamentall*, maketh nothing to our preſent Queſtion. Thirdly, that to ſay the *Creed* containes all fundamentall points of faith, is neither *pertinent*, nor *true*. Fourthly, that both *Luther*, and all they who after him, perſiſt in diviſion from the *Communion*, and *Faith* of the Roman Church, cannot be excuſed from *Schiſme*. Fiftly, nor from Hereſy. Sixtly and laſtly, that in regard of the precept of *Charity* towards ones ſelfe, Proteſtants be in ſtate of ſinne, as long as they remaine divided from the *Roman* Church. And theſe ſix points, ſhall be ſeverall Arguments for ſo many enſuing Chapters.

17 Only I will here obſerve, that it ſeemeth very ſtrange, that Proteſtants ſhould charge us ſo deeply with *Want of Charity*, for only teaching, that both they, and we cannot be ſaved, ſeeing themſelves muſt affirme the like of whoſoever oppoſeth any leaſt point delivered in Scripture, which they hold to be the ſole Rule of Faith. Out of which ground they muſt be enforced to let all our former Inferences paſſe for good. For, is it not a grievous ſinne, to deny any one truth contained in holy Writ? Is there in ſuch deniall, any diſtinction betwixt points fundamentall, and not fundamentall, ſufficient to excuſe from hereſy? Is it not impertinent, to alleadge the Creed containing all fundamentall points of faith, as if believing it alone, we were at liberty to deny all other points of Scripture? In a word: According to Proteſtants; Oppoſe not Scripture, there is no Errour againſt faith. Oppoſe it in any leaſt point, the error (if Scripture be ſufficiently propoſed, which propoſition is alſo required before a man can be obliged to believe even fundamentall points) muſt be damnable. What is this, but to ſay with us, *Of perſons contrary in whatſoever point of beliefe, one party only can be ſaved?* And *D. Potter* muſt not take it ill, if Catholiques believe they may be ſaved in that Religion for which they ſuffer. And if by occaſion of this doctrine, men will ſtill be charging us with *Want of Charity*, and be reſolved to *take* ſcandall where none is *given*; we muſt comfort our ſelves with that grave, and true ſaying of *S. Gregory: If ſcandall* (1) *be taken from declaring a truth, it is better to permit ſcandall, then forſake the truth.* But the ſolid grounds of our Aſſertion, and the ſincerity of our intention in utte-

1 *S. Greg. Hom. 7. in Ezec.*

ring

ring what we thinke, yield us confidence, that all will hold for moſt reaſonable the ſaying of Pope *Gelaſius* to *Anaſtaſius* the Emperour: *Farre be it from the Roman Emperour that he ſhould hold it for a wrong to have truth declared to him.* Let us therefore begin with that point which is the firſt that can be controverted betwixt Proteſtants and us, for as much as concernes the preſent Queſtion, and is contained in the Argument of the next enſuing Chapter.

THE ANSWER TO THE FIRST CHAPTER.

1. *TO the firſt* § Your firſt onſet is very violent. *D. Potter* is charg'd with malice and indiſcretion, for *being uncharitable to you, while he is accuſing you of uncharitableneſſe.* Verily a great fault, and folly, if the accuſation be juſt; if unjuſt a great calumnie. Let us ſee then how you make good your charge. The effect of your diſcourſe, if I miſtake not, is this. *D. Potter chargeth the Roman Church with many and great errours; judgeth reconciliation betweene her doctrine and ours impoßible; and that for them who are convicted in Conſcience of her Errors, not to forſake her in them, or to be reconcil'd unto her is damnable. Therefore if Roman Catholiques be convicted in conſcience of the Errours of Proteſtants, they may and muſt judge a reconciliation with them damnable, & conſequently, to judge ſo is no more uncharitable in thē, then it is in the Doctor to judge as he does.* All this I grant; nor would any Proteſtant accuſe you of *want of Charity*, if you went no further: if you judg'd the Religion of Proteſtants damnable to them only who profeſſe it being convicted in conſcience that it is erroneous. For, *if a man iudge ſome act of vertue to be a ſinne, in him it is a ſinne indeed.* So you haue taught us, p. 19. So if you be convinc'd, or rather, to ſpeake properly, perſwaded in conſcience that our Religion is erroneous, the profeſſion of it, though in it ſelfe moſt true, to you would bee damnable. This therefore I ſubſcribe very willingly, and withall, that if you ſaid no more, *D. Potter* and my ſelfe ſhould not be to Papiſts only, but even to Proteſtants, as uncharitable as you are. For I ſhall alwaies profeſſe and glory in this uncharitableneſſe of judging *hypocriſie a damnable ſinne.* Let Hypocrites then and Diſſemblers on both ſides paſſe. It is not towards them, but good Chriſtians; not to Proteſtant Profeſſors but Believers that we require your Charitie. What think you of thoſe that believe ſo verily the truth of our Religion, that they are reſolv'd to die in it, and if occaſion were, to die for it? What Charity haue you for them? What think yee of thoſe that in the daies of our Fathers, laid downe their liues for it? are you content that they ſhall be ſaved, or doe you hope they may be ſo? Will you grant that notwithſtanding their Errours, there is good hope they might die with repentance? and if they did ſo, certainly they are ſav'd. If you will doe ſo, this Controverſie is ended. No man will hereafter charge you with *want of Charity*. This is as much as either we giue you, or expect of you, while you remaine in your Religion. But then you muſt leaue abuſing ſilly people, with telling them (as your faſhion is) that *Proteſtants confeſſe*

Papiſts may be ſaved; but Papiſts confeſſe not ſo much of Proteſtants; therefore yours is the ſafer way, and in Wiſdome and Charitie to our owne ſoules we are bound to follow it. For granting this, you grant as much hope of ſalvation to Proteſtants, as Proteſtants doe to you. If you will not, but will ſtill affirme, as C.M. does, that *Protectants*, not diſſemblers but *believers, without a particular repentance of their Religion cannot be ſaved*: This I ſay, is a *want of Charitie*, into the ſociety whereof *D. Potter* cannot be drawne but with palpable and tranſparent *Sophiſtrie*. For I pray Sir, what dependance is there between theſe Propoſitions. We that hold Proteſtant Religion falſe ſhould be damned if we ſhould profeſſe it, Therefore they alſo ſhall be damned, that hold it true. Iuſt as if you ſhould conclude, *Becauſe he that doubts is damnèd if he eat*, therefore he that does not doubt is damn'd alſo if he eat. And therefore though your Religion to us, or ours to you, if profeſſed againſt Conſcience would be damnable: yet may it well be uncharitable to define it ſhall be ſo, to them that profeſſe either this or that according to Conſcience. This Recrimination therefore upon *D. Potter* is a plaine fallacie, and if beginnings be ominous, as they ſay they are, this Book in all likely-hood will be *full of Sophiſtrie*.

2 *Ad* §. 2. In this Paragraph, Proteſtants are thus farre comforted, that they are not ſent to Hell without Company, which the Poet tells vs, is the miſerable *comfort of miſerable Men*. Then we in *England* are requeſted *not to be offended with the name of Proteſtants*. Which is a favour I ſhall eaſily grant, if by it be underſtood thoſe that *Proteſt*, not againſt *Imperiall Edicts*, but againſt the *Corruptions of the Church of Rome*.

3 *Ad* §. 3.4.5.6. *That you giue us not over to reprobation, That you pray and hope for our ſalvation*, if it be a Charity, is ſuch a one as is common to *Turkes* and *Iewes* and *Pagans* with Vs. But that which followes is extraordinary; Neither doe I know any man that requires more of you then there you pretend to. For there you tell us, *That when any man, eſteem'd a Proteſtant, dies, you doe not inſtantly avouch that he is lodg'd in Hell*. Where the word *eſteem'd* is ambiguous: For it may ſignifie, *eſteem'd truly*, and *eſteem'd falſely*. He may be eſteem'd a Proteſtant that *is ſo*: And he may be eſteem'd a Proteſtant that is *not ſo*. And therfore I ſhould haue had juſt occaſion to haue laid to your charge the tranſgreſſion of your own chiefe preſcription, which you ſay *truth exacts at our hands*, that is, *to ſpeak clearely or diſtinctly, and not to walk in darkneſſe*; But that your following words to my underſtanding declare ſufficiently that you ſpeak of *both ſorts*. For there you tell us that the Reaſons why you damne not any man that dies with the eſteem of a Proteſtant, are 1. *Becauſe you are not alwaies acquainted with what ſufficiency of meanes he was furniſhed for inſtruction*; You muſt mean touching the falſhood of his own Religion, and the truth of yours. Which reaſon is proper to thoſe that are Proteſtants in *truth*, and not only in *eſtimation*. 2. Becauſe you doe *not penetrate his capacitie to underſtand his Catechiſt*; which is alſo peculiar to thoſe, who for want of capacity (as you conceiue) remaine Proteſtants indeed

deed, and are not only ſo accounted. 3. Becauſe you have *no Revelation what light might clear his errors*; which belongs to thoſe which were eſteem'd Proteſtants, but indeed were not ſo. 4. Becauſe you have *no Revelation what Contrition might have retracted his ſinnes*: which reaſon being diſtinct from the former, and divided from it by the disjunctive particle, *Or*, inſinuates unto us, that though no light did clear the errors of a dying Proteſtant, yet *Contrition* might, for ought you know, retract his ſinnes: which appropriates this reaſon alſo to Proteſtants truly ſo eſteem'd. I wiſh with all my heart that in obedience to your own preſcription, you had expreſſed your ſelfe in this matter more fully and plainly. Yet that which you ſay, doth plainly enough afford us theſe corollaries.

1 That whatſoever Proteſtant wanteth capacity, or having it, wanteth ſufficient meanes of inſtruction to convince his Conſcience of the falſhood of his own, and the truth of the Roman Religion, by the confeſſion of his moſt rigid Adverſaries, may be ſaved, notwithſtanding any error in his Religion.

2 That nothing hinders but that a Proteſtant dying a Proteſtant may dye with contrition for all his ſinnes.

3 That, if he doe dye with Contrition, he may and ſhall be ſaved.

4 All theſe acknowledgements we have from you, while you are, as you ſay, ſtáteing, but as I conceive granting the very point in queſtion; which was, as I have already prov'd out of C. M. *whether without uncharitableneſſe you may pronounce, that Proteſtants dying in the belief of their Religion, and without particular repentance and dereliction of it cannot poſſibly be ſaved.* Which C. M. affirmes univerſally, and without any of your limitations. But this preſumption of his, you thus qualify, by ſaying, that *this ſentence cannot be pronounced truly and therefore ſure not charitably, neither of thoſe Proteſtants that want meanes ſufficient to inſtruct and convince them of the truth of your Religion and the falſhood of their own: Nor of thoſe, who, though they have neglected the meanes they might have had, dyed with contrition, that is, with a ſorrow for all their ſinnes proceeding from the love of God.* So that according to your doctrine it ſhall remain upon *ſuch only, as either were, or but for their own fault, might have been ſufficiently convinced of the truth of your Religion, and the falſhood of their own, and yet dye in it without contrition.* Which doctrine if you would ſtand to, and not pull down, and pull back with one hand, what you give and build with the other, this controverſy were ended; and I ſhould willingly acknowledge, that which followes in your fourth paragraph; *That you allow Proteſtants as much Charity as* D. Potter *allowes you.* But then I muſt intreat you to alter the *argument of this Chapter*, and not to goe about to give us reaſons, *why amongſt men of different Religions, one ſide only can be ſaved abſolutely*, which your Reaſons drive at: But you muſt temper the crudenes of your Aſſertion by ſaying, *One ſide only can be ſaved, unleſſe want of Conviction, or elſe Repentance excuſe the other.* Beſides you muſt not only abſtaine from damning any Proteſtant in particular, but from affirming in generall, that *Proteſtants dying*

in

in their Religion cannot be ſaved; for you muſt alwaies remember to adde this caution, unleſſe *they were excuſably ignorant of the falſhood of it, or dyed with contrition.* And then conſidering that you cannot know, whether or no, all things conſidered, they were convinc'd ſufficiently of the truth of your Religion and the falſhood of their own, you are oblig'd by Charity to judge the beſt, and hope they are not. Conſidering again, that notwithſtanding their Errors, they may dye with contrition, & that it is no way improbable that they doe ſo, & the contrary you cannot be certain of, You are bound in Charity to judge and hope they doe ſo. Conſidering thirdly and laſtly, that if they dye not with *Contrition*, yet it is very probable they may dye with *Attritiõ*, & that this pretence of yours, that *Contrition will ſerve without actuall Confeſſion, but Attrition will not*, is but a nicety or phancy, or rather, to give it the true name, a Device of your own, to ſerve ends and purpoſes; (God having no where declared himſelfe, but that whereſoever he will accept of that repentance, which you are pleaſed to call *Contrition*, he will accept of that which you call *Attrition*; For though he like beſt the bright flaming holocauſt of Love, yet he rejects not, he quenches not the ſmoaking flaxe of that repentance (if it be true and effectuall) which proceeds from hope and fear:) Theſe things I ſay, conſidered, (unleſſe you will have the Charity of your doctrine riſe up in judgement againſt your uncharitable practiſe) you muſt not only not be peremptory, in damning Proteſtants, but you muſt hope well of their Salvation: and out of this hope, you muſt doe for them as well as others, thoſe, as you conceive, Charitable offices, of Praying, giving Almes and offering Sacrifice, which uſually you doe, for thoſe of whoſe Salvation you are well and charitably perſwaded; (for I believe you will never conceive ſo well of Proteſtants, as to aſſure your ſelves they goe directly to heaven.) Theſe things whē you doe I ſhall believe you think as charitably as you ſpeak. But untill then, as he ſaid in the Comedy, *Quid verba audiam cum facta videam?* ſo may I ſay to you, *Quid verba audiam cum facta non videam?* To what purpoſe ſhould you give us charitable words, which preſently you retract again, by denying us your charitable actions. And as theſe things you muſt doe, if you will ſtand to and make good this pretended Charity, ſo muſt I tell you again and again, that one thing you muſt not doe; I mean, you muſt not affright poore people out of their Religion, with telling them, that *by the confeſſion of both ſides, your way is ſafe, but in your judgement, ours undoubtedly damnable.* Seeing neither you deny Salvation to *Proteſtants dying with repentance*, nor we promiſe it to you, *if ye dye without it.* For to deal plainly with you, I know no Proteſtant that hath any other hope of your ſalvation, but upon theſe grounds, that *unaffected ignorance* may excuſe you, or *true repentance* obtain pardon for you; neither doe the heavy cenſures which Proteſtants (you ſay) paſſe upon your errors, any way hinder but they may hope as well of you, upon repentance, as I doe. For the *fierce doctrine*, which, God knowes who, teaches, that *Chriſt for many ages before Luther had no viſible Church upon earth*; will be mild enough

nough, if you conceive them to mean (as perhaps they doe) by *no viſible Church, none pure and free from corruptions*, which in your judgement is all one with no Church. But the truth is the *corruption* of the Church, and the *deſtruction* of it, is not all one. For if a particular man or Church may (as you confeſſe they may) hold ſome particular Errors, and yet be a member of the Church univerſall: why may not the Church hold ſome univerſall Error, and yet be ſtill the Church? eſpecially, ſeeing you ſay, it is nothing but *oppoſing the doctrine of the Church, that makes an error damnable*, and it is impoſſible that the Church ſhould oppoſe the Church, I mean that the preſent Church ſhould oppoſe it ſelfe. And then for the Engliſh Proteſtants, though they cenſure your Errors deeply, yet, by your favour, with their deepeſt cenſures it may well conſiſt that *invincible ignorance* may excuſe you from damnation for them. For you your ſelfe confeſſe *that ignorance may excuſe Errors, even in Fundamentall Articles of faith: ſo that a man ſo erring ſhall not offend at all in ſuch his ignorance or error*; they are your own words. p. 19. And againe whith their heavieſt cenſures it may well conſiſt, that your Errors though in themſelves damnable, yet may prove *not damning* to you, if you dye with true repentance, for all your ſinnes known and unknown.

5 Thus much Charity therefore, if you ſtand to what you have ſaid, is interchangeably granted by each Side to the other, that Neither Religion is ſo fatally *deſtructive, but that by ignorance or repentance ſalvation may be had on both Sides*: though with a difference that keeps Papiſts ſtill on the more uncharitable ſide. For whereas we conceive a lower degree of repentance (that which they call *Attrition*) if it be true, and effectuall, and convert the heart of the penitent, will ſerve in them: They pretend (even *this Author* which is moſt charitable towards us,) that *without Contrition* there is no hope for us, But though Proteſtants may not obtain this purchaſe at ſo eaſy a rate as Papiſts, yet (even Papiſts being Iudges) they may obtain it; and though there is no entrance for them but at the only doore of *Contrition*, yet they may enter, Heaven is not inacceſſible to them. Their errors are no ſuch impenetrable Iſtmus's between them and Salvation, but that *Contrition* may make a way through them. All their Schiſme and Hereſy is no ſuch fatall poiſon, but that if a man joyne with it the Antidote of a generall repentance, he may dye in it, and live for ever. Thus much then being acknowledged, I appeal to any indifferent reader, whether C. M. be not by his *Hyperaſpiſt* forſaken in the plain field, and the point in queſtion granted to *D. Potter*, viz. *That Proteſtancy even without a particular repentance, is not deſtructive of Salvation*; ſo that all the Controverſy remaining now, is, not ſimply whether *Proteſtancy unrepented deſtroies ſalvation?* as it was at firſt propoſed, but *Whether Proteſtancy in it ſelfe* (that is *abſtracting from ignorance and contrition*) *deſtroies Salvation?* So that as a fooliſh fellow who gave a Knight the Lye, deſiring withall leave of him to ſet his Knighthood aſide, was anſwered by him, that he would not ſuffer any thing to be ſet aſide that belonged unto him: So might we juſtly take it amiſſe, that conceiving

ceiving as you doe ignorance and repentance ſuch neceſſary things for us, you are not more willing to confider us with them, then without them. For my part ſuch is my charity to you, that conſidering what great neceſſity *You* have, as much as any *Chriſtian ſociety in the World*, that theſe ſanctuaries of *Ignorance* and *Repentance* ſhould alwaies ſtand open, I can very hardly perſwade my ſelfe ſo much as in my moſt ſecret conſideration to deveſt you of theſe ſo needfull qualifications: But whenſoever your errors, ſuperſtitions and impieties come into my mind, (and beſides the generall bonds of humanity and Chriſtianity, my own particular obligations to many of you, ſuch and ſo great, that you cannot periſh without a part of my ſelfe,) my only comfort is amidſt theſe agonies, that the Doctrine and practiſe too of repentance, is yet remaining in your Church: And that though you put on a face of confidence of your innocence in point of Doctrine, yet you will be glad to ſtand in the eye of mercy as well as your fellowes, and not be ſo ſtout, as to refuſe either Gods pardon or the Kings.

6 But for the preſent, Proteſtancy is called to the barre, and though not ſentenc'd by you to death without mercy, yet arraigned of ſo much naturall malignity (if not corrected by *ignorance* or *contrition*) as to be *in it ſelfe, deſtructive of Salvation*. Which controverſy I am content to diſpute with you, tying my ſelfe to follow the Rules preſcribed by you in your *Preface*. Only I am to remember you, that the adding of this limitation (*in it ſelfe*) hath made this a new Queſtion; and that this is not the concluſion for which you were charged with *want of Charity*. But that whereas according to the grounds of your own Religion, *Proteſtants may dye in their ſuppoſed errors, either with excuſable ignorance, or with Contrition, and if they doe ſo may be ſaved*, you ſtill are peremptory in pronouncing them damn'd. Which poſition ſuppoſing your Doctrine true, and ours falſe, as it is farre from *Charity*, (whoſe eſſentiall character it is, *to judge and hope the beſt*,) ſo I beleeve that I ſhall cleerly evince this new, but more moderate aſſertion of yours to be farre from verity, & that it is *Popery, and not Proteſtancy, which in it ſelfe deſtroies Salvation*.

7 *Ad* § 7. & 8. In your gradation I ſhall riſe ſo farre with you as to grant, *that Chriſt founded a viſible Church, ſtored with all helps neceſſary to ſalvation, particularly with ſufficient meanes to beget and conſerve faith, to maintain unity, and compoſe ſchiſmes, to diſcover and condemne hæreſies, and to determine all controverſies in Religion*, which were neceſſary to be determin'd. For all theſe purpoſes, he gave at the begining (as we may ſee in the Ep. to the *Epheſians*) *Apoſtles, Prophets, Evangeliſts, Paſtors, and Doctours:* who by word of mouth taught their comtemporaries, and by writings (wrot indeed by ſome, but approved by all of them) taught their Chriſtian poſterity to the worlds end, how all theſe ends, and that which is the end of all theſe ends, Salvation, is to be atchieved. And theſe meanes the Providence of God hath ſtill preſerved, and ſo preſerved, that they are ſufficient for all theſe intents. I ſay *ſufficient*, though, through the malice

malice of men, not alwaies *effectuall*, for that the ſame meanes may be ſufficient for the compaſſing an end, and not effectuall, you muſt not deny, who hold that *God gives to all men ſufficient meanes of Salvation, and yet that all are not ſav'd.* I ſaid alſo, ſufficient to determine all controverſies, which *were neceſſary to be determin'd.* For if ſome controverſies may for many ages be undetermined, and yet in the mean while men be ſav'd; why ſhould, or how can the *Churches being furniſht with effectuall meanes to determine all Controverſies in Religion* be neceſſary to Salvation, the end it ſelfe, to which theſe meanes are ordained being as experience ſhewes not neceſſary? Plain ſenſe will teach every man, that the neceſſity of the meanes muſt alwaies be meaſured by, and can never exceed the neceſſity of the end. As if eating be neceſſary, only that I may live, then certainly if I have no neceſſity to live, I have no neceſſity to eat. If I have no need to be at London, I have no need of a horſe to carry me thither. If I have no need to fly, I have no need of wings. Anſwer me then I pray directly, and categorically, Is it neceſſary that all Controverſies in Religion ſhould be determin'd, or is it not? If it be, why is the queſtion of *Predetermination*, of the *immaculate conception*, of the *Popes indirect power in temporalties*, ſo long undetermined? if not, what is it but hypocriſy to pretend ſuch great neceſſity of ſuch effectuall meanes, for the atchieving that end, which is it ſelfe not neceſſary. Chriſtians therefore have and ſhall have *means ſufficient* (though not alwaies effectuall) *to determine* not all *controverſies* but *all neceſſary to be determined.* I proceed on farther with you, and grant that this meanes to decide controverſies in Faith & Religion muſt be indued with an Vniverſall infallibility in whatſoever it propoundeth for a divine truth. For if it may be falſe in any one thing of this nature, in any thing which God requires men to believe, we can yeeld unto it but a wavering and fearfull aſſent in any thing. Theſe grounds therefore I grant very readily, and give you free leave to make your beſt advantage of them. And yet, to deal truly, I doe not perceive how from the denyall of any of them it would follow that Faith is Opinion: or from the granting them, that it is not ſo. But for my part, whatſoever clamour you have raiſed againſt me, I think no otherwiſe of the Nature of Faith, I mean *Hiſtoricall Faith*, then generally both Proteſtants and Papiſts doe; for I conceive it *an aſſent to divine Revelations upon the authority of the revealer.* Which though in many things it differ from opinion, (as commonly the word *opinion* is underſtood) yet in ſome things, I doubt not but you will confeſſe, that it agrees with it. As firſt, that as Opinion is an Aſſent, ſo is faith alſo. Secondly that as Opinion ſo Faith, is alwaies built upon leſſe evidence then that of ſenſe or ſcience. Which aſſertion you not only grant but mainly contend for in your *ſixt Ch.* Thirdly and laſtly, that as Opinion, ſo Faith admits degrees; and that as there may be a ſtrong and weak Opinion, ſo there may be a ſtrong and weak Faith. Theſe things if you wil grant (as ſure if you be in your right mind you will not deny any of them) I am well contented that this ill-ſounding word, *Opinion*, ſhould be diſcarded, and

that among the Intellctuall habits you ſhould ſeek out ſome other *Genus* for *Faith*. For I will never contend with any man about words, who grants my meaning.

8 *But though the eſſence of Faith exclude not all weakneſſe and imperfection, yet may it be enquired, whether any certainty of Faith, under the higheſt degree may be ſufficient to pleaſe God and attain ſalvation.* Whereunto I anſwer, that though men are unreaſonable, God requires not any thing but Reaſon. They will not be pleaſ'd without a down weight, but God is contented if the ſcale be turn'd. They pretend, that heavenly things cannot be ſeen to any purpoſe, but by the mid-day light: But God will be ſatisfied, if we receive any degree of light which makes us leave the *works of darkneſſe and walk as children of the light*. They exact a certainty of Faith above that of ſence or ſcience, God deſires only that we believe the concluſion, as much as the premiſes deſerve, that the ſtrength of our Faith be equall or proportionable to the credibility of the motives to it. Now though I have, and ought to have an abſolute certainty of this Theſis, *All which God reveales for truth is true*, being a propoſition that may be demonſtrated, or rather ſo evident to any one that underſtands it that it needs it not; Yet of this Hypotheſis, *That all the Articles of our Faith were reveal'd by God*, we cannot ordinarily have any rationall and acquired certainty, more then morall, founded upon theſe conſiderations: Firſt that the goodneſſe of the precepts of Chriſtianity, and the greatneſſe of the promiſes of it, ſhewes it, of all other Religions, moſt likely to come from the fountaine of goodneſſe. And then that a conſtant, famous and very generall Tradition, ſo credible, that no wiſe man doubts of any other, which hath but the fortieth part of the credibility of this, ſuch and ſo credible a Tradition, tells us, that God himſelfe hath ſet his Hand and Seale to the truth of this Doctrine, by doing great, and glorious, and frequent miracles in confirmation of it. Now our faith is an aſſent to this concluſion, that *the Doctrine of Chriſtianity is true*, which being deduc'd from the former *Theſis*, which is Metaphyſically certain, and from the former *Hypotheſis*, whreof we can have but a Morall certainty, we cannot poſſibly by naturall meanes be more certain of it then of the weaker of the premiſes; as a River will not riſe higher then the fountaine from which it flowes. For the concluſion alwaies followes the worſer part, if there be any worſe: and muſt be Negative, Particular, Contingent, or but Morally certain, if any of the Propoſitions, from whence it is deriv'd be ſo. Neither can we be certain of it in the higheſt degree, unleſſe we be thus certain of all the principles whereon it is grounded. As a man cannot goe or ſtand ſtrongly, if either of his leggs be weak. Or as a building cannot be ſtable, if any one of the neceſſary pillars thereof be infirme and inſtable. Or as, If a meſſage be brought me, from a man of abſolute credit with me, but by a meſſenger that is not ſo, my confidence of the truth of the Relation, cannot but be rebated and leſſened, by my diffidence in the Relatour.

9 Yet al this I ſay not as if I doubted, that the ſpirit of God, being

ing implor'd by devout and humble prayer and ſyncere obedience, may, and will by degrees, advance his ſervants higher, and give them a certainty of adherence, beyond their certainty of evidence. But what God gives as a reward to believers, is one thing: and what he requires of all men, as their duty, is another: and what he will accept of out of grace and favour, is yet another. To thoſe that believe and live according to their faith, he gives by degrees the *ſpirit of obſignation & confirmation*, which makes them know (though how they know not) what they did but believe: And to be as fully and reſolutely aſſur'd of the Goſpell of Chriſt, as thoſe which heard it from Chriſt himſelfe with their eares, which ſaw it with their eyes, which looked upon it, and whoſe hands handled the word of life. He requires of all, that their Faith ſhould be (as I have ſaid) proportionable to the motives and Reaſons enforcing to it; he will accept of the weakeſt and loweſt degree of Faith, if it be living and effectuall unto true obedience. For he it is that *will not quench the ſmoaking flaxe, nor break the bruiſed reed.* He did not reject the prayer of that diſtreſſed man that cryed unto him, *Lord I believe, Lord help my unbelief.* He commands us to *receive them that are weak in faith*, and thereby declares that he receives them. And as nothing availes with him, but Faith, *which worketh by love:* So any faith, if it be but as a *grain of muſtard ſeed*, if it *work by love*, ſhall certainly avail with him, and be accepted of him. Some experience makes me fear, that the faith of conſidering and diſcourſing men, is like to be crack't with too much ſtraining: And that being poſſeſſed with this *falſe* Principle, That it is in vain to believe the Goſpell of Chriſt, with ſuch a kind or degree of aſſent, as they yeeld to other matters of Tradition: And finding that their faith of it, is to them undiſcernable, from the belief they give to the truth of other Stories; are in danger either not to believe at all, thinking not at all as good as to no purpoſe, or elſe, though indeed they doe believe it, yet to think they doe not, and to caſt themſelves into wretched agonies and perplexities, as fearing they have not that, without which it is impoſſible to pleaſe God and obtain eternall happineſſe. Conſideration of this advantage, which the Divell probably may make of this phancy, made me willing to inſiſt ſomewhat largely upon the Refutation of it.

10 I returne now thither from whence I have digreſſed, and aſſure you, concerning the grounds afore-laid, which were, that there is a *Rule of Faith, whereby controverſies may be decided, which are neceſſary to be decided*, and that *this rule is univerſally infallible*, That notwithſtanding any opinion I hold, touching Faith, or any thing elſe, I may, and doe believe them, as firmely as you pretend to doe. And therefore you may build on, in Gods name, for by Gods helpe, I ſhall alwaies imbrace, whatſoever ſtructure is naturally and rationally laid upon them, whatſoever concluſion may, to my underſtanding, be evidently deduced from them. You ſay, out of them, it undeniable followes, *That of two diſagreeing in matter of Faith, the one cannot be ſaved, but by repentance or ignorance.* I anſwere by diſtinction of thoſe

termes, *two diſſenting in a matter of Faith.* For it may bee either in a thing which is indeed a *matter of Faith*, in the ſtricteſt ſenſe, that is, ſomething, the Beliefe whereof God requires under paine of damnation: And ſo the concluſion is true, though the Conſequence of it from your former premiſſes either is none at all, or ſo obſcure, that I can hardly diſcerne it. Or it may be, as it often falls out, concerning a thing which being indeed *no matter of Faith, is yet overvalued* by the Parties at variance, and eſteemed to be ſo. And in this ſenſe it is neither conſequent nor true. The untruth of it I haue already declared in my examination of your Preface. The inconſequence of it is of it ſelfe evident; for who ever heard of a wilder Collection then this--

God hath provided meanes ſufficient to decide all Controverſies in Religion, neceſſary to be decided;
This meanes is univerſally infallible,
Therefore of two, that differ in any thing which they eſteeme a matter of Faith, one cannot be ſaved.

He that can finde any connection between theſe Propoſitions, I belieue will be able to finde good coherence between the deafe Plaintiffe's accuſation, in the Greek Epigram, and the deafe Defendants Anſwer, and the deafe Iudges ſentence: And to contriue them all into a formall Categoricall Syllogiſme.

11 Indeed if the matter in agitation were plainely decided, by this infallible meanes of deciding Controverſies, and the Parties in variance knew it to be ſo, and yet would ſtand out in their diſſention; this were in one of them, direct oppoſition to the Teſtimonie of God, and undoubtedly a damnable ſinne. But if you take the liberty to ſuppoſe what you pleaſe, you may very eaſily conclude what you liſt. For who is ſo fooliſh as to grant you theſe unreaſonable Poſtulates, that every emergent Controverſie of Faith is plainly decided by the means of deciſion which God hath appointed, and that of the Parties litigant, one is alwaies ſuch a *convicted Recuſant* as you pretend? Certainly, if you ſay ſo, having no better warrant then you haue, or can haue for it, this is more proper and formall uncharitableneſſe, then ever was charg'd upon you. Me thinks, with much more Reaſon, and much more Charity, you might ſuppoſe, that many of theſe Controverſies which are now diſputed among Chriſtians (all which profeſſe themſelues lovers of Chriſt, and truly deſirous to knowe his will and doe it) are either *not decidable* by that meanes which God hath provided, and ſo not neceſſary to be decided: Or if they be, yet *not ſo plainly and evidently*, as to oblige all men to hold one way: or Laſtly, if decidable, and evidently decided, yet you may hope that the erring part, by reaſon of ſome veile before his eyes, *ſome excuſable ignorance or unavoidable preiudice*, does not ſee the Queſtion to be decided againſt him, and ſo oppoſes not that which *He doth know* to be the word of God, but only that which *You know* to be ſo, and which *he might know*, were he void of prejudice. Which is a fault I confeſſe, but a fault which is incident even to good and honeſt men very often: and not of ſuch a gigantique diſpoſition as you make it, to fly directly upon God Almighty, and to giue him the lye to his face.

12. *Ad*

12 *Ad §. 9.10.11.12.13.14.15.16.* In all this long diſcourſe you only tell us what you will doe, but doe nothing. Many Poſitions there are, but proofes of them you offer none, but reſerue them to the Chapters following; and there in their proper places they ſhall be examined. The ſumme of all your Aſſumpts collected by your ſelfe, §. 16 is this. That *the infallible meanes of determining Controverſies, is the viſible Church.*

That *the diſtinction of points Fundamentall, and not Fundamentall, maketh nothing to the preſent Queſtion.*

That *to ſay the Creed containeth all Fundamentals, is neither pertinent nor true.*

That *whoſoever perſiſt in Diviſion from the Communion and Faith of the Roman Church are guilty of Schiſme and Hereſie.*

That *in regard of the Precept of Charity towards ones ſelfe, Proteſtants are in ſtate of ſinne, while they remaine divided from the Romane Church.*

To all theſe Aſſertions I will content my ſelfe for the preſent to oppoſe this one, That *not one of them all is true.* Only I may not omit to tell you, that if the firſt of them were as true as the Pope himſelfe deſires it ſhould be, yet the corollary which you deduce from it, would be utterly inconſequent, That *whoſoever denies any point propos'd by the Church, is iniurious to Gods Diuine Maieſtie, as if He could deceiue, or be deceiued.* For though your Church were indeed as *Infallible a Propounder of Diuine Truths* as it pretends to be, yet if it appear'd not to me to be ſo, I might very well belieue God moſt true, & your Church moſt falſe. As though the Goſpell of S. *Mathew* be the word of God, yet if I neither knew it to be ſo, nor believed it, I might belieue in God, and yet think that Goſpell a Fable. Hereafter therefore I muſt entreat you to remember, that our being guilty of this impiety, depends not only upon your being, but upon our knowing that you are ſo. Neither muſt you argue thus, *The Church of Rome is the Infallible Propounder of Diuine Verities, therefore he that oppoſes Her calls Gods Truth in Queſtion*: But thus rather; The *Church of Rome is ſo, and Proteſtants know it to be ſo, therefore in oppoſing her, they impute to God, that either he deceiues them, or is deceiued himſelfe.* For as I may deny ſomething which you upō your knowledge have affirm'd, & yet never diſparage your honeſty, if I never knew that you affirm'd it: So I may bee undoubtedly certaine of Gods Omniſcience, and Veracitie, & yet doubt of ſomething which he hath revealed, provided I doe not knowe, nor belieue that he hath revealed it. So, that though your Church be the appointed witneſſe of Gods Revelations yet untill you know, that we know ſhe is ſo, you cannot without foule calumnie impute to us, That *we charge God blaſphemouſly with deceiving, or being deceiued.* You will ſay perhaps, That this is directly conſequent from our Doctrine, That the *Church may erre*, which is directed by God in all her propoſalls. True, if we knew it to be directed by him, otherwiſe not; much leſſe if we belieue, and know the contrary. But then if it were conſequent from our opinion, haue you ſo little Charitie as to ſay, that men are

iuſtly

iuſtly chargeable with all the conſequences of their Opinions; Such Conſequences, I mean, as they doe not owne but diſclaim, and if there were a neceſſity of doing either, would much rather forſake their Opinion then imbrace theſe Conſequences? What opinion is there that draws after it ſuch a train of *portentous blaſphemies*, as that of the *Dominicans*, by the judgement of the beſt Writers of your own *Order*? And will you ſay now that the *Dominicans* are juſtly chargable with all theſe blaſphemies? If not, ſeeing our caſe (take it at the worſt) is but the ſame, why ſhould not your judgement of us be the ſame? I appeale to all thoſe Proteſtants that haue gone over to your ſide; whether when they were moſt averſe from it, they did ever deny or doubt of *Gods omniſcience or Veracitie*; whether they did ever belieue, or were taught, that *God did deceiue them or was deceiued himſelfe*. Nay, I provoke to you your ſelfe, & deſire you to deale truly, & to tell Us whether you doe in your heart belieue, that we doe indeed not belieue the eternall Veracitie of the eternall Verity? And if you judge ſo ſtrangely of us, having no better ground for it, then you haue or can haue, wee ſhall not need any farther proofe of your uncharitablenes towards us, this being the extremity of true uncharitableneſſe. If not, then I hope having no other ground but this (which ſure is none at all) to pronounce us *damnable Heretiques*, you will ceaſe to doe ſo; and hereafter (as, if your ground be true, you may doe with more truth and Charity) collect thus, *They only erre damnably, who oppoſe what they know God hath teſtified*, But *Proteſtants ſure doe not oppoſe what they knowe God hath teſtified, at leaſt we cannot with Charity ſay they doe, Therefore they either doe not erre damnably, or with charity we cannot ſay they doe ſo.*

13 *Ad* § 17. *Proteſtants* (you ſay) *according to their own grounds muſt hold, that of Perſons contrary in whatſoever point of beleife one part only can be ſaved, therefore it is ſtrangely done of them to charge Papiſts with want of Charity for holding the ſame.* The conſequence I acknowledge, but wonder much what it ſhould be that laies upon Proteſtants any neceſſity to doe ſo! You tell us it is their holding *Scripture the ſole Rule of Faith*: for this, you ſay, obligeth them to pronounce them damn'd, that oppoſe any leaſt point *delivered in Scripture*. This I grant, If they oppoſe it after ſufficient declaration, ſo that either they *know it to be contain'd in Scripture*, or haue no juſt probable Reaſon, and which may moue an honeſt man to doubt whether or no it be there contained. For to oppoſe in the firſt caſe in a man that beliues the Scripture to be the word of God, is to giue God the lye. To oppoſe in the ſecond, is to be obſtinate againſt Reaſon, and therefore a ſinne though not ſo great as the former. But then this is nothing to the purpoſe of the neceſſity of damning all thoſe that are of contrary beliefe; and that for theſe Reaſons. Firſt, becauſe the contrary beliefe may be touching a point not at all mentioned in Scripture; and ſuch points, though indeed they be not *matters of Faith*, yet by men in variance are often over-valued and eſteem'd to be ſo. So that, though it were damnable to oppoſe any point contain'd in Scripture; yet Perſons of a contrary beliefe (as *Victor* and *Polycrates*, S. *Cyprian*, and

Stephen

Stephen) might both be ſaved, becauſe their contrary beliefe was not touching any point contained in Scripture. Secondly, becauſe the contrary beliefe may be about the ſenſe of ſome place of Scripture which is ambiguous, and with probabilitie capable of diverſe ſenſes; and in ſuch caſes it is no marvell, and ſure no ſinne, if ſeverall men goe ſeverall waies. Thirdly becauſe the contrary beliefe may bee concerning points wherein Scripture may with ſo great probabilitie bee alleaged on both ſides, (which is a ſure note of a point *not neceſſary*) that men of honeſt and upright hearts, true lovers of God and of truth, ſuch as deſire, above all things, to know Gods will and to doe it, may, without any fault at all, ſome goe one way, and ſome another, & ſome (& thoſe as good men as either of the former) ſuſpend their judgements, and expect ſome *Elias to ſolue doubts*, and reconcile repugnancies. Now in all ſuch Queſtions one ſide or other (which ſoever it is) holds that which indeed is oppoſite to the ſenſe of the Scripture, which God intended; for it is impoſſible that God ſhould intend Contradictions. But then this intended ſenſe is not ſo fully declared, but that they which oppoſe it may verily belieue that they indeed maintaine it, and haue great ſhew of reaſon to induce them to belieue ſo; and therefore are not to be damn'd, as men oppoſing that which they either knowe to be a truth delivered in Scripture, or haue no probable Reaſon to belieue the contrary; but rather in Charity to be acquitted and abſolv'd, as men who endeavour to finde the Truth, but fayle of it through humane frailty.

This ground being laid, the Anſwer to your enſuing Interrogatories, which you conceiue impoſſible, is very obvious & eaſie.

14 *To the firſt. Whether it be not in any man a grievous ſinne to deny any one Truth contain'd in holy Writ?* I anſwer, Yes, if he knewe it to be ſo, or haue no probable Reaſon to doubt of it: otherwiſe not.

15 *To the ſecond. Whether there be in ſuch deniall any diſtinction between Fundamẽtall & not Fundamẽtall ſufficient to excuſe from Hereſie?* I anſwer, Yes, There is ſuch a Diſtinction. But the Reaſon is, becauſe theſe points, either in themſelues, or by accident, are *Fundamentall*, which are *evidently contain'd in Scripture, to him that knowes them to be ſo*: Thoſe not Fundamentall which are there-hence deducible but probably only, not evidently.

16 *To the third. Whether it be not impertinent to alleage the Creed as containing all Fundamentall points of Faith, as if believing it alone wee were at Libertie to deny all other Points of Scripture?* I anſwer, It was never alleag'd to any ſuch purpoſe; but only as a ſufficient, or rather more then a ſufficient Summarie of thoſe points of Faith, which were of neceſſity to be believed actually and explicitely; and that onely of ſuch which were meerely and purely *Credenda*, and not *Agenda*.

17 *To the fourth*, drawn as a Corollary from the former, *Whether this be not to ſay, that of Perſons contrary in beliefe, one part only can bee ſaved?* I anſwer, By no meanes. For they may differ about points *not contain'd in Scripture*: They may differ about the *ſenſe of ſome ambiguous Texts* of Scripture: They may differ about ſome Doctrines, for

and againſt which Scriptures may be alleadged with *ſo great probability*, as may juſtly excuſe either Part from Hæreſie, and a ſelfe condemning obſtinacy. And therefore, though *D. Potter* doe not take it ill, that you believe your ſelves may be ſav'd in your Religion; yet notwithſtanding all that hath yet been pretended to the contrary, hee may juſtly condemne you, and that out of your own principles, of *uncharitable preſumption*, for affirming as you doe, that *no man can be ſaved out of it.*

CHAP. II.

What is that meanes, whereby the revealed truths of God are conveyed to our Vnderſtanding, and which muſt determine Controverſies in Faith and Religion.

IF our eſtimation, reſpect, and reverence to holy Scripture even Proteſtants themſelves doe in fact give teſtimony, while they poſſeſſe it from us, and take it upon the integrity of our cuſtody. No cauſe imaginable could avert our will from giving the function of ſupreme and ſole Iudge to holy writ, if both the thing were not impoſſible in it ſelfe, and if both reaſon and experience did not convince our underſtanding, that by this aſſertion Contentions are increaſed, and not ended. We acknowledge holy Scripture to be a moſt perfect rule, for as much as a writing can be a Rule: We only deny that it excludes either divine Tradition, though it be unwritten, or an externall Iudge to keep, to propoſe, to interpret in a true, Orthodoxe, and Catholique ſenſe. Every ſingle book, every Chapter, yea every period of holy Scripture is infallibly true, and wants no due perfection. But muſt we therefore inferre, that all other Books of Scripture, are to be excluded, leaſt by addition of them, we may ſeem to derogate from the perfection of the former? When the firſt Bookes of the old and new Teſtament were written, they did not exclude unwritten Traditions, nor the Authority of the Church to decide Controverſies; and who hath then ſo altered their nature, and filled them with ſuch jealouſies, as that now they cannot agree for fear of mutuall diſparagement? What greater wrong is it for the written Word, to be compartner now with the unwritten, then for the unwritten, which was once alone, to be afterward joyned with the written? Who ever heard, that to commend the fidelity of a Keeper, were to diſauthorize the thing committed to his cuſtody? Or that, to extoll the integrity and knowledge, and to avouch the neceſſity of a Iudge in ſuits of Law, were to deny perfection in the Law? Are there not in Common wealths beſides the Lawes written & unwritten, cuſtomes, Iudges appointed to declare both the one, & the other, as ſeverall occaſions may require?

2 That the Scripture alone cannot be Iudge in Controverſies of faith, we gather very cleerly, From the quality of a writing in generall: From the nature of holy Writ in particular, which muſt be believed as true, and infallible: From the Editions, and tranſlations of it: From the difficulty to underſtand it without hazard of Errour: From the inconveniences that muſt follow upon the aſcribing of ſole Iudicature to it: and finally from the Confeſſions of our Adverſaries. And on the other ſide, all theſe difficulties ceaſing, and all other qualities requiſite to a Iudge concurring in the viſible Church of Chriſt our Lord, we muſt conclude, that ſhe it is, to whom in doubts concerning Faith and Religion, all Chriſtians ought to have recourſe.

3 The name, notion, nature, and properties of a Iudge cannot in common reaſon agree to any meere writing, which, be it otherwiſe in its kind, never ſo highly qualified with ſanctity and infallibility; yet it muſt ever be, as all writings are, deaf, dumb, and inanimate. By a Iudge, all wiſe men underſtand a Perſon endued with life, and reaſon, able to hear, to examine, to declare his mind to the diſagreeing parties, in ſuch ſort as that each one may know whether the ſentence be in favour of his cauſe, or againſt his pretence, and he muſt be appliable, and able to doe all this, as the diverſity of Controverſies, perſons, occaſions, and circumſtances may require. There is a great and plain diſtinction betwixt a *Iudge* and a *Rule*. For as in a Kingdome, the Iudge hath his rule to follow which are the received Lawes and Cuſtomes; ſo are not they fit or able to declare, or be Iudges to themſelves, but that office muſt belong to a living Iudge. The holy Scripture may be, and is a Rule, but cannot be a Iudge, becauſe it being alwaies the ſame, cannot declare it ſelfe any one time, or upon any one occaſion more particularly then upon any other; and let it be read over an hundred times, it will be ſtill the ſame, and no more fit alone to terminate

contro-

controverſies in faith, then the Law would be to end ſuits, if it were given over to the phancy, and gloſſe of every ſingle man.

4 This difference betwixt a Iudge and a Rule, *D. Potter* perceived, when more then once, having ſtiled the Scripture a *Iudge*, by way of correcting that terme, he addes, *or rather a Rule*, becauſe he knew that an inanimate writing could not be a *Iudge*. From hence alſo it was, that though Proteſtants in their begining affirmed Scripture alone to be the Iudge of Controverſies; yet upon a more adviſed reflection, they changed the phraſe, and ſaid, that not Scripture, but the Holy Ghoſt ſpeaking in Scripture, is Iudge in Controverſies. A difference without a diſparity. The holy Ghoſt ſpeaking only in Scripture is no more intelligible to us, then the Scripture in which he ſpeaks: as a man ſpeaking only Latin, can be no better underſtood, then the tongue wherein he ſpeaketh. And therefore to ſay, a Iudge is neceſſary for deciding controverſies, about the meaning of Scripture is as much as to ſay, he is neceſſary to decide what the Holy Ghoſt ſpeakes in Scripture. And it were a conceyt, equally fooliſh and pernitious, if one ſhould ſeek to take away all Iudges in the Kingdome, upon this nicety, that albeit Lawes cannot be Iudges, yet the Law-maker ſpeaking in the Law, may performe that Office; as if the Law-maker ſpeaking in the Law, were with more perſpicuity underſtood, then the Law whereby he ſpeaketh.

5 But though ſome writing were granted to have a priviledge, to declare it ſelfe upon ſuppoſition that it were maintained in being, and preſerved entire from corruptions; yet it is manifeſt, that no writing can conſerve it ſelfe, nor can complaine, or denounce the falſifier of it; and therefore it ſtands in need of ſome watchfull and not erring eye, to guard it, by meanes of whoſe aſſured vigilancy, we may undoubtedly receive it ſyncere and pure.

6 And ſuppoſe it could defend it ſelfe from corruption, how could it aſſure us that it ſelfe were Canonicall, and of infallible verity? By ſaying ſo? Of this very *affirmation*, there will remain the ſame Queſtion ſtill; how it can prove it ſelfe to be infallibly true? Neither can there ever be an end of the like multiplied demands, till we reſt in the externall Authority of ſome perſon or perſons bearing witnes to the world, that ſuch, or ſuch a book is Scripture: and yet upon this point according to Proteſtants all other Controverſies in faith depend.

7 That Scripture cannot aſſure us, that it ſelfe is Canonicall Scripture, is acknowledged by ſome Proteſtants in expreſſe words, and by all of them in deeds. *M. Hooker*, whom D. *Potter* ranketh (*a*) among men of great *learning and Iudgement*, ſaith: *of things* (b) *neceſſary, the very chiefeſt is to know what books we are to eſteem holy; which point is confeſſed impoſſible for the Scripture it ſelfe to teach.* And this he proveth by the ſame argument, which we lately uſed, ſaying thus: *It is not* (c) *the word of God which doth, or poſſibly can, aſſure us, that we doe well to think it his word. For if any one book of Scripture did give teſtimony of all, yet ſtill that Scripture which giveth teſtimony to the reſt, would require another Scripture to give credit unto it. Neither could we come to any pauſe whereon to reſt, unleſſe beſides Scripture, there were ſomething which might aſſure us &c.* And this he acknowledgeth to be the (d) Church. By the way. If, *Of things neceſſary the very chiefeſt cannot poſſibly be taught by Scripture*, as this *man of ſo great learning and judgement affirmeth*, and demonſtratively proveth; how can the Proteſtant Clergy of England ſubſcribe to their ſixt Article? Wherein it is ſaid of the Scripture: *Whatſoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it ſhould be believed as an Article of the faith, or be thought requiſite or neceſſary to ſalvation*: and concerning their belief and profeſſion of this Article, they are particularly examined when they be ordained Prieſts and Biſhops. With *Hooker*, his defendant *Covell* doth punctually agree. *Whitaker* likewiſe confeſſeth, that the queſtion about Canonicall Scriptures, is defined to us, not by *teſtimony of the private ſpirit*, which (ſaith he) *being private and ſecret, is* (e) *unfit to teach and reſell others*; but (as he acknowledgeth) *by the* (f) *Eccleſiaſticall Tradition: An argument* (ſaith he) *whereby may be argued, and convinced, what books be Canonicall, and what be not. Luther* ſaith: *This* (g) *indeed the Church hath, that ſhe can diſcerne the word of God, from the word of men: as Auguſtine confeſſeth, that he believed the Goſpell, being moved by the authority of the Church, which did preach this to be the Goſpell. Fulk* teacheth, that *the Church* (h) *hath judgement to diſcerne true writings from counterfeit, and the word of God from the writing of men, and that this iudgement ſhe hath not of her ſelfe, but of the Holy Ghoſt.* And to the end that you may not be ignorant, from what Church you muſt receive Scriptures, hear your firſt Patriarch *Luther*, ſpeaking againſt them, who (as he ſaith) brought in *Anabaptiſme*, that ſo they might deſpight the Pope. *Verily* (ſaith he) *theſe* (i) *men build upon a weak foundation. For by this means they ought to deny the whole Scripture, and the Office of Preaching. For, all theſe we have from the Pope: otherwiſe we muſt go make a new Scripture.*

8 But now in deeds, they all make good, that without the Churches authority, no certainty can be had what Scripture is Canonicall, while they cannot agree in aſſigning the Canon of holy Scripture. Of the Epiſtle of *S. Iames*, *Luther* hath theſe words: *The* (k) *Epiſtle of Iames is contentious, ſwelling, dry, ſtrawy, and unworthy of an Apoſtolicall ſpirit.* Which cenſure of *Luther*, *Illyricus* acknowledgeth and maintaineth. *Kemnitius* teacheth, *that the ſecond Epiſtle* (l) *of Peter, the ſecond and third of Iohn, the Epiſtle to the Hebrewes, the Epiſtle of Iames, the Epiſtle of Iude, and the Apocalyps of John are Apocryphall, as not having ſufficient Teſtimony* (m) *of their authority*, and therefore that *nothing in controverſy can be proved out of theſe* (n) *Bookes.* The ſame is taught by divers other Lutherans: and if ſome other amongſt them, be of a contrary opini-

a *Pag.* 131.
b *In his firſt book of Eccleſ. Policy ſect.* 14. *p.* 68.
c *Ibid. lib.* 2. *Sect.* 4. *p.* 102.
d *l.* 3. *Sect.* 8. *pag.* 1, 146. *et alibi.*
e *Adverſ. Stapl. l.* 2. *c.* 6. *pag.* 270. *&* *pag.* 357.
f *Adverſus Stapl. l.* 2. *c.* 4. *pag.* 300.
g *lib. de cap. Babyl. tom.* 2. *Wittemb. f.* 88
h *In his anſwer to a counterfeit Catholique pag.* 5.
i *Epiſt. cont. Anabap. ad duos Parochos tom.* 2. *Germ. Wittemb.*
k *Præfat. in epiſt. Iac. in edit. Ienenſi.*
l *In Euchirid. pag.* 63.
m *In examin. Conc. Trid. part.* 1. *pag.* 55.
n *Ibid.*

on ſince *Luther's* time, I wonder what new infallible ground they can alleage, why they leaue their Maſter, and ſo many of his prime Schollers? I know no better ground, then becauſe they may with as much freedome abandon him, as hee was bold to alter that Canon of Scripture, which he found receaved in Gods Church.

9 What Bookes of Scripture the Proteſtants of England hold for Canonicall, is not eaſie to affirme. In their *ſixt Article* they ſay *In the name of the holy Scripture, wee doe underſtand thoſe Canonicall Books of the Old and New Teſtament, of whoſe authority was never any doubt in the Church.* What meane they by theſe words? That by the Churches conſent they are aſſured what Scriptures be Canonicall? This were to make the Church Iudge, and not Scriptures alone. Doe they only underſtand the agreement of the Church to be a probable inducement? Probability is no ſufficient ground for an infallible aſſent of faith. By this rule (*of whoſe authority was NEVER any doubt in the Church*) the whole booke of *Eſther* muſt quit the Canon, becauſe ſome in the Church haue excluded it from the Canon, as (o) *Melito Aſianus*, (p) *Athanaſius*, and (q) *Gregory Nazianzen.* And *Luther* (if Proteſtants will be content that he be *in the Church*) ſaith: *The Iewes* (r) *place the booke of Eſther in the Canon, which yet, if I might be Iudge, doth rather deſerve to bee put out of the Canon.* And of *Eccleſiaſtes* he ſaith: *This* (s) *booke is not full; there are in it many abrupt things: he wants boots and ſpurres, that is, he hath no perfect ſentence, hee rides upon a long reed like me when I was in the Monaſtery.* And much more is to be read in him: who (t) ſaith further, that the ſaid book was not written by *Salomon*, but by *Syrach* in the time of the *Machabees*, and that it is like to *the Talmud* (the Iewes bible) *out of many bookes heaped into one worke, perhaps out of the Library of king Ptolomeus.* And further he ſaith, that (u) he doth not belieue all to haue been done as there is ſet downe. And he teacheth the (w) booke of *Iob* to be *as it were an argument for a fable* (or Comedy) *to ſet before us an example of Patience.* And he (x) delivers this generall cenſure of the Prophets Books: *The Sermons of no Prophet, were written whole, and perfect, but their Diſciples, and Auditors ſnatched, now one ſentence, and then another, and ſo put them all into one book, and by this meanes the Bible was conſerved.* If this were ſo, the Books of the Prophets, being not written by themſelues, but promiſcuouſly, and caſually, by their Diſciples, will ſoone be called in queſtion. Are not theſe errours of *Luther*, fundamentall? and yet if Proteſtants deny the infallibility of the Church, upon what certaine ground can they diſproue theſe *Lutherian*, and *Luciferian* blaſphemies? ô godly Reformer of the Roman Church! But to returne to our Engliſh Canon of Scripture. In the New Teſtament by the aboue mentioned rule (*of whoſe authority was never any doubt in the Church*) divers Books of the New Teſtament muſt be diſcanonized, to wit, all thoſe of which ſome Ancients haue doubted, and thoſe which divers *Lutherans* haue of late denied. It is worth the obſervation how the before-mentioned *ſixt Article*, doth ſpecify by name all the Books of the *Old Teſtament* which they hold for Canonicall; but thoſe of the *New Teſtament, as they are commonly receaved, we doe receiue, and account them Canonicall.* The myſtery is eaſily to be unfolded. If they had deſcended to particulars, they muſt haue contradicted ſome of their chiefeſt Brethren. *As they are commonly recieued*, &c. I aske: By whom? By the Church of *Rome*: Then, by the ſame reaſon they muſt receiue divers Books of the Old Teſtament, which they reject. By *Lutherans*? Then with *Lutherans* they may deny ſome Books of the New Teſtament. If it bee the greater, or leſſe number of voices, that muſt cry up, or downe, the Canon of Scripture, our *Roman* Canon will prevaile: and among Proteſtants the *Certainty* of their *Faith* muſt be reduced to an *Vncertaine* Controverſie of *Fact*, whether the number of thoſe who reject, or of thoſe others who recieue ſuch and ſuch Scriptures, bee greater. Their Faith muſt alter according to yeares, and daies. When *Luther* firſt appeared, he, and his Diſciples were the greater number of that new Church; and ſo this claime (*Of being commonly received*) ſtood for them, till *Zuinglius* and *Calvin* grew to ſome equall, or greater number then that of the *Lutherans*, and then this rule of (*Commonly received*) will canonize their Canon againſt the *Lutherans*. I would gladly know, why in the former part of their Article, they ſay both of the *Old* and *New Teſtament*: *In the name of the holy Scripture, we doe underſtand thoſe Canonicall Books of the Old and New Teſtament, of whoſe authority was never any doubt in the Church.* and in the latter part, ſpeaking againe of the *New Teſtament*, they giue a farre different rule, ſaying: *All the Books of the New Teſtament, as they are commonly receiued, we doe receiue, and account them Canonicall.* This I ſay is a rule much different from the former (*Of whoſe authority was NEVER any doubt in the Church.*) For ſome Books might be ſaid to be *Commonly received*, although they were *ſometime* doubted of *by ſome.* If to be *Commonly received*, paſſe for a good rule to know the Canon of the *New Teſtament*; why not of the *Old*? Aboue all we deſire to know, upon what infallible ground in ſome Bookes they agree with us againſt *Luther*, and divers principall *Lutherans*, and in others jump with *Luther* againſt us? But ſeeing they diſagree among themſelues, it is evident that they haue no certaine rule to know the Canon of Scripture, in aſſigning whereof ſome of them muſt of neceſſity erre, becauſe of contradictory propoſitions both cannot be true.

10 Moreover the letters, ſyllables, words, phraſe, or matter contained in holy Scripture haue

o *Apud Euſeb. l. 4. hiſt. c. 26.*
p *In Synop.*
q *In carm. de genuinis Scripturis.*
r *lib. de ſervo arbitrio. cont. Eraſ. tom. 2. Witt. fol. 471.*
s *In latinis ſermonibus convivialibus Francof. in 8. impr. Anno 1571.*
t *In Germanicis colloq. Lutheri ab Aurifabro editis Francofurt. tit. de libris vetteris & novi Teſt. fol. 379.*
u *Ib. tit. de Patriarchis & Prophet. fol. 282.*
w *Tit. de lib. Vet. & Nov. Teſt.*
x *Fol. 380.*

haue no neceſſary, or naturall connection with divine *Revelation* or *Inſpiration*: and therefore by ſeeing, reading, or underſtanding them, we cannot inferre that they proceed from God, or be confirmed by divine authoritie, as becauſe *Creatures* involve a neceſſary relation, connection, and dependance on their *Creator*, Philoſophers may by the light of naturall reaſon, demonſtrate the exiſtence of one prime cauſe of all things. In Holy Writ there are innumerable truths not ſurpaſſing the ſpheare of humane wit, which are, or may be delivered by Pagan Writers, in the ſelfe ſame words and phraſe as they are in Scripture. And as for ſome truths peculiar to Chriſtians, (for Example, the myſtery of the bleſſed Trinitie &c.) The only ſetting them down in *Writing* is not enough to be aſſured that ſuch a *Writing* is the undoubted word of God: otherwiſe ſome ſayings of *Plato*, *Triſmegiſtus*, *Sybils*, *Ovid*, *&c.* muſt be eſteemed Canonicall Scripture, becauſe they fall upon ſome truths proper to Chriſtian Religion. The internall *light*, and *inſpiration* which directed and moved the Authors of Canonicall Scriptures, is a hidden *Qualitie* infuſed into their underſtanding and will, and hath no ſuch particular ſenſible influence into the externall *Writing*, that *in it* we can diſcover, or *from it* demonſtrate any ſuch ſecret *light* and *inſpiration*; and therefore to be aſſured that ſuch a *Writing* is divine we cannot know from it ſelfe alone, but by ſome other extrinſecall authority.

11 And here we appeale to any man of judgement, whether it be not a vaine brag of ſome Proteſtants to tell us, that they wot full well what is Scripture, by the light of Scripture it ſelfe, or (as *D. Potter* words it) *by* (y) *that glorious beame of divine light which ſhines therein*; even as our eye diſtinguiſheth light from darkneſſe, without any other help then light it ſelfe; and as our eare knowes a voice, by the voice it ſelfe alone. But this vanity is refuted, by what we ſaid even now; that the externall Scripture hath no apparent or neceſſary connection with divine *inſpiration*, or *revelation*. Will *D. Potter* hold all his Bretheren for blinde men, for not ſeeing *that glorious beam of divine light which ſhines in Scripture*, about which they cannot agree? Corporall light may be diſcerned by it ſelfe alone, as being evident, proportionate, and connaturall to our faculty of ſeeing. That Scripture is Divine, and inſpired by God, is a truth exceeding the naturall capacity and compaſſe of mans underſtanding, to us obſcure, and to be believed by divine faith, which according to the *Apoſtle* is; *argumentum* (z) *non apparentium*; *an argument*, or conviction, *of things not evident*: and therefore no wonder if Scripture doe not manifeſt it ſelfe by it ſelfe alone, but muſt require ſome other meanes for applying it to our underſtanding. Nevertheleſſe their own ſimilitudes and inſtances, make againſt themſelues. For ſuppoſe a man had never read, or heard of Sunne, Moone, Fire, Candle, &c. and ſhould bee brought to behold a light, yet in ſuch ſort as that the Agent, or Cauſe efficient from which it proceeded, were kept hidden from him; could ſuch a one, by only beholding the light, certainly know, whether it were produced by the Sunne, or Moone &c.? Or if one heare a voice, and had never known the ſpeaker, could he know from whom in partieular that voice proceeded? They who look upon Scripture, may well ſee, that ſome one wrote it, but that it was written by divine inſpiration, how ſhall they know? Nay, they cannot ſo much as know who wrote it, unleſſe they firſt know the writer, and what hand he writes: as likewiſe I cannot know whoſe voice it is which I heare, unleſſe I firſt both know the perſon who ſpeakes, and with what voice he uſeth to ſpeak; and yet even all this ſuppoſed, I may perhaps be deceaved. For there may be voices ſo like, and Hand ſo counterfeited, that men may be deceaved by them, as birds were by the grapes of that skilfull Painter. Now ſince Proteſtants affirme knowledge concerning God as our *ſupernaturall* end, muſt be taken from Scripture, they cannot in Scripture alone diſcerne that it is his voice, or writing, becauſe they cannot know from whom a writing, or voice proceeds, unleſſe firſt they know the perſon who ſpeaketh, or writeth. Nay I ſay more: By Scripture alone, they cannot ſo much as know, that any perſon doth in it, or by it, ſpeak any thing at all: becauſe one may write without intent to ſignifie, or affirme any thing, but onely to ſet downe, or as it were paint, ſuch characters, ſyllables, and words, as men are wont to ſet copies, not caring what the ſignification of the words imports: or as one tranſcribes a writing which himſelfe underſtands not; or when one writes what another dictates, and in other ſuch caſes, wherein it is cleare, that the writer ſpeakes, or ſignifies nothing in ſuch his writing; and therefore by *it* we cannot heare, or underſtand *his* voice. With what certainty then can any man affirme, that by Scripture it ſelfe they can ſee, that the writers did intend to ſignifie any thing at all; that they were Apoſtles, or other Canonicall Authors; that they wrote their own ſenſe, and not what was dictated by ſome other man; and finally, and eſpecially, that they wrote by the infallible direction of the Holy Ghoſt?

y *Pag.* 141.

z *Heb.* 11. 1.

12 But let us be liberall, and for the preſent ſuppoſe (not grant) that Scripture is, like to corporall light, by it ſelfe alone able to determine, and moue our underſtanding to aſſent; yet the ſimilitude proues againſt themſelues. For light is not viſible, except to ſuch as haue eyes, which are not made by the light, but muſt be preſuppoſed as produced by ſome other cauſe. And therefore, to hold the ſimilitude, Scripture can be cleare onely to thoſe who are endued with the eye of faith; or, as *D. Potter* aboue cited ſaith, to all that *haue* (a) *eyes to diſcerne the ſhining beames thereof*; that is, to the *believer*, as immediatly

a *Pag.* 141.

diatly after he ſpeaketh. Faith then muſt not originally proceed from Scripture, but is to be preſuppoſed, before we can ſee the light thereof; and conſequently there muſt be ſome other meanes precedent to Scripture to beget Faith, which can be no other then the Church.

13 Others affirme, that they know Canonicall Scriptures to be ſuch, by the *Title* of the Bookes. But how ſhall we know ſuch *Inſcriptions*, or *Titles* to be infallibly true? From this their Anſwere our argument is ſtrengthened, becauſe divers Apocryphall writings have appeared, under the *Titles*, and Names of ſacred Authors, as the Goſpell of *Thomas* mentioned by (b) S. *Auguſtine*: the Goſpell of *Peter*, which the *Nazarei* did uſe, as (c) *Theodoret* witneſſeth, with which *Seraphion* a Catholique Biſhop, was for ſome time deceived, as may be read in (d) *Euſebius* who alſo ſpeaketh of the *Apocalyps* of (e) *Peter*. The like may be ſaid of the Goſpells of *Barnabas*, *Bartholomew*, and other ſuch writings ſpecified by Pope (f) *Gelaſius*. Proteſtants reject likewiſe ſome part of *Eſther* and *Daniel*, which bear the ſame *Titles* with the reſt of thoſe Bookes, as alſo both we, and they hold for Apochryphall, the third and fourth Bookes which goe under the name of *Eſdras*, and yet both of us receive his firſt and ſecond book. Wherefore Titles are not ſufficient aſſurances what bookes be Canonicall: which (h) *D. Covell* acknowledgeth in theſe words: *It is not the word of God, which doth, or poſſibly can, aſſure us, that we doe well to think it is the word of God: the firſt outward motion leading men ſo to eſteem of the Scripture, is the Authority of Gods Church, which teacheth us to receive Marks Goſpell, who was not an Apoſtle, and to refuſe the Goſpell of Thomas who was an Apoſtle: and to retain Lukes Goſpell who ſaw not Chriſt, and to reiect the Goſpell of Nicodemus who ſaw him.*

b *Cont. Adimant. c. 17.*
c *l. 2. hæretic. fab.*
d *lib. 6. cap. 10.*
e *lib. 6. cap. 11.*
f *Diſt. Can. Sancta Romana:*
h *In his defence art. 4. Pag. 31.*

14 Another Anſwer, or rather Objection they are wont to bring: That the Scripture being a *principle needs no proof among Chriſtians*. So (i) D. *Potter*. But this is either a plain begging of the queſtion, or manifeſtly untrue, and is directly againſt their own doctrine, and practiſe. If they mean, that Scripture is one of thoſe principles, which being the firſt, and the moſt known in all Sciences, cannot be demonſtrated by other Principles, they ſuppoſe that which is in queſtion, whether there be not ſome principle (for example, the Church) whereby we may come to the knowledge of Scripture. If they intend, that Scripture is a Principle, but not the firſt, and moſt known in Chriſtianity, then Scripture may be proved. For principles, that are not the firſt, nor known of themſelves, may, and ought to be proved, before we can yeild aſſent, either to them, or to other verities depending on them. It is repugnant to their own doctrine, and practiſe, in as much as they are wont to affirme, that one part of Scripture may be known to be Canonicall, and may be interpreted by another. And ſince every Scripture is a principle ſufficient, upon which to ground divine faith, they muſt grant, that one Principle may, and ſometime muſt be proved by another. Yea this their Anſwer, upon due ponderation, falls out to prove, what we affirme. For ſince all Principles cannot be proved, we muſt (that our labour may not be endleſſe) come at length to reſt in ſome principle; which may not require any other proof. Such is *Tradition*, which involves an evidence of fact, and from hand to hand, and age to age, bringing us up to the *times*, and *Perſons* of the Apoſtles, and our Saviour himſelfe cometh to be confirmed by all thoſe miracles, and other arguments, whereby they convinced their doctrine to be true. Wherefore the ancient Fathers avouch that we muſt receive the ſacred Canon upon the credit of Gods Church. (k) S. *Athanaſius* ſaith, that only four Goſpels are to be received, becauſe the *Canons of the Holy, and Catholique Church have ſo determined*. The third Councell of (l) *Carthage* having ſet down the Bookes of holy Scripture, gives the reaſon, becauſe, *We have received from our Fathers that theſe are to be read in the Church*. S. *Auguſtine* (m) ſpeaking of the *Acts* of the *Apoſtles*, ſaith: *To which book I muſt give credit, if I give credit to the Goſpell, becauſe the Catholique Church doth alike recommend to me both theſe Bookes*. And in the ſame place he hath alſo theſe words: *I would not believe the Goſpell, unles the authority of the Catholique Church did move me*. A ſaying ſo plain, that *Zuinglius*, is forced to cry out: *Heere I* (n) *implore your equity to ſpeak freely, whether this ſaying of Auguſtine ſeem not overbold, or elſe unadviſedly to have fallen from him.*

i *Pag. 234.*
k *In Synopſi.*
l *Can. 47.*
m *Cont. ep. Fundam. c. 5.*
n *Tom. 1. fol. 135.*

15 But ſuppoſe they were aſſured what Books were Canonicall, this will little avail them, unles they be likewiſe certain in what language they remain uncorrupted, or what *Tranſlations* be true. *Calvin* (o) acknowledgeth corruption in the Hebrew Text; which if it be taken without points, is ſo ambiguous, that ſcarcely any one Chapter, yea period, can be ſecurely underſtood without the help of ſome Tranſlation. If with points: Theſe were after S. *Hieroms* time, invented by the perfidious Iewes, who either by ignorance might miſtake, or upon malice force the Text, to favour their impieties. And that the Hebrew Text ſtill retaines much ambiguity, is apparent by the diſagreeing *Tranſlation* of *Noveliſts*; which alſo proves the Greek, for the New Teſtament, not to be void of doubtfulnes, as *Calvin* (p) confeſſeth it to be corrupted. And although both the Hebrew and Greeke were pure, what doth this help, if only Scripture be the rule of faith, and ſo very few be able to examine the Text in theſe languages. All then muſt be reduced to the certainty of *Tranſlations* into other tongues, wherein no private man having any promiſe, or aſſurance of infallibility, Proteſtants who rely upon Scripture alone, will find no certain ground for their faith: as accordingly *Whitaker* (q) affirmeth: *Thoſe who underſtand not the Hebrew and Greek doe erre often, and unavoidably.*

o *Inſtit. c. 6. §. 11.*
p *Inſtit. c. 7. §. 12.*
q *lib. de ſancta Scriptura p. 52.*

16 Now concerning the Tranſlations of Proteſtants, it will be ſufficient to ſet down what the laborious, exact, and judicious Author of the *Proteſtants Apology &c.* dedicated to our late King *Iames* of famous memory, hath to this (r) purpoſe. To omit (ſaith he) particulars, whoſe recitall would be infinite, and to touch this point but generally only, the Tranſlation of the New Teſtament by *Luther* is condemned by *Andreas*, *Oſiander Keckermannus*, and *Zuinglius*, who ſaith hereof to *Luther*. *Thou doſt corrupt the word of God, thou art ſeen to be a manifeſt and common corrupter of the holy Scriptures: how much are we aſhamed of thee who have hitherto eſteemed thee beyond all meaſure, and now prove thee to be ſuch a man?* And in like manner doth *Luther* reject the Tranſlation of the *Zuinglians*, terming them in matter of Divinity, fooles, Aſſes, Antichriſts, deceavers, and of Aſſe-like underſtanding. In ſo much that when *Froſchoverus* the Zwinglian Printer of *Zurich* ſent him a Bible tranſlated by the Divines there, *Luther* would not receive the ſame, but ſending it back reiected it, as the Proteſtant Writers *Hoſpinianus*, and *Lavatherus* witneſſe. The tranſlation ſet forth by *Oecolampadius*, and the Divines of *Baſil*, is reproved by *Beza*, who affirmeth that the *Baſil Tranſlation is in many places wicked, and altogether differing from the mind of the Holy Ghoſt.* The tranſlation of *Caſtalio* is condemned by *Beza*, as being *ſacrilegious, wicked*, and *Ethnicall*. As concerning *Calvins* tranſlation, that learned Proteſtant Writer *Carolus Molinæus* ſaith thereof: *Calvin in his Harmony maketh the text of the Goſpell to leap up and down: he uſeth violence to the letter of the Goſpell, and beſides this addeth to the Text.* As touching *Bezas* tranſlation (to omit the diſlike had thereof by *Selneccerus* the German Proteſtant of the Vniverſity of *Iena*) the foreſaid *Molinæus* ſaith of him, *de facto mutat textum; he actually changeth the text*, and giveth farther ſundry inſtances of his corruptions: as alſo *Caſtalio that learned Calviniſt, and moſt learned in the tongues*, reprehendeth *Beza* in a whole book of this matter, and ſaith; that to note all his errours in tranſlation, *would require a great volume.* And *M. Parkes* ſaith: *As for the Geneva Bibles, it is to be wiſhed that either they may be purged from thoſe manifold errors, which are both in the text, and in the margent; or elſe utterly prohibited.* All which confirmeth your Maieſties grave and learned Cenſure, in your *thinking the Geneva tranſlation to be worſt of all*; and that in the *Marginall notes annexed to the Geneva tranſlation, ſome are very partiall, untrue, ſeditious, &c.* Laſtly concerning the Engliſh Tranſlation, the Puritans ſay: *Our tranſlation of the Pſalmes comprized in our Book of Common Prayer, doth in addition, ſubtraction, and alteration, differ from the Truth of the Hebrew in two hundred places at the leaſt.* In ſo much as they doe therefore profeſſe to reſt doubtfull, *whether a man with a ſafe conſcience may ſubſcribe thereunto.* And *M. Carlile* ſaith of the Engliſh Tranſlators, that they have *depraved the ſenſe, obſcured the truth, and deceived the ignorant; that in many places they doe detort the Scriptures from the right ſenſe.* And that, *they ſhew themſelves to love darkneſſe more then light, falſhood more then truth.* And the Miniſters of Lincolne Dioceſſe give their publike teſtimony, terming the Engliſh Tranſlation: *A Tranſlation that taketh away from the Text; that addeth to the Text; and that, ſometime to the changing, or obſcuring of the meaning of the Holy Ghoſt.* Not without cauſe therefore did your Majeſty affirme, that you *could never yet ſee a Bible well tranſlated into Engliſh.* Thus farre the *Author* of the *Proteſtants Apology &c.* And I cannot forbear to mention in particular that famous corruption of *Luther*, who in the Text where it is ſaid (*Rom. 3. v. 28. We accompt a man to be juſtified by faith, without the works of the Law*, in favour of Iuſtification by faith *alone*, tranſlateth (*iuſtified by faith ALONE.*) As likewiſe the falſification of *Zuinglius* is no leſſe notorious, who in the Goſpels of *S. Matthew, Mark*, and *Luke*, and in *S. Paul*, in place of, *This is my Body, This is my Blood*, tranſlates, *This ſignifies my Body, This ſignifies my blood.* And here let Proteſtants conſider duely of theſe points. Salvation cannot be hoped for without true faith: Faith according to them relies upon Scripture alone: Scripture muſt be delivered to moſt of them by the Tranſlations: Tranſlations depend on the skill and honeſty of men, in whom nothing is more certain then a moſt certain poſſibility to erre, and no greater evidence of truth, then that it is evident ſome of them imbrace falſhood, by reaſon of their contrary tranſlations. What then remaineth, but that truth, faith, ſalvation, and all, muſt in them rely upon a fallible, and uncertain ground? How many poore ſoules are lamentably ſeduced, while from preaching Miniſters, they admire a multitude of Texts of divine Scripture, but are indeed the falſe tranſlations, and corruptions of erring men? Let them therefore, if they will be aſſured of true Scriptures, fly to the alwaies viſible Catholique Church, againſt which the gates of hell can never ſo farre prevaile, as that ſhe ſhall be permitted to deceive the Chriſtian world with falſe Scriptures. And *Luther* himſelfe, by unfortunate experience, was at length forced to confeſſe thus much ſaying: *If the* (s) *world laſt longer, it will be againe neceſſary to receive the decrees of Councels, and to have recourſe to them, by reaſon of divers interpretations of Scripture which now raigne.* On the contrary ſide, the Tranſlation approved by the Roman Church, is commended even by our adverſaries: and *D. Covel* in particular ſaith, *that it was uſed in the Church, one thouſand* (t) *three hundred yeares agoe*, and doubteth not *to prefer* (u) *that Tranſlation before others.* In ſo much, that whereas the Engliſh tranſlations be many, and among themſelves diſagreeing, he concludeth, that of all thoſe *the approved tranſlation authorized by the Church of England, is that which commeth neareſt to the vulgar, and is commonly called the Biſhops Bible.* So that the truth of that tranſlation which we uſe, muſt be the rule to judge of the goodneſſe of their Bibles: and therefore they are obliged to maintain our Tranſlation if it were but for their own ſake.

r *Taſt. 1. Sect. 10. ſubd. 4. joyned with tract. 2. cap. 2. Sect. 10. ſubd. 2.*

s *Lib. cont. Zwingl. deverit. corp. Chriſti in Euchar.*

t *In his anſwere unto M. Iohn Burges pag. 94.*

u *Ibid.*

17 But doth indeed the ſource of their manifold uncertainties ſtop here? No, The chiefeſt difficulty remaines, concerning the true meaning of Scripture: for attaining whereof, if Proteſtants had any certainty, they could not diſagree ſo hugely as they doe. Hence M. *Hooker* ſaith: *We are* (w) *right ſure of this, that Nature, Scripture, and Experience have all taught the world to ſeek for the ending of contentions, by ſubmitting it ſelfe unto ſome iudiciall, and definitive ſentence, whereunto neither part that contendeth may, under any pretence, refuſe to ſtand.* D. *Fields* words are remarkable, to this purpoſe: *Seeing* (ſaith he) *the controverſies* (x) *of Religion in our times are grown in number ſo many, and in nature ſo intricate, that few have time and leaſure, fewer ſtrength of underſtanding to examine them; what remaineth for men deſirous of ſatisfaction in things of ſuch conſequence, but diligently to ſearch out which among all the ſocieties in the world, is that bleſſed company of holy ones, that houſhold of Faith, that Spouſe of Chriſt, and Church of the living God, which is the Pillar and ground of Truth, that ſo they may imbrace her communion, follow her directions, and reſt in her iudgement?*

w *In his Preface to his Bookes of Eccleſiaſticall Policy. Sect. 6. 26.*

x *In his treatiſe of the Church. In his Epiſtle dedicatory to the L. Archbiſhop.*

18 And now that the true Interpretation of Scripture, ought to be received from the Church, it is alſo proved by what we have already demonſtrated, that ſhe it is, who muſt declare what Bookes be true Scripture; wherein if ſhe be aſſiſted by the Holy Ghoſt, why ſhould we not believe her, to be infallibly directed concerning the true meaning of them? Let Proteſtants therefore either bring ſome proofe out of Scripture, that the Church is guided by the Holy Ghoſt in diſcerning true Scripture, and not in delivering the true ſenſe thereof; Or elſe give us leave to apply againſt them, the argument, which *S. Auguſtine* oppoſed to the *Manicheans*, in theſe words: *I would not* (y) *believe the Goſpell, unleſſe the authority of the Church did move me. Them therefore whom I obeyed ſaying, Believe the Goſpell, why ſhould I not obey ſaying to me, Doe not believe Manichæus* (Luther, Calvin, &c.) *Chooſe what thou pleaſeſt. If thou ſhalt ſay, believe the Catholiques; They warne me not to give any credit to you. If therefore I believe them, I cannot believe thee. If thou ſay, Do not believe the Catholiques, thou ſhalt not doe well in forcing me to the faith of Manichæus, becauſe by the preaching of Catholiques I believed the Goſpell it ſelfe. If thou ſay, you did well to believe them* (Catholiques) *commending the Goſpell, but you did not well to believe them, diſcommending Manichæus; Doſt thou think me ſo very fooliſh, that without any reaſon at all, I ſhould believe what thou wilt, and not believe what thou wilt not?* And doe not Proteſtants perfectly reſemble theſe men, to whom *S. Auguſtine* ſpake, when they will have men to believe the *Roman* Church delivering Scripture, but not to believe her condemning *Luther*, and the reſt? Againſt whom, when they firſt oppoſed themſelves to the Roman Church, *S. Auguſtine* may ſeem to have ſpoken no leſſe prophetically, then doctrinally, when he ſaid: *Why ſhould I not moſt* (z) *diligently inquire what Chriſt cõmanded of them before all others, by whoſe authority I was moved to believe, that Chriſt commanded any good thing? Canſt thou better declare to me what he ſaid, whom I would not have thought to have been, or to be, if the belief thereof had been recommended by thee to mee? This therefore I believed by fame, ſtrengthned with celebrity, conſent, Antiquity. But every one may ſee that you, ſo few, ſo turbulent, ſo new, can produce nothing deſerving authority. What madneſſe is this? Believe them* (Catholiques) *that we ought to believe Chriſt; but learn of us what Chriſt ſaid. Why, I beſeech thee? Surely if they* (Catholiques) *were not at all, and could not teach me any thing, I would more eaſily perſwade my ſelfe, that I were not to believe Chriſt, then that I ſhould learn any thing concerning him from any other then them by whom I believed him.* If therefore we receive the knowledge of Chriſt, and Scriptures from the Church, from her alſo muſt we take his doctrine, and the interpretation thereof.

y *Cont. ep. Fund. cap. 5.*

z *Lib. de util. cre. cap. 14.*

19 But beſides all this, the Scriptures cannot be Iudge of Controverſies; who ought to be ſuch, as that to him not only the learned, or Veterans, but alſo the unlearned, and Novices, may have recourſe: for theſe being capable of ſalvation, and endued with faith of the ſame nature with that of the learned, there muſt be ſome univerſall Iudge, which the ignorant may underſtand, and to whom the greateſt Clerks muſt ſubmit. Such is the Church: and the Scripture is not ſuch.

20 Now, the inconveniences which follow by referring all Controverſies to Scripture *alone*, are very clear. For by this principle, all is finally in very deed and truth reduced to the *internall private Spirit*, becauſe there is really no middle way betwixt a *publique externall*, and a *private internall* voyce; and whoſoever refuſeth the one, muſt of neceſſity adhere to the other.

21 This Tenet alſo of Proteſtants, by taking the office of Iudicature from the Church, comes to conferre it upon every particular man, who being driven from ſubmiſſion to the Church, cannot be blamed if he truſt himſelfe as farre as any other, his conſcience dictating, that wittingly he meanes not to cozen himſelf, as others malitiouſly may doe. Which inference is ſo manifeſt, that it hath extorted from divers Proteſtants the open Confeſſion of ſo vaſt an abſurdity. Hear *Luther*: *The Governours* (a) *of Churches and Paſtors of Chriſts ſheep have indeed power to teach, but the ſheep ought to give iudgement whether they propound the voice of Chriſt, or of Aliens.* *Lubertus* ſaith: *As we have* (b) *demonſtrated that all publique Iudges may be deceived in interpreting; ſo we affirme, that they may erre in iudging. All faithfull men are private Iudges, and they alſo have power to iudge of doctrines and interpretations.* *Whitaker*, even of the unlearned, ſaith: *They* (c) *ought to have recourſe unto the more learned; but in the meane time we muſt be carefull not to attribute to them over-much, but ſo, that ſtill we retaine our owne freedome.* *Bilſon* alſo affirmeth; that, *The people* (d) *muſt be diſcerners, and Iudges of that which is taught.* This ſame pernicious doctrine is delivered by *Brentius*, *Zanchius*, *Cartwright*, and others exactly

a *Tom. 2. Wittemberg. fol. 375.*

b *In lib. de principiis Chriſtian. dogm. lib. 6. c. 13.*

c *De ſacra Scriptura pag. 529.*

d *In his true difference part. 2.*

cited

cited by (e) *Brerely*; and nothing is more common in every Proteſtants mouth, then that he admits of Fathers, Councells, Church &c, as farre as they agree with Scripture; which upon the matter is himſelfe. Thus *Hereſy* ever fals upon extreames: It pretends to have Scripture alone for judge of Controverſies, and in the meane time ſets up as many Iudges, as there are men and women in the Chriſtian world. What good Stateſmen would they be, who ſhould ideate, or fancy ſuch a Cómon wealth, as theſe men haue framed to themſelues a Church? They verifie what *S. Auguſtine* objecteth againſt certaine Heretiques. *You ſee* (f) *that you goe about to overthrow all authority of Scripture, and that every mans minde may be to himſelfe a Rule, what he is to allow, or diſallow in every Scripture.*

e *Tract. 2. cap. 1. Sect. 1.*

f *Lib. 32. cont. Fauſt.*

22 Moreover what confuſion to the Church, what danger to the Common wealth, this deniall of the authority of the Church, may bring, I leaue to the conſideration of any judicious, indifferent man. I will only ſet down ſome words of *D. Potter*, who ſpeaking of the Propoſition of reuealed Truths, ſufficient to proue him that gain-ſaith them to be an Heretique, ſaith thus: *This Propoſition* (g) *of reuealed truths, is not by the infallible determination of Pope, or Church*; (Pope, & Church being excluded, let us heare what more ſecure rule he will preſcribe) *but by whatſoever meanes a man may be convinced in conſcience of divine revelation. If a Preacher doe cleare any point of faith to his Hearers; if a priuate Chriſtian doe make it appeare to his Neighbour, that any concluſion, or point of faith is delivered by divine revelation of Gods word; if a man himſelfe (without any Teacher) by reading the Scriptures, or hearing them read, be convinced of the truth of any ſuch concluſion: this is a ſufficient propoſition to proue him that gainſaith any ſuch proofe, to be an Heretique, and obſtinate oppoſer of the faith.* Behold what goodly ſafe Propounders of faith ariſe in place of Gods univerſall viſible Church, which muſt yeeld to a ſingle Preacher, a Neighbour, a man himſelfe if he can read, or at leaſt haue eares to heare Scripture read. Verily I doe not ſee, but that every well-governed Civill Commonwealth, ought to concurre towards the exterminating of this doctrine, whereby the Interpretation of Scripture is taken from the Church, and conferred upon every man, who, whatſoever is pretended to the contrary, may be a paſſionate ſeditious creature.

g *Pag. 247.*

23 Moreover, there was no Scripture, or written word for about two thouſand yeares from *Adam* to *Moyſes*, whom all acknowledge to haue been the firſt Author of Canonicall Scripture: And againe for about two thouſand yeares more, from *Moyſes* to Chriſt our Lord, holy Scripture was only among the people of Iſrael; and yet there were Gentiles endued in thoſe daies with divine Faith, as appeareth in *Iob*, and his friends. Wherefore during ſo many ages, the Church alone was the Decider of Controverſies, and Inſtructer of the faithfull. Neither did the word written by *Moyſes*, depriue the Church of her former Infallibility, or other qualities requiſite for a Iudge: yea *D. Potter* acknowledgeth, that beſides the *Law*, there was a living *Iudge* in the Iewiſh Church, endued with an *abſolutely infallible direction in caſes of moment*; as all points belonging to divine Faith are. Now, the Church of Chriſt our Lord, was before the Scriptures of the New Teſtament, which were not written inſtantly, nor all at one time, but ſucceſſiuely upon ſeverall occaſions; and ſome after the deceaſe of moſt of the Apoſtles: and after they were written, they were not preſently knowne to all Churches: and of ſome there was doubt in the Church for ſome Ages after our Saviour. Shall we then ſay, that according as the Church by little and little received holy Scripture, ſhe was by the like degrees deveſted of her poſſeſſed Infallibility, and power to decide Cõtroverſies in Religion? That ſome time Churches had one Iudge of Controverſies, and others another? That with moneths, or yeares, as new Canonicall Scripture grew to be publiſhed, the Church altered her whole Rule of faith, or Iudge of Controverſies? After the Apoſtles time, and after the writing of Scriptures, Hereſies would be ſure to riſe, requiring in Gods Church for their diſcovery and condemnation, *Infallibilitie*, either to write new Canonicall Scripture, as was done in the Apoſtles time by occaſion of emergent hereſies; or *infallibilitie* to interpret Scriptures, already written, or, without Scripture, by divine unwritten Traditions, and aſſiſtants of the holy Ghoſt to determine all Controverſies, as *Tertullian* ſaith: *The ſoule is* (h) *before the letter; and ſpeech before Bookes; and ſenſe before ſtile.* Certainly ſuch *addition* of Scripture, with derogation, or *ſubtraction* from the former power and infallibilitie of the Church, would haue brought to the world *diviſion* in matters of faith, and the Church had rather loſt, then gained by holy Scripture (which ought to be far from our tongues and thoughts,) it being manifeſt, that for deciſion of Controverſies, infallibilitie ſetled in a living Iudge, is incomparably more uſefull and fit, then if it were conceived, as inherent in ſome inanimate writing. Is there ſuch repugnance betwixt Infallibility in the Church, and Exiſtence of Scripture, that the *production* of the one, muſt be the *deſtruction* of the other? Muſt the Church wax dry, by giving to her Children the milke of ſacred Writ? No, No. Her Infallibility was, and is derived from an inexhauſted fountaine. If *Proteſtants* will haue the *Scripture* alone for their Iudge, let them firſt produce ſome *Scripture* affirming, that by the *entring* thereof, Infallibilitie *went out* of the Church. *D. Potter* may remember what himſelfe teacheth; That the Church is ſtill endued with infallibility in points fundamentall, and conſequently, that infallibility in the Church doth well agree with the truth, the ſanctity, yea with the ſufficiency of Scripture, for all matters neceſſary to Salvation. I would therefore gladly know, out of what Text he imagineth that the Church by the comming of Scripture, was deprived of infallibility in ſome points, and not in others? He affirmeth that the Iewiſh Synagogue retained infallibility in her ſelfe, notwithſtanding the writing of the *Old* Teſta-

h *De teſt. anim. cap. 5.*

ment; and will he ſo unworthily and unjuſtly deprive the Church of Chriſt of infallibilitie by reaſon of the *New* Teſtament? Eſpecially if we conſider, that in the Old Teſtament, Lawes, Ceremonies, Rites, Puniſhments, Iudgements, Sacraments, Sacrifices &c. were more particularly, and minutely delivered to the Iewes, then in the New Teſtament is done; our Saviour leaving the determination, or declaration of particulars to his Spouſe the Church, which therefore ſtands in need of infallibility more then the Iewiſh Synagogue. *D. Potter*, (i) againſt this argument, drawne from the power and infallibilitie of the Synagogue, objects; that we might as well inferre, that *Chriſtians muſt haue one ſoveraigne Prince over all, becauſe the Iewes had one chiefe Iudge.* But the diſparitie is very cleare. The Synagogue was a type, and figure of the Church of Chriſt, not ſo their civill government of Chriſtian Common wealths, or kingdomes. The Church ſucceeded to the Synagogue, but not Chriſtian Princes to Iewiſh Magiſtrates: And the Church is compared to a houſe, or (k) family; to an (l) Army, to a (m) body; to a (n) kingdome &c. all which require one Maſter, one Generall, one head, one Magiſtrate, one ſpirituall King; as our bleſſed Saviour with (o) joyned *Vnus Paſtor: One ſheepfold, one Paſtour:* But all diſtinct kingdomes, or Common-wealths, are not one Army, Family, &c. And finally, it is neceſſary to ſalvation, that all haue recourſe to one Church; but for temporall weale, there is no need that all ſubmit, or depend upon one temporall Prince, kingdome, or Common-wealth: and therefore our Saviour hath left to his whole Church, as being *One*, one Law, one Scripture, the ſame Sacraments, &c. Whereas kingdomes haue their ſeverall Lawes, different governments, diverſity of Powers, Magiſtracy &c. And ſo this objection returneth upon *D. Potter*. For as in the *One* Community of the Iewes, there was one Power and Iudge, to end debates, and reſolue difficulties: ſo in the Church of Chriſt, which is *One*, there muſt be ſome *one* Authority to decide all Controverſies in Religion.

Pag. 24.

k *Heb.* 13.
l *Cant.* 2.
m 1. *Cor.* 10. *Epheſ.* 4.
n *Mat.* 12.
o *Ioan. c.* 10.

24 This diſcourſe is excellently proved by ancient *S. Irenæus* (p) in theſe words. *What if the Apoſtles had not left Scriptures, ought we not to haue followed the order of Tradition which they delivered to thoſe to whom they committed the Churches? to which order many Nations yeeld aſſent, who believe in Chriſt, having ſalvation written in their hearts by the ſpirit of God, without letters or Inke, and diligently keeping ancient Tradition. It is eaſie to receiue the truth from Gods Church, ſeeing the Apoſtles haue moſt fully depoſited in her, as in a rich ſtorehouſe, all things belonging to truth. For what? if there ſhould ariſe any contention of ſome ſmall queſtion, ought wee not to haue recourſe to the moſt ancient Churches, and from them to receiue what is certaine and cleare concerning the preſent queſtion?*

p *Lib.* 5. *c.* 4.

25 Beſides all this, the doctrine of Proteſtants is deſtructiue of it ſelfe. For either they haue certaine, and infallible meanes not to erre in interpreting Scripture; or they haue not. If not; then the Scripture (to them) cannot be a ſufficient ground for infallible faith, nor a meet Iudge of Controverſies. If they haue certaine infallible meanes, and ſo cannot erre in their interpretations of Scriptures; then they are able with infallibility to heare, examine, and determine all controverſies of faith; and ſo they may be, and are *Iudges* of Controverſies, although they uſe the Scripture as a *Rule*. And thus, againſt their own doctrine, they conſtitute another Iudge of Controverſies, beſides Scripture alone.

26 Laſtly, I aske *D. Potter*, whether this Aſſertion, *(Scripture alone is Iudge of all Controverſies in faith,)* be a fundamentall point of faith, or no? He muſt be well adviſed, before he ſay, that it is a fundamentall point. For he will haue againſt him, as many Proteſtants as teach that by Scripture alone, it is impoſſible to knowe what Bookes be Scripture, which yet to Proteſtants is the moſt neceſſary and chiefe point of all other. *D. Covell* expreſly ſaith: *Doubtleſſe* (q) *it is a tolerable opinion in the Church of Rome, if they goe no further, as ſome of them doe not* (hee ſhould haue ſaid as none of them doe) *to affirme, that the Scriptures are holy & divine in themſelues, but ſo eſteemed by us, for the authority of the Church.* He will likewiſe oppoſe himſelfe to thoſe his Brethren, who grant that Controverſies cannot be ended, without ſome externall living authority, as we noted before. Beſides, how can it be in us a fundamentall errour to ſay, the Scripture alone is not Iudge of Controverſies, ſeeing (notwithſtanding this our beliefe) wee uſe for interpreting of Scripture, all the meanes which they preſcribe; as Prayer, Conferring of places, Conſulting the Originals &c. and to theſe adde the Inſtruction, and Authority of Gods Church, which even by his confeſſion *cannot* erre damnably, and *may* afford us more *help*, then can be expected from the induſtry, learning, or wit of any private perſon: and finally *D. Potter* grants, that the Church of Rome doth not maintain any fundamentall errour againſt faith; and conſequently, he cannot affirme that our doctrine in this preſent Controverſie is damnable. If he anſwer, that their Tenet, about the *Scriptures* being *the only Iudge of Controverſies*, is not a fundamentall point of faith: then, as *he* teacheth that the univerſall Church may erre in points not fundamentall; ſo I hope he will not deny, but particular Churches, and private men, are much more obnoxious to errour in ſuch points; and in particular in this, that *Scripture alone is Iudge of Controverſies*: And ſo, the very principle upon which their whole faith is grounded, remaines to them uncertaine: and on the other ſide, for the ſelfe ſame reaſon, they are not certaine, but that the Church is Iudge of Controverſies; which if ſhe be, then their caſe is lamentable, who in *generall* deny her this authority, & in *particular* controverſies oppoſe her definitions. Beſides among publique Concluſions defended in *Oxford* the yeare 1633. to the queſtions, *Whether the Church haue authority to determine controverſies in faith*; And, *To interpret holy Scripture?* The anſwer to both is *Affirmative*.

q *In his defence of M. Hookers booke art.* 4. *p.* 31.

27 Since then, the viſible Church of Chriſt our Lord is that infallible *Meanes whereby the revealed*

revealed truths of Almighty God are conveyed to our understanding; it followeth that to oppose her definitions is to resist God himselfe; which blessed *S. Augustine* plainly affirmeth, when speaking of the Controversy about *Rebaptization* of such as were baptized by Heretiques, he saith. *This* (t) *is neither openly, nor evidently read, neither by you nor by me; yet if there were any wise man of whom our Saviour had given testimony, and that he should be consulted in this question, we should make no doubt to performe what he should say, least we might seem to gainsay not him so much as Christ, by whose testimony he was recommended. Now Christ beareth witnesse to his Church.* And a little after: *Whosoever refuseth to follow the practise of the Church, doth resist our Saviour himselfe, who by his testimony recommends the Church.* I conclude therefore with this argument. Whosoever resisteth that meanes which infallibly proposeth to us Gods Word or Revelation, commits a sinne, which, unrepented, excludes salvation: But whosoever resisteth Christs visible Church, doth resist that meanes, which infallibly proposeth Gods word or revelation to us: Therefore whosoever resisteth Christs visible Church, commits a sinne, which unrepented, excludes salvation. Now what visible Church was extant, when *Luther* began his pretended Reformation, whether it were the Roman, or Protestant Church; and whether he, and other Protestants doe not oppose that visible Church, which was spread over the world, before, and in *Luthers* time, is easy to be determined, and importeth every one most seriously to ponder, as a thing whereon eternall salvation dependeth. And because our Adversaries doe here most insist upon the distinction of points fundamentall, and not fundamentall; and in particular teach, that the Church may erre in points not fundamentall, it will be necessary to examine the truth, and weight of this evasion, which shall be done in the next Chapter.

(t) *De unit. Eccles. c. 22.*

ANSVVER TO
THE SECOND CHAPTER.

Concerning the meanes, whereby the revealed Truths of God are conveyed to our understanding; and which must determine Controversies in Faith and Religion.

AND §. 1. He that would usurpe an absolute lordship and tyranny over any people, need not put himselfe to the trouble and difficulty of abrogating and disanulling the Lawes, made to maintain the common liberty; for he may frustrate their intent, and compasse his own designe as well, if he can get the power and authority to interpret them as he pleases, and adde to them what he pleases, and to have his interpretations and additions stand for Lawes; if he can rule his people by his lawes, and his Lawes by his Lawyers. So the *Church of Rome*, to establish her tyranny over mens consciences, needed not either to abolish or corrupt the holy Scriptures, the Pillars and supporters of Christian liberty (which in regard of the numerous multitude of copies dispersed through all places, translated into almost all languages, guarded with all sollicitous care and industry, had been an impossible attempt;) But the more expedite way, and therefore more likely to be successefull, was to gain the opinion and esteem of the *publique and authoriz'd interpreter* of them, and the Authority of adding to them what doctrine she pleal'd under the title of *Traditions* or *Definitions*. For by this meanes, she might both serve her selfe of all those clauses of Scripture, which might be drawen to cast a favourable countenance upon her ambitious pretences, which in case the Scripture had been abolished, shee could not have done; and yet be se-

cure enough of having either her power limited, or her corruptions and abuſes reformed by them; this being once ſetled in the mindes of men, that *unwritten doctrines, if propoſed by her, were to be receav'd with equall reverence to thoſe that were written*: and that *the ſenſe of Scripture was not that which ſeem'd to mens reaſon and underſtanding to be ſo, but that which the Church of Rome ſhould declare to be ſo, ſeem'd it never ſo unreaſonable, and incongruous*. The matter being once thus ordered, and the holy Scriptures being made in effect not your directors and Iudges (no farther then you pleaſe) but your *ſervants and inſtruments*, alwaies preſt and in readineſſe to advance your deſignes, and diſabled wholly with mindes ſo qualified to prejudice or impeach them; it is ſafe for you to put a crown on their head, and a reed in their hands, and to bow before them, & cry, *Haile King of the Iewes!* to pretend a great deale of *eſteem, and reſpect, & reverence* to them, as here you doe. But to little purpoſe is verball reverence without entire ſubmiſſion and ſyncere obedience; and, as our Saviour ſaid of ſome, ſo the Scripture, could it ſpeak, I believe would ſay to you, Why *call ye mee Lord, Lord, and doe not that which I command you?* Caſt away the vaine and arrogant pretence of *Infallibility*, which makes your errors incurable. Leave picturing God, and worſhipping him by pictures. *Teach not for Doctrine the Commandments of men*. Debarre not the Laity of the Teſtament of Chriſts blood. Let your publique Prayers and Pſalmes and Hymmes be in ſuch language as is for the edification of the Aſſiſtants. Take not from the Clergy that liberty of Marriage which Chriſt hath left them. Doe not impoſe upon men that *Humility of worſhipping Angels* which S. *Paul* condemnes. Teach no more proper ſacrifices of Chriſt but one. Acknowledge them *that dye in Chriſt to be bleſſed, and to reſt from their labours*. Acknowledge the Sacrament after conſecration, to be Bread and Wine, as well as Chriſts body and blood. Acknowledge the gift of continency without Marriage not to be given to all. Let not the weapons of your warfare be carnall; ſuch as are Maſſacres, Treaſons, Perſecutions, and in a word all meanes either violent or fraudulent: Theſe and other things, which the Scripture commands you, doe, and then we ſhall willingly give you ſuch Teſtimony as you deſerve; but till you doe ſo, to talk of eſtimation, reſpect, and reverence to the Scripture, is nothing elſe but talk.

2 For neither is that true which you pretend, *That we poſſeſſe the Scripture from you, or take it upon the integrity of your Cuſtody*, but upon *Vniverſall Tradition*, of which you are but a little part. Neither, if it were true that Proteſtants acknowledged, *The integrity of it to have been guarded by your alone Cuſtody*, were this any argument of your reverence towards them. For firſt, you might preſerve them entire, not for want of Will, but of Power to corrupt them, *as it is a hard thing to poyſon the Sea*. And then having prevailed ſo farre with men, as either not to look at all into them, or but only through ſuch ſpectacles as you ſhould pleaſe to make for them, and to ſee nothing in them, though as cleere as the ſunne, if it any way made againſt you,

you

you might keep them entire, without any thought or care to conforme your doctrine to them, or reforme it by them (which were indeed to reverence the Scriptures) but out of a perſwaſion, that you could qualify them well enough with your gloſſes and interpretations, and make them ſufficiently conformable to your preſent Doctrine, at leaſt in their judgement, who were prepoſſes'd with this perſwaſion, that *your Church was to judge of the ſenſe of Scripture, not to be judged by it.*

3 For, whereas you ſay, *No cauſe imaginable could avert your will, from giving the function of ſupreme and ſole Iudge to holy writ; but that the thing is impoſſible; and that by this meanes controverſies are encreaſed and not ended:* you mean perhaps-*That you can or will imagine no other cauſe but theſe.* But ſure there is little Reaſon you ſhould meaſure other mens imaginations by your own, who perhaps may be ſo clouded and vail'd with prejudice, that you cannot, or will not ſee that which is moſt manifeſt. For what indifferent and unprejudicate man may not eaſily conceive another cauſe which (I doe not ſay does, but certainly) may pervert your wills, and avert your underſtandings from ſubmitting your religion and Church to a *tryall by Scripture.* I mean the great and apparent and unavoidable danger which by this meanes you would fall into, of looſing the Opinion which men have of your Infallibility, and conſequently your power and authority over mens conſciences, and all that depends upon it; ſo that though *Diana of the Epheſians* be cryed up, yet it may be feared that with a great many among you (though I cenſure or judge no man) the other cauſe which wrought upon *Demetrius* and the *Craftsmen,* may have with you alſo the more effectuall, though more ſecret influence: and that is, that *by this craft we have our living*; by this craft, I mean of keeping your Proſelytes from an indifferent tryall of your Religion by Scripture, and making them yeeld up and captivate their judgement unto yours. Yet had you only ſaid *de facto,* that no other cauſe did avert your own will from this, but only theſe which you pretend; out of Charity I ſhould have believed you. But ſeeing you ſpeak not of your ſelfe, but of all of your ſide, whoſe hearts you cannot know; and profeſſe not only, That there is no other cauſe, but that *No other is imaginable,* I could not let this paſſe without a cenſure. As for the impoſſibility of Scriptures being the ſole judge of Controverſies, that is, *the ſole rule for man to Iudge them by* (for we mean nothing elſe) you only affirme it without proofe, as if the thing were evident of it ſelfe. And therefore I, conceiving the contrary to be more evident, might well-content my ſelfe to deny it without refutation. Yet I cannot but deſire you to tell me, If Scripture cannot be the Iudge of any Controverſy, how ſhall that touching the *Church and the notes of it* be determined? And if it be the ſole judge of this one, why may it not of others? Why not of All? Thoſe only excepted wherein the Scripture it ſelfe is the ſubject of the Queſtion, which cannot be determined but by naturall reaſon, the only principle, beſide Scripture, which is common to Chriſtians.

4 Then for the Imputation of *increaſing contentions and not ending them*, Scripture is innocent of it; as alſo this opinion; *That controverſies are to be decided by Scripture.* For if men did really and ſincerely ſubmit their judgements to Scripture, and that only, and would require no more of any man but to doe ſo, it were impoſſible but that all controverſies, touching things neceſſary and very profitable ſhould be ended: and if others were continued or increaſed, it were no matter.

5 In the next wordes we have direct *Boyes-play*; a thing given with one hand and taken away with the other; an acknowledgement made in one line, and retracted in the next. *We acknowledge* (ſay you) *Scripture to be a perfect rule, for as much as a writing can be a Rule; only wee deny that it excludes unwritten tradition.* As if you ſhould have ſaid, we acknowledge it to be as perfect a rule as a writing can be; only we deny it to be as perfect a rule as a writing may be. Either therefore you muſt revoke your acknowledgement, or retract your retractation of it; for both cannot poſſibly ſtand together. For if you will ſtand to what you have granted, That *Scripture is as perfect a rule of Faith as a writing can be*: you muſt then grant it both ſo *Compleat*, that it needs no addition, and ſo *evident*, that it needs no interpretation: For both theſe properties are requiſite to a *perfect rule*; and a writing is capable of both theſe properties.

6 That both theſe Properties are requiſite to a *perfect rule*, it is apparent: Becauſe that is not perfect in any kind which wants ſome parts belonging to its integrity: As he is not a perfect man that wants any part appertaining to the Integrity of a Man; and therefore that which wants any acceſſion to make it a perfect rule, of it ſelfe is not a perfect Rule. And then, the end of a *rule* is to regulate and direct. Now every inſtrument is more or leſſe perfect in its kinde, as it is more or leſſe fit to attain the end for which it is ordained: But nothing obſcure or unevident while it is ſo, is fit to regulate and direct them to whom it is ſo. Therefore it is requiſite alſo to a *rule* (ſo farre as it is a Rule) to be evident; otherwiſe indeed it is no *rule*, becauſe it cannot ſerve for direction. I conclude therefore, that both theſe properties are required to a perfect Rule: both to be ſo compleat as to need no Addition; and to be ſo evident as to need no Interpretation.

7 Now that a writing is capable of both theſe perfections, it is ſo plain, that I am even aſhamed to prove it. For he that denies it muſt ſay, That *ſomething may be ſpoken which cannot be written.* For if ſuch a compleat and evident rule of faith may be delivered by word of mouth, as you pretend it may, and is; and whatſoever is delivered by word of mouth may alſo be written; then ſuch a compleat and evident rule of faith may alſo be written. If you will have more light added to the Sunne, anſwer me then to theſe Queſtions. Whether your Church can ſet down in writing all theſe, which ſhe pretends to be divine unwritten Traditions, and adde them to the verities already written? And whether ſhe can ſet us down ſuch interpretations of all obſcurities in the Faith as ſhall need no farther interpretations? If ſhee cannot

cannot, then ſhe hath not that power which you pretend ſhe hath, of being an *Infallible teacher of all divine verities*, and an infallible interpreter of obſcurities in the faith: for ſhe cannot teach us all divine verities, if ſhe cannot write them down; neither is that an interpretation which needs again to be interpreted: If ſhe can; Let her doe it, and then we ſhall have a writing, not only capable of, but, actually endowed with both theſe perfections, of being both ſo compleat as to need no Addition, and ſo evident as to need no Interpretation. Laſtly, whatſoever your Church can doe or not doe, no man can without Blaſphemy deny, that *Chriſt Ieſus*, if he had pleaſ'd, could have writ us a rule of Faith ſo plaine and perfect, as that it ſhould have wanted neither any part to make up its integrity, nor any cleereneſſe to make it ſufficiently intelligible: And if Chriſt could have done this, then the thing might have been done; a writing there might have been indowed with both theſe properties. Thus therefore I conclude, a writing may be ſo perfect a Rule, as to need neither Addition nor Interpretation; But the *Scripture you acknowledge a perfect Rule for as much as a writing can be a Rule*, therefore it needs neither Addition nor Interpretation.

8 You will ſay, that *though a writing be never ſo perfect a Rule of Faith, yet it muſt be beholding to Tradition to give it this Teſtimony, that it is a Rule of Faith, and the Word of God.* I anſwere: Firſt, there is no abſolute neceſſity of this. For God might, if he thought good, give it the atteſtation of perpetuall miracles. Secondly, that it is one thing to be a perfect Rule of Faith, another to be proved ſo unto us. And thus though a writing could not be proved to us to be a perfect rule of Faith, by its own ſaying ſo, for nothing is prov'd true by being ſaid or written in a book, but only by Tradition which is a thing credible of it ſelfe; yet it may be ſo in it ſelfe, and containe all the materiall objects, all the particular articles of our Faith, without any dependance upon Tradition; even this alſo not excepted, that *this writing doth containe the rule of Faith.* Now when Proteſtants affirme againſt Papiſts, that *Scripture is a perfect Rule of Faith*, their meaning is not, that by Scripture all things abſolutely may be proved, which are to be believed: For it can never be prov'd by Scripture to a gainſayer, that there is a God, or that the book called Scripture is the word of God; For he that will deny theſe Aſſertions when they are ſpoken, will believe them never a whit the more becauſe you can ſhew them written: But their meaning is, that the Scripture, to them which preſuppoſe it Divine, and a Rule of Faith, as Papiſts and Proteſtants doe, containes all the materiall objects of Faith; is a compleat and totall, and not only an imperfect and a partiall Rule.

9 *But every Book, and Chapter, and Text of Scripture is infallible and wants no due perfection, and yet excludes not the Addition of other bookes of Scripture; Therefore the perfection of the whole Scripture excludes not the Addition of unwritten Tradition.* I anſwere; Every Text of Scripture though it have the perfection belonging to a Text of Scripture, yet it hath not the perfection requiſite to a *perfect Rule of*

Faith

Faith; and that only is the perfection which is the ſubject of our diſcourſe. So that this is to abuſe your Reader with the ambiguity of the word *Perfect*. In effect, as if you ſhould ſay, A text of Scripture may be a perfect Text, though there be others beſide it; therefore the whole Scripture may be a perfect Rule of Faith, though there be other parts of this Rule, beſides the Scripture, and though the Scripture be but a part of it.

10 The next Argument to the ſame purpoſe is, for Sophiſtry, coſen german to the former. *When the firſt bookes of Scripture were written, they did not exclude unwritten Tradition: Therefore now alſo, that all the bookes of Scripture are written, Traditions are not excluded.* The ſenſe of which argument (if it have any) muſt be this. When only a part of the Scripture was written, then a part of the divine doctrine was unwritten; Therefore now when all the Scripture is written, yet ſome part of the divine doctrine is yet unwritten. If you ſay, your concluſion is not that it is ſo, but without diſparagement to Scripture, may be ſo: without diſparagement to the truth of Scripture, I grant it; but without diſparagement to the Scriptures being a *perfect Rule*, I deny it. And now the Queſtion is not of the Truth, but the perfection of it; which are very different things, though you would faine confound them. For Scripture might very well be all true, though it containe not all neceſſary Divine Truth. But unleſſe it doe ſo, it cannot be a *perfect Rule of Faith*; for that which wants any thing is not perfect. For I hope you doe not imagine, that we conceive any antipathy between Gods word written and unwritten, but that both might very well ſtand together. All that we ſay is this, that we have reaſon to believe that God *de Facto*, hath ordered the matter ſo, that all the Goſpell of Chriſt, the whole covenant between God and man, is now written. Whereas if he had pleal'd, he might ſo have diſpoſed it, that part might have been written, and part unwritten: but then he would have taken order, to whom we ſhould have had recourſe, for that part of it which was not written; which ſeeing he hath not done (as the progreſſe ſhall demonſtrate) it is evident he hath left no part of it unwritten. We know no man therefore that ſaies, It were any injury to the written Word to be joyn'd with the unwritten, if there were any wherewith it might be joyn'd; but that we deny. The fidelity of a Keeper may very well conſiſt with the authority of the thing committed to his cuſtody. But we know no one ſociety of Chriſtians that is ſuch a faithfull Keeper as you pretend. The Scripture it ſelfe was not kept ſo faithfully by you, but that you ſuffered infinite variety of Readings to creep into it; all which could not poſſibly be divine, and yet, in ſeverall parts of your Church, all of them, untill the laſt Age, were ſo eſteem'd. The interpretations of obſcure places of Scripture, which without Queſtion the Apoſtles taught the Primitive Chriſtians, are wholy loſt; there remaines no certainty ſcarce of any one. Thoſe *Worlds of Miracles*, which our Saviour did, which were not written, for want of writing are vaniſhed out of the memory of men. And many profitable things which the Apoſtles taught and

writ

writ not, as that which S. *Paul* glances at, in his *ſecond Epiſtle to the Theſſalon.* of the *cauſe of the hindrance of the comming of Antichriſt*, are wholly loſt and extinguiſhed. So unfaithfull or negligent hath been this keeper of Divine verities; whoſe eyes, like the keepers of Iſraell (you ſay) have *never ſlumbred nor ſlept*. Laſtly, we deny not but a Iudge and a Law might well ſtand together, but we deny that there is any ſuch Iudge of Gods appointment. Had he intended any ſuch Iudge, he would have nam'd him, leaſt otherwiſe (as now it is) our *Iudge of controverſies* ſhould be our greateſt controverſy.

11 *Ad §. 2.3.4.5.6.* In your ſecond Paragraph, you ſumme up thoſe arguments wherewith you intend to prove, that *Scripture alone cannot be Iudge in controverſies*. Wherein I profeſſe unto you before hand, that you will fight without an Adverſary. For though Proteſtants, being warranted by ſome of the Fathers, have called Scripture the *Iudge of Controverſies*; and you in ſaying here, That Scripture *alone* cannot be Iudge, imply that it may be called in ſome ſenſe a Iudge, though not alone: Yet to ſpeak properly (as men ſhould ſpeak when they write of Controverſies in Religion) the Scripture is not a Iudge of Controverſies, but *a Rule, only and the only Rule for Chriſtians to judge them by*. Every man is to judge for himſelfe with the *Iudgement of Diſcretion*, and to chooſe either his Religion firſt, and then his Church, as we ſay: or as you, his Church firſt, and then his Religion. But by the conſent of both ſides, every man is to judge and chooſe: and the Rule whereby he is to guide his choyce, if he be a naturall man, is Reaſon, if he be already a Chriſtian, Scripture, which we ſay is the Rule to judge controverſies by. Yet not all ſimply, but all the Controverſies of Chriſtians, of thoſe, that are already agreed upon This firſt Principle that, *the Scripture is the word of God*. But that there is any man, or any company of men appointed to be judge for all men, that we deny, and that I believe you will never prove. The very truth is, we ſay no more in this matter, then evidence of Truth hath made you confeſſe in plain termes in the begining of this chapter, *viz.* That *Scripture is a perfect Rule of faith, for as much as a writing can be a rule*. So that all your reaſons whereby you labour to dethrone the Scripture from this office of *Iudgeing*, we might let paſſe as impertinent to the concluſion which we maintaine, and you have already granted; yet out of curteſy we will conſider them.

12 Your firſt is this; *a Iudge muſt be a perſon fit to end controverſies, but the Scripture is not a perſon, nor fit to end controverſies, no more then the Law would be without the Iudges, therefore though it may be a Rule it cannot be a Iudge*. Which concluſion I have already granted. Only my requeſt is, that you will permit Scripture to have the properties of a Rule, that is, to be fit to direct every one that will make the beſt uſe of it, to that end for which it was ordained. And that is as much as we need deſire. For as if I were to goe a journey and had a guide which could not erre, I needed not to know my way: ſo on the other ſide if I know my way or have a plain rule to know it by, I ſhall need no guide. Grant therefore Scripture to be ſuch a Rule,

and it will quickly take away all neceſſity of having an infallible guide. But *without a living Iudge it will be no fitter* (you ſay) *to end Controverſies, then the Law alone to end ſuits.* I anſwere, if the Law were plain and perfect, and men honeſt and deſirous to underſtand aright, and obey it, he that ſaies it were not fit to end controverſies, muſt either want underſtanding himſelf, or think the world wants it. Now the Scripture, we pretend, *in things neceſſary is plain & perfect*, and men, we ſay, are oblig'd, under pain of Damnation, to ſeek the true ſenſe of it, and not to wreſt it to their preconceived Phanſies. Such a law therefore to ſuch men cannot but be very fit to end all controverſies, neceſſary to be ended. For others that are not ſo, they will end when the world ends, and that is time enough.

12 Your next encounter is with them, who acknowledging the Scripture a Rule only and not a Iudge, make the holy Ghoſt, ſpeaking in Scripture, the judge of Controverſies. Which you diſprove by ſaying, *That the holy Ghoſt ſpeaking only in Scripture is no more intelligible to us, then the Scripture in which he ſpeakes.* But by this reaſon neither the Pope, nor a Councell can be a Iudge neither. For firſt, denying the Scriptures, the writings of the Holy Ghoſt, to be judges, you will not I hope offer to pretend, that their decrees, the writings of men are more capable of this function: the ſame exceptions at leaſt, if not more, and greater lying againſt them as doe againſt Scripture. And then what you object againſt the holy Ghoſt, ſpeaking in Scripture, to exclude him from this office, The ſame I returne upon them and their decrees, to debarre them from it; that they ſpeaking unto us only in their decrees, are no more intelligible then the decrees in which they ſpeak. And therefore if the Holy Ghoſt ſpeaking in Scripture may not be a judge for this reaſon; neither may they, ſpeaking in their decrees, be judges for the ſame Reaſon. *If the Popes decrees* (you will ſay) *be obſcure, he can explain himſelfe, and ſo the Scripture cannot.* But the holy Ghoſt, that ſpeaks in Scripture, can doe ſo, if he pleaſe, and when he is pleas'd will doe ſo. In the mean time it will be fit for you to wait his leaſure, and to be content, that thoſe things of Scripture which are plain ſhould be ſo, and thoſe which are obſcure ſhould remain obſcure, untill he pleaſe to declare them. Beſides he can (which you cannot warrant me of the Pope or a Councell) ſpeak at firſt ſo plainly, that his words ſhall need no farther explanation; and ſo in things neceſſary we believe he has done. And if you ſay, *the Decrees of Councells touching Controverſies, though they be not the Iudge, yet they are the Iudges ſentence*: So, I ſay, the Scripture, though not the Iudge, is the ſentence of the Iudge. When therefore you conclude, *That to ſay a Iudge is neceſſary for deciding controverſies, about the meaning of Scripture, is as much as to ſay, he is neceſſary to decide what the holy Ghoſt ſpeakes in Scripture:* This I grant is true, but I may not grant that a Iudge (ſuch a one as we diſpute of) is neceſſary either to doe the one, or the other. For if the Scripture (as it is in things neceſſary) be plain, why ſhould it be more neceſſary to have a judge to interpret them in plain places, then to have a judge to interpret the meaning of

A

a Councell's decrees,and others to interpret their Interpretations, and others to interpret theirs,and ſo on for ever? And where they are not plaine,there if we,uſing diligence to finde the truth, doe yet miſſe of it and fall into errour,there is no danger in it. They that erre, and they that doe not erre may both be ſaved. So that thoſe places which containe things neceſſary,and wherein errour were dangerous,need no infallible interpreter becauſe they are plaine:and thoſe that are obſcure need none becauſe they contain not things neceſſary, neither is errour in them dangerous.

13 *The Law-maker ſpeaking in the Law*, I grant it, *is no more eaſily underſtood then the Law it ſelfe*, for his ſpeech is nothing elſe but the Law: I grant it *very neceſſary*, *that beſides the Law-maker ſpeaking in the Law, there ſhould be other Iudges to determine civill and criminall Controverſies, and to giue every man that Iuſtice which the Law allowes him*. But your Argument drawn from hence to ſhew a neceſſitie of a viſible Iudge in Controverſies of Religion, I ſay is Sophiſticall: and that for many Reaſons.

14 Firſt, Becauſe the variety of Civill caſes is infinite, and therefore there cannot be poſſibly Lawes enough provided for the determination of them: and therefore there muſt be a Iudge to ſupply out of the Principles of Reaſon the interpretation of the Law, where it is defectiue. But the Scripture (we ſay) is a perfect Rule of Faith, and therefore needs no ſupply of the defects of it.

15 Secondly, To execute the Letter of the Law, according to rigour, would be many times unjuſt, and therefore there is need of a Iudge to moderate it; whereof in Religion there is no uſe at all.

16 Thirdly, In Civill and Criminall cauſes the parties haue for the moſt part ſo much intereſt, and very often ſo little honeſty, that they will not ſubmit to a Law though never ſo plaine, if it bee againſt them; or will not ſee it to be againſt them, though it be ſo never ſo plainly: whereas if men were honeſt, and the Law were plaine and extended to all caſes, there would be little need of Iudges. Now in matters of Religion, when the Queſtion is, whether every man bee a fit Iudge and chooſer for himſelfe, we ſuppoſe men honeſt, and ſuch as underſtand the difference between a Moment and Eternity. And ſuch men, we conceiue, will think it highly concernes them to be of the true Religion, but nothing at all that this or that Religion ſhould be the true. And then wee ſuppoſe that all the neceſſary points of Religion are plaine and eaſie, & conſequently every man in this cauſe to be a competent Iudge for himſelfe; becauſe it concernes himſelfe to judge right as much as eternall happineſſe is worth. And if through his owne default he judge amiſſe he alone ſhall ſuffer for it.

17 Fourthly, In Civill Controverſies we are obliged only to externall paſſiue obedience, and not to an internall and actiue. Wee are bound to obey the ſentence of the Iudge, or not to reſiſt it, but not alwaies to belieue it juſt. But in matters of Religion, ſuch a judge is required whom we ſhould be obliged to belieue, to haue judged right. So that in Civill Controverſies every honeſt underſtanding man is fit

to be a Iudge; But in religion none but he that is infallible.

18 Fiftly, In Civill Cauſes there is meanes and power, when the Iudge has decreed, to compell men to obey his ſentence: otherwiſe, I believe, Laws alone, would be to as much purpoſe, for the ending of differences, as Lawes and Iudges both. But all the power in the world is neither fit to convince, nor able to compell a mans conſcience to conſent to any thing. Worldly terrour may prevaile ſo far as to make men profeſſe a Religion which they believe not, (ſuch men I meane, who know not that there is a Heaven provided for Martyrs, and a Hell for thoſe that diſſemble ſuch truths as are neceſſary to bee profeſſed:) But to force, either any man to believe what he believes not, or any honeſt man to diſſemble what he does beleiue (if God commands him to profeſſe it,) or to profeſſe what he does not believe, all the Powers in the World are too weak, with all the powers of Hell, to aſſiſt them.

19 Sixtly, In Civill Controverſies the caſe cannot be ſo put, but there may be a Iudge to end it, who is not a party: In Controverſies of Religion, it is in a manner impoſſible to bee avoided but the Iudge muſt be a partie. For this muſt be the firſt, whether hee be a judge or no, and in that he muſt be a partie. Sure I am, the Pope, in the controverſies of our time, is a chiefe partie; for it highly concernes him, even as much as his Popedome is worth, not to yeeld any one point of his Religion to be erroneous. And hee is a man ſubject to like paſſions with other men. And therefore we may juſtly decline his ſentence, for feare temporall reſpects ſhould either blinde his judgement, or make him pronounce againſt it.

20 Seaventhly, In Civill Controverſies, it is impoſſible *Titius* ſhould hold the land in queſtion and *Sempronius* too: and therefore either the Plaintiffe muſt injure the Defendant, by diſquieting his poſſeſſion, or the Defendant wrong the Plaintiffe by keeping his right from him. But in Controverſies of Religion the Caſe is otherwiſe. I may hold my opinion and doe you no wrong, and you yours and doe mee none. Nay we may both of us hold our opinion, and yet doe our ſelues no harme; provided, the difference be not touching any thing neceſſary to ſalvation, and that we loue truth ſo well, as to bee diligent to informe our Conſcience, and conſtant in following it.

21 Eightly, For the ending of Civill Controverſies, who does not ſee it is abſolutely neceſſary, that not only Iudges ſhould bee appointed, but that it ſhould be known and unqueſtioned who they are? Thus all the Iudges of our Land are known men, known to be Iudges, and no man can doubt or queſtion, but theſe are the Men. Otherwiſe if it were a diſputable thing, who were theſe Iudges, and they had no certain warrant for their Authority, but only ſome Topicall congruities, would not any man ſay ſuch Iudges, in all likelyhood, would rather multiply Controverſies, then end them?

22 Ninthly, and laſtly, For the deciding of Civill Controverſies men may appoint themſelues a judge. But in matters of Religion, this office may be given to none but whom God hath deſigned for it: who doth not alwaies giue us thoſe things which we conceiue moſt expedient for our ſelues.

So

23 So likewiſe if our Saviour, the King of Heaven, had intended that all Controverſies in Religion ſhould be by ſome Viſible Iudge finally determined, who can doubt, but in plaine termes hee would haue expreſſed himſelfe about this matter? He would haue ſaid plainely, *The Biſhop of Rome I haue appointed to decide all emergent Controverſies.* For that our Saviour deſign'd the *Biſhop of Rome* to this Office, & yet would not ſay ſo, nor cauſe it to be written--*ad Rei memoriam*-- by any of the *Evangeliſts* or *Apoſtles*, ſo much as once; but leaue it to bee drawn out of uncertain Principles, by thirteen or fourteen more uncertain conſequences, He that can beleiue it, let him. All theſe Reaſons, I hope, will convince you, that though we haue, and haue great neceſſity of, Iudges in Civill and Criminall cauſes: yet you may not conclude from thence, that there is any publique authoriz'd Iudge to determine Controverſies in Religion, nor any neceſſity there ſhould be any.

24 *But the Scripture ſtands in need of ſome watchfull and unerring eye to guard it, by meanes of whoſe aſſured vigilancy, we may undoubtedly receiue it ſyncere and pure.* Very true, but this is no other then the watchfull eye of divine providence: the goodneſſe whereof will never ſuffer, that the Scripture ſhould be depraved and corrupted, but that in them ſhould be alwaies extant a conſpicuous and plain way to eternall happineſſe. Neither can any thing be more palpably unconſiſtent with his goodneſſe, then to ſuffer Scripture to be undiſcernably corrupted in any matter of moment, and yet to exact of men the beliefe of thoſe verities, which without their fault, or knowledge, or poſſibility of prevention, were defac'd out of them. So that God requiring of men to beleiue Scripture in its purity, ingages himſelfe to ſee it preſerv'd in ſufficient purity, and you need not feare but he will ſatisfie his ingagement. You ſay, *we can haue no aſſurance of this but your Churches Vigilancie.* But if we had no other we were in a hard caſe; for who could then aſſure us that your Church has been ſo vigilant, as to guard Scripture from any the leaſt alteration? There being various Lections in the ancient copies of your Bibles, what ſecurity can your new rais'd *Office of Aſſurance* giue us, that, that reading is true which you now receiue, and that falſe which you reject? Certainly they that anciently received and made uſe of theſe divers Copies, were not all guarded by the Churches vigilancy from having their Scripture alter'd from the puritie of the Originall in many places. For of different readings, it is not in nature impoſſible that all ſhould bee falſe, but more then one cannot poſſibly be true. Yet the want of ſuch a protection was no hinderance to their ſalvation, and why then ſhall the having of it be neceſſary for ours? But then this Vigilancy of your Church, what meanes haue we to be aſcertain'd of it? Firſt, the thing is not evident of it ſelfe; which is evident, becauſe many doe not beleiue it. Neither can any thing be pretended to giue evidence to it, but only ſome places of Scripture; of whoſe incorruption more then any other what is it that can ſecure me? If you ſay the Churches vigilancy, you are in a Circle, proving the Scriptures uncorrupted by the Churches vigilancy, & the Churches vigilancy by the incorruption of ſome places of Scripture, and againe

the incorruption of thoſe places by the Churches vigilancy. If you name any other meanes, then that meanes which ſecures mee of the Scriptures incorruption in thoſe places, will alſo ſerue to aſſure me of the ſame in other places. For my part, abſtracting from Divine Providence, which will never ſuffer the way to Heaven to bee block'd up or made inviſible, I know no other meanes (I meane no other naturall and rationall meanes) to be aſſured hereof, then I haue that any other Book is uncorrupted. For though I haue a greater degree of rationall and humane Aſſurance of that then this, in regard of divers conſiderations which make it more credible, *That the Scripture hath been preſerv'd from any materiall alteration*; yet my aſſurance of both is of the ſame kinde and condition, both Morall aſſurances, and neither Phyſicall or Mathematicall.

25 To the next Argument the Reply is obvious; *That though we doe not believe the books of Scripture to be Canonicall becauſe they ſay ſo*, For other books that are not Canonicall may ſay they are, and thoſe that are ſo may ſay nothing of it: yet we believe not this upon the authority of your Church, but upon the Credibilitie of *Vniverſall Tradition*, which is a thing *Credible of it ſelfe*, and therefore fit to bee reſted on; whereas the Authority of your Church is not ſo. And therefore your reſt thereon is not rationall but meerly voluntary. I might as well reſt upon the judgement of the next man I meet, or upon the chance of a Lottery for it. For by this meanes I only know I might erre, but by relying on you I know I ſhould erre. But yet (to returne you one ſuppoſe for another) ſuppoſe I ſhould for this and all other things ſubmit to her direction, how could ſhee aſſure mee that I ſhould not be miſ-led by doing ſo? She pretends indeed infallibility herein, but how can ſhe aſſure us that ſhe hath it? What, by Scripture? That you ſay cannot aſſure us of its own Infallibility, and therefore not of yours. What then, by Reaſon? That you ſay may deceiue in other things, and why not in this? How then will ſhe aſſure us hereof, By ſaying ſo? Of this very affirmation there will remain the ſame Queſtion ſtill, How it can proue it ſelfe to be infallibly true. Neither can there be an end of the like multiplied Demands, til we reſt in ſomthing evident of it ſelfe, which demonſtrates to the world that this Church is infallible. And ſeeing there is no ſuch Rock for the Infallibility of this Church to be ſetled on, it muſt of neceſſity, like the Iland of *Delos*, flote up and down for ever. And yet upon this point according to Papiſts all other Controverſies in faith depend.

26 *To the* 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. 12. 13. 14. §. The ſumme and ſubſtance of the Ten next Paragraphs is this, *That it appeares, by the Confeſſions of ſome Proteſtants, and the Contentions of others, that the Queſtions about the Canon of Scripture, what it is: and about the Various reading and Tranſlations of it, which is true and which not, are not to bee determined by Scripture, and therefore that all Controverſies of Religion are not decidable by Scripture.*

27 To which I have already anſwered ſaying, That when Scripture is affirm'd to be the rule by which all controverſies of Religion

are

are to be decided, Thoſe are to be excepted out of this generality which are concerning the Scripture it ſelfe. For as that generall ſaying of Scripture, *He hath put all things under his feet*, is moſt true, though yet S. *Paul* tels us, *That when it is ſaid, he hath put all things under him, it is manifeſt he is excepted who did put all things under him*: So when we ſay that all controverſies of Religion are decidable by the Scripture, it is manifeſt to all, but cavillers, that we doe and muſt except from this generality, thoſe which are *touching the Scripture it ſelfe*. Iuſt as a Merchant ſhewing a ſhip of his own, may ſay, all my ſubſtance is in this ſhip; and yet never intend to deny, that his ſhip is part of his ſubſtance, nor yet to ſay that his ſhip is in it ſelfe. Or as a man may ſay, that a whole houſe is ſupported by the foundation, and yet never mean to exclude the foundation from being a part of the houſe, or to ſay that it is ſupported by it ſelfe. Or as you your ſelves uſe to ſay, that the Biſhop of Rome is head of the whole Church, and yet would think us but captious ſophiſters ſhould we inferre from hence, that either you made him no part of the whole, or elſe made him head of himſelfe. Your negative concluſion therefore, that theſe *Queſtions touching Scripture, are not decidable by Scripture*, you needed not have cited any Authorities, nor urged any reaſon to prove it; it is evident of it ſelfe, and I grant it without more adoe. But your corollary from it, which you would inſinuate to your unwary reader, *that therefore they are to be decided by your, or any viſible Church*, is a meere inconſequence, and very like his collection, who becauſe *Pamphilus* was not to have *Glycerium* for his wife, preſently concluded that he muſt have her; as if there had been no more men in the world but *Pamphilus* and himſelfe. For ſo you as if there were nothing in the world capable of this office, but the Scripture, or the preſent Church, having concluded againſt Scripture, you conceive, but too haſtily, that you have concluded for the Church. But the truth is, neither the one nor the other have any thing to doe with this matter. For firſt, the Queſtion *whether ſuch or ſuch a book be Canonicall Scripture*, though it may be decided negatively out of Scripture, by ſhewing apparent and irreconcileable contradictions between it and ſome other book confeſſedly Canonicall; yet affirmatively it cannot but only by the teſtimonies of the ancient Churches: any book being to be received as undoubtedly Canonicall, or to be doubted of as uncertain, or rejected as Apocryphall, according as it was received, or doubted of, or rejected by them. Then for the Queſtion, *of various readings which is the true*, it is in reaſon evident and confeſſed by your own Pope, that there is no poſſible determination of it, but only by compariſon with ancient Copies. And laſtly for controverſies about different tranſlations of Scripture, the learned have the ſame meanes to ſatisfy themſelves in it, as in the Queſtions which happen about the tranſlation of any other Author, that is, skill in the language of the Originall, and comparing tranſlations with it. In which way if there be no certainty, I would know what certainty you have, that your *Doway* old, and *Rhemiſh* new Teſtament are true tranſlations? And then for

the

the unlearned thoſe on your ſide are ſubject to as much, nay the very ſame uncertainty with thoſe on ours. Neither is there any reaſon imaginable, why an ignorant Engliſh Proteſtant may not be as ſecure of the tranſlation of our Church, that it is free from errour, if not abſolutely, yet in matters of moment, as an ignorant Engliſh Papiſt can be of his Rhemiſt Teſtament, or Doway Bible. The beſt direction I can give them is to compare both together, and where there is no reall difference (as in the tranſlation of controverted places I believe there is very little) there to be confident, that they are right; where they differ, there to be prudent in the choice of the guides they follow. Which way of proceeding, if it be ſubject to ſome poſſible errour, yet is it the beſt that either we, or you have; and it is not required that we uſe any better then the beſt we have.

28 You will ſay, *Dependance on your Churches infallibility is a better.* I anſwere, it would be ſo, if we could be infallibly certaine, that your Church is infallible; that is, if it were either evident of it ſelfe, and ſeen by its own light, or could be reduc'd unto and ſetled upon ſome Principle that is ſo. But ſeeing you your ſelves doe not ſo much as pretend, to enforce us to the belief hereof, by any proofes infallible and convincing, but only to induce us to it, by ſuch as are, by your confeſſion, only probable, and *prime motives*; certainly it will be to very little purpoſe, to put off your uncertainty for the firſt turne, and to fall upon it at the ſecond: to pleaſe your ſelves in building your houſe upon an imaginary Rock, when you your ſelves ſee and confeſſe, that this very Rock ſtands it ſelfe at the beſt but upō a frame of timber. I anſwer ſecondly, that this cannot be a better way, becauſe we are infallibly certain that your Church is not infallible, and indeed hath not the reall preſcription of this priviledge, but only pleaſeth her ſelfe with a falſe imagination and vaine preſumption of it: as I ſhall hereafter demonſtrate by many unanſwerable arguments.

29 Now ſeeing I make no ſcruple or difficulty to grant the concluſion of this diſcourſe, that *theſe controverſies about Scripture, are not decidable by Scripture*; and have ſhewed, that your deduction from it, that *therefore they are to be determin'd by the authority of ſome preſent Church*, is irrationall, and inconſequent; I might well forbeare to tire my ſelfe with an exact and punctuall examination of your premiſes κατ' ἄνδρας, which wether they be true or falſe, is to the Queſtion diſputed wholly impertinent. Yet becauſe you ſhall not complaine of tergiverſation, I will runne over them, and let nothing, that is materiall and conſiderable, paſſe without ſome ſtricture or animadverſion.

30 You pretend that M. *Hooker* acknowledgeth that, *That whereon we muſt reſt our aſſurance that the Scripture is Gods word, is the Church*: and for this acknowledgement you referre us to *l. 3. Sect. 8.* Let the Reader conſult the place, and he ſhall finde that he and M. *Hooker* have been much abuſed, both by you here, and by M. *Breerly* and others before you, and that M. *Hooker* hath not one ſyllable to your pretended purpoſe, but very much directly to the contrary. There he tells us indeed, *that ordinarily the firſt introduction and probable motive to the*

belief

belief of the verity is the Authority of the Church, but that it is the laſt Foundation whereon our belief hereof is rationally grounded, that in the ſame place he plainly denies. His words are, *Scripture teacheth us, that ſaving Truth which God hath diſcovered unto the world by Revelation, and it preſumeth us taught otherwiſe, that it ſelfe is divine and ſacred. The Queſtion then being by what meanes we are taught this*: ſome anſwere; *that to learne it we have no other way then tradition.* * *As namely that ſo we believe, becauſe we from our Predeceſſors, and they from theirs have ſo received. But is this enough? That which all mens experience teacheth them, may not in any wiſe be denied: and by experience we all know, that* [a] *the firſt outward motive leading men to eſteeme of the Scripture, is the Authority of Gods Church. For when we know* [b] *the whole Church of God hath that opinion of the Scripture, we judge it at the firſt an impudent thing for any man, bred and brought up in the Church, to be of a contrary minde without cauſe. Afterwards the more we beſtow our labour upon reading or hearing the myſteries thereof,* [c] *the more we find that the thing it ſelf doth anſwer our received opinion concerning it: ſo that the former inducement prevailing* [d] *ſomewhat with us before, doth now much more prevaile, when the very thing hath miniſtred farther reaſon. If Infidels, or Atheiſts chance at any time to call it in queſtion, this giveth us occaſion to ſift what reaſon there is, whereby the teſtimony of the Church, concerning Scripture, and our own perſwaſion, which Scripture it ſelfe hath ſetled, may be proved a truth infallible.* [e] *In which caſe the ancient Fathers, being often conſtrained to ſhew what warrant they had ſo much to rely upon the Scriptures, endeavoured ſtill to maintaine the Authority of the bookes of God by arguments, ſuch as the unbelievers themſelves muſt needs think reaſonable, if they judge thereof as they ſhould. Neither is it a thing impoſſible, or greatly hard, even by ſuch kinde of proofes, ſo to manifeſt and cleare that point, that no man living ſhall be able to deny it, without denying ſome apparent principle, ſuch as all men acknowledge to be true* [f]. By this time I hope the reader ſees ſufficient proofe of what I ſaid in my Reply to your Preface, that M. *Breerelies* great oſtentation of exactneſſe, is no very certain argument of his fidelity.

(* *Some anſwer ſo, but he doth not.*)

[a] *The firſt outward motive, not the laſt aſſurance whereon we reſt.*

[b] *The whole Church that he ſpeaks of ſeemes to be that particular Church, wherein a man is bred and brought up; and the authority of this he makes an argument which preſeth a mans modeſty more then his reaſon. And in ſaying, it ſeemes impudent to be of a contrary mind without cauſe, he implyes; There may be a juſt cauſe to be of a contrary mind, and that then it were no impudence to be ſo.*

[c] *Therefore the authority of the Church is not the pauſe whereon we reſt: we had need of more aſſurance, and the intrinſecall arguments afford it.*

31 But, *ſeeing the beliefe of the Scripture is a neceſſary thing, and cannot be prov'd by Scripture, how can the Church of England teach, as ſhe doth, Art. 6. That all things neceſſary are contain'd in Scripture?*

32 I have anſwered this already. And here again I ſay, That all but cavillers will eaſily underſtand the meaning of the Article to be, That all the Divine verities, which Chriſt revealed to his Apoſtles, and the Apoſtles taught the Churches, are contained in Scripture. That is, all the materiall objects of our faith; whereof the Scripture is none, but only the meanes of conveying them unto us: which we believe not finally, and for it ſelfe, but for the matter contained in it. So that

[d] *Somewhat, but not much, untill it be back'd and inforced by farther reaſon: it ſelfe therefore is not the farthеſt reaſon and the laſt reſolution.* [e] *Obſerve I pray; our perſuaſion, and the teſtimony of the Church concerning Scripture, may be proved true, therefore neither of them was in his account the fartheſt proofe.* [f] *Naturall reaſon then built on principles common to all men, is the laſt reſolution; unto which the Churches authority is but the firſt inducement.*

if men did believe the doctrine contained in Scripture, it ſhould no way hinder their ſalvation, not to know whether there were any Scripture or no. Thoſe barbarous nations *Irenæus* ſpeaks of were in this caſe, and yet no doubt but they might be ſaved. The end that God aimes at, is the beliefe of the Goſpell, the covenant between God and man; the Scripture he hath provided as a meanes for this end, and this alſo we are to believe, but not as the laſt object of our faith, but as the inſtrument of it. When therefore we ſubſcribe to the *6. Art.* you muſt underſtand that, by *Articles of Faith*, they mean the finall and ultimate objects of it, and not the meanes and inſtrumentall objects; and then there will be no repugnance between what they ſay, and that which *Hooker*, and D. *Covell*, and D. *Whitaker*, and *Luther* here ſay.

33 But, *Proteſtants agree not in aſſigning the Canon of holy Scripture.* Luther *and* Illyricus *reject the Epiſtle of S.* Iames. Kemnitius, *and other Luth. the ſecond of Peter, the ſecond and third of* Iohn. *The Epiſt. to the Heb. the Epiſt. of Iames, of Iude, and the Apocalyps. Therefore without the Authority of the Church, no certainty can be had what Scripture is Canonicall.*

34 So alſo the *Ancient Fathers*, and not only Fathers, but *whole Churches* differed about the certainty of the authority of the very ſame bookes: and by their difference ſhewed, they knew no neceſſity of conforming themſelves herein to the judgement of your or any Church. For had they done ſo, they muſt have agreed all with that Church, and conſequently among themſelves. Now I pray tell me plainly, Had they ſufficient certainty what Scripture was Canonicall, or had they not? If they had not, it ſeemes there is no ſuch great harme or danger in not having ſuch a certainty whether ſome books be Canonicall or no, as you require: If they had, why may not Proteſtants, notwithſtanding their differences, have ſufficient certainty hereof, as well as the Ancient Fathers and Churches, notwithſtanding theirs?

35 You proceed. And whereas the Proteſtants of *England* in the *6. Art.* have theſe words, *In the name of the Holy Scripture we doe underſtand thoſe Bookes, of whoſe authority was never any doubt in the Church*; you demaund, *what they meane by them? Whether that by the Churches conſent they are aſſured what Scriptures be Canonicall?* I Anſwer for them. Yes, they are ſo. And whereas you inferre from hence, *This is to make the Church Iudge*: I haue told you already, That *of this Controverſie we make the Church the Iudge*; but not the preſent Church, much leſſe the preſent Roman Church, but the conſent and teſtimony of the *Ancient and Primitive Church.* Which though it be but a highly probable inducement, and no demonſtrative enforcement, yet me thinks you ſhould not denie but it may be a ſufficient ground of faith: Whoſe Faith, even of the Foundation of all your Faith, your Churches Authority, is built laſtly and wholly upon *Prudentiall Motives.*

36 But *by this Rule the whole booke of Eſther muſt quit the Canon; becauſe it was excluded by ſome in the Church*: by *Melito, Athanaſius,*

and

and Gregory Nazianzen. Then for ought I know he that ſhould thinke he had reaſon to exclude it now, might be ſtill in the Church as well as *Melito, Athanaſius, Nazianzen* were. And while you thus inveigh againſt *Luther*, and charge him with Luciferian hereſies, for doing that which you in this very place confeſſe that Saints in Heaven before him have done, *are you not partiall and a Iudge of evill thoughts?*

37 *Luther's* cenſures of *Eccleſiaſtes*, *Iob*, and the *Prophets*, though you make ſuch tragedies with them, I ſee none of them but is capable of a tolerable conſtruction, and far from having in them any fundamentall hereſie. He that condemnes him for ſaying, the booke of *Eccleſiaſtes is not full*, *That it hath many abrupt things*, condemnes him, for ought I can ſee, for ſpeaking truth. And the reſt of the cenſure is but a bold and blunt expreſſion of the ſame thing. The booke of *Iob* may be a true Hiſtory, and yet as many true ſtories are, and haue been an Argument of a Fable to ſet before us an example of Patience. And though the books of the Prophets were not written by themſelves, but by their Diſciples, yet it does not follow that they were written caſually: (Though I hope you will not damne all for Heretikes, that ſay, ſome books of Scripture were written caſually.) Neither is there any reaſon they ſhould the ſooner be call'd in queſtion for being written by their Diſciples, ſeeing being ſo written they had atteſtation from themſelues. Was the Propheſie of *Ieremie* the leſſe Canonicall, for being written by *Baruch*? Or becauſe S. *Peter* the Maſter dictated the Goſpell, and S. *Marke* the Scholler writ it, is it the more likely to be called in Queſtion?

38 But leaving *Luther*, you returne to our Engliſh Canon of Scripture; And tell us, that in *the new teſtament, by the above mentioned rule, (of whoſe Authority was never any doubt in the Church) divers books muſt be* [di]*canoniz'd.* Not ſo. For I may believe even thoſe queſtioned bookes to have been written by the Apoſtles and to be Canonicall: but I cannot in reaſon believe this of them ſo undoubtedly, as of *thoſe books which were never queſtioned.* At leaſt I have no warrant to damne any man that ſhall doubt of them or deny them now: having the example of Saints in Heaven, either to juſtify, or excuſe ſuch their doubting or deniall.

39 You obſerve in the next place, that *our ſixt Article, ſpecifying by name all the books of the Old Teſtament, ſhuffles over theſe of the New with this generality--All the books of the New Teſtament, as they are commonly received, we doe receive, and account them Canonicall*: And in this you phanſy to your ſelfe *a myſtery of iniquity.* But if this be all the ſhuffling that the Church of *England* is guilty of, I believe the Church, as well as the King, may give for her Motto, *Honi ſoit qui mal y penſe.* For all the Bibles which ſince the compoſing of the Articles have been uſed and allowed by the *Church of England*, doe teſtify and even proclaime to the World, that by-*Cõmonly received*, they meant, *received by the Church of Rome, and other Churches before the Reformation.* I pray take the paines to look in them, and there you ſhall finde the bookes which the Church of England counts Apocryphall mar-

ked out and ſevered from the reſt, with this title in the begining, *The bookes called Apocrypha*; and with this cloſe or ſeal in the end, *The end of the Apocrypha.* And having told you by name, and in particular, what bookes only ſhee eſteemes *Apocryphall*, I hope you will not put her to the trouble of telling you that the reſt are in her judgement *Canonicall.*

40 *But if by Commonly received, ſhee meant, by the Church of Rome; Then by the ſame reaſon, muſt ſhe receive divers books of the old Teſtament which ſhe reiects.*

41 Certainly a very good conſequence. The Church of *England* receives the Bookes of the New Teſtament, which the Church of *Rome* receives; Therefore ſhe muſt receive the bookes of the old Teſtament which ſhe receives. As if you ſhould ſay, If you will doe as we, in one thing, you muſt in all things. If you will pray to God with us, ye muſt pray to Saints with us. If you hold with us, when we have reaſon on our ſide, you muſt doe ſo, when we have no reaſon.

42 The diſcourſe following is but a vaine declamation. No man thinks that this Controverſie is to be tryed by moſt voices, but by the Iudgement and Teſtimony of the ancient Fathers and Churches.

43 But, *with what Coherence can we ſay in the former part of the Article, That by Scripture we mean thoſe Bookes that were never doubted of; and in the latter ſay, We receive all the bookes of the new Teſtament, as they are commonly received, whereas of them many were doubted?* I anſwere. When they ſay, *of whoſe Authority there was never any doubt in the Church*, They mean not, thoſe only of whoſe authority there was ſimply no doubt at all, by any man in the Church; But ſuch as were not at any time doubted of by the whole Church, or by all Churches, but had atteſtation, though not univerſall, yet at leaſt ſufficient to make conſidering men receive them for Canonicall. In which number they may well reckon thoſe Epiſtles which were ſometimes doubted of by ſome, yet whoſe number and authority was not ſo great, as to prevaile againſt the contrary ſuffrages.

44 But, *if to be commonly received, paſſe for a good rule to know the Canon of the new Teſtament by, why not of the Old?* You conclude many times very well, but ſtill when you doe ſo, it is out of principles which no man grants. For who ever told you, that to be *commonly* received is a good Rule to know the Canon of the New Teſtament by? Have you been train'd up in Schooles of ſubtilty, and cannot you ſee a great difference, between theſe two, We receive the bookes of the new Teſtament *as they are* commonly received, and we receive thoſe that are commonly received, *becauſe they are ſo?* To ſay this, were indeed to make, *being commonly received*, a Rule or Reaſon to know the Canon by. But to ſay the former, doth no more make it a Rule, then you ſhould make the Church of *England* the rule of your receiving them, if you ſhould ſay, as you may, The bookes of the New Teſtament we receive for Canonicall, as they are received by the Church of England.

45 You demand, *upon what infallible ground we agree with Luther againſt*

againſt you, in ſome, and with you againſt Luther in others? And I alſo demand upon what infallible ground you hold your Canon, & agree neither with us, nor *Luther?* For ſure your differing from us both, is of it ſelfe no more apparently reaſonable, then our agreeing with you in part, and in part with *Luther*. If you ſay, your Churches infallibility is your ground: I demand againe ſome infallible ground both for the Churches infallibility, and for this, that *Yours is the Church*; and ſhall never ceaſe multiplying demands upon demands, untill you ſettle me upon a Rock; I mean, giue ſuch an Anſwer, whoſe Truth is ſo evident that it needs no further evidence. If you ſay, *This is Vniverſall Tradition*: I reply, your Churches infallibility is not built upon it, and that the Canon of Scripture, as we receiue it, is. For wee doe not profeſſe our ſelues ſo abſolutely, and and undoubtedly certain; neither doe we urge others to be ſo, of thoſe Books, which haue been doubted, as of thoſe that never haue.

46 The Concluſion of your Tenth § is, That *the Divinity of a writing cannot be known from it ſelfe alone, but by ſome extrinſecall authority*: Which you need not proue, for no wiſe man denies it. But then this authority is that of *Vniverſall Tradition*, not of your Church. For to me it is altogether as αὐτόπιστον, that the Goſpell of *Saint Mathew* is the word of God, as that all which your Church ſaies is true.

47 That Believers of the Scripture, by conſidering the divine matter, the excellent precepts, the glorious promiſes contained in it, may be confirmed in their faith, of the Scriptures divine Authority; & that among other inducements and inforcements hereunto, internall arguments haue their place and force, certainly no man of underſtanding can deny. For my part I profeſſe, if the doctrine of the Scripture were not as good, and as fit to come from the fountain of goodneſſe, as the Miracles, by which it was confirm'd, were great, I ſhould want one main pillar of my faith, and for want of it, I feare ſhould be much ſtagger'd in it. Now this and nothing elſe did the *Doctor* mean in ſaying, *The Belieuer ſees, by that glorious beam of divine light which ſhines in Scripture, and by many internall Arguments, that the Scripture is of Divine Authority. By this* (ſaith he) *he ſees it*, that is, hee is moved to, and ſtrengthned in his beliefe of it: and by this partly, not wholly; by this, not alone, but with the concurrence of other Arguments. He that will quarrell with him for ſaying ſo, muſt finde fault with the *Maſter of the Sentences*, and all his *Schollers*, for they all ſay the ſame. The reſt of this Paragraph, I am as willing it ſhould be true, as you are to haue it: and ſo let it paſſe, as a diſcourſe wherein we are wholy unconcern'd. You might haue met with an Anſwerer that would not haue ſuffred you to haue ſaid ſo much Truth together, but to me it is ſufficient, that it is nothing to the purpoſe.

48 In the next Diviſion, out of your liberality, you will ſuppoſe, that Scripture, like to a corporall light, is *by it ſelfe alone* able to determine and moue our underſtanding to aſſent: yet notwithſtanding this ſuppoſall, *Faith ſtill* (you ſay) *muſt goe before Scripture, becauſe as*

the light is viſible only to thoſe that haue eyes: ſo the Scripture onely to thoſe that haue the Eye of Faith. But to my underſtanding, if Scripture doe moue and determine our Vnderſtanding to aſſent, then the Scripture, and its moving muſt be before this aſſent, as the cauſe muſt bee before its own effect; now this very aſſent is nothing elſe but Faith, and Faith nothing elſe then the Vnderſtanding's aſſent. And therefore (upon this ſuppoſall) Faith doth, and muſt originally proceed from Scripture, as the effect from its proper cauſe: and the influence and efficacy of Scripture is to be preſuppos'd before the aſſent of faith, unto which it moues and determines, and conſequently if this ſuppoſition of yours were true, there ſhould need no other meanes precedent to Scripture to beget Faith, Scripture it ſelfe being able (as here you ſuppoſe) to determine and moue the underſtanding to aſſent, that is to believe them, and the Verities contained in them. Neither is this to ſay, that the eyes with which we ſee, are made by the light by which we ſee. For you are miſtaken much, if you conceiue that in this compariſon, Faith anſwers to the Eye. But if you will not pervert it, the Analogie muſt ſtand thus-; Scripture muſt anſwer to light; The eye of the ſoule, that is the Vnderſtanding, or the faculty of aſſenting, to the bodily eye; And laſtly aſſenting or believing to the act of ſeeing. As therefore the light, determining the Eye to ſee, though it preſuppoſes the Eye which it determines, as every Action doth the object on which it is imployed, yet it ſelfe is preſuppos'd and antecedent to the act of ſeeing, as the cauſe is alwaies to its effect: So, if you will ſuppoſe that Scripture, like light, moues the underſtanding to aſſent, The Vnderſtanding (that's the eye and object on which it works) muſt bee before this influence upon it; But the Aſſent, that is the beliefe whereto the Scripture moues, and the underſtanding is mov'd, which anſwers to the act of ſeeing, muſt come after. For if it did aſſent already, to what purpoſe ſhould the Scripture doe that which was done before? Nay indeed how were it poſſible it ſhould be ſo, any more then a Father can beget a Sonne that he hath already? Or an Architect build an houſe that is built already? Or then this very world can bee made againe before it be unmade? Tranſubſtantiation indeed is fruitfull of ſuch Monſters. But they that haue not ſworne themſelues to the defence of Errour, will eaſily perceiue, that *Iam factum facere*, and *Factum infectum facere*, are equally impoſſible. But I digreſſe.

49 The cloſe of this Paragraph, is a fit cover for ſuch a diſh. There you tell us, That *if there muſt be ſome other meanes precedent to Scripture to beget faith, this can be no other then the Church.* By the Church, we know you doe, and muſt underſtand the *Roman Church*: ſo that in effect you ſay, no man can haue faith, but he muſt bee mou'd to it by your Churches Authority. And that is to ſay, that the King and all other Proteſtants, to whom you write, though they verily think they are Chriſtians & believe the Goſpell, becauſe they aſſent to the truth of it, and would willingly dye for it, yet indeed are Infidels and believe nothing. The Scripture tells us, *The heart of man knoweth no man, but the ſpirit of man which is in him.* And who are you, to take upon

you

you to make us believe, that we doe not believe, what we know we doe? But if I may think verily that I believe the Scripture, and yet not believe it; how know you that you believe the Roman Church? I am as verily, and as ſtrongly perſwaded that I believe the Scripture, as you are that you believe the Church. And if I may be deceived, why may not you? Againe, what more ridiculous, and againſt ſenſe and experience, then to affirme, That there are not millions amongſt you and us that believe, upon no other reaſon then their education, and the authority of their Parents and Teachers, and the opinion they haue of them? The tenderneſſe of the ſubject, and aptneſſe to receiue impreſſions, ſupplying the defect and imperfection of the Agent! And will you proſcribe from heaven all thoſe believers of your own Creed, who doe indeed lay the foundation of their Faith (for I cannot call it by any other name) no deeper then upon the Authority of their Father, or Maſter, or pariſh Prieſt? Certainly, if theſe haue no true faith, your Church is very full of Infidels. Suppoſe *Xaverius* by the holyneſſe of his life had converted ſome Indians to Chriſtianity, who could (for ſo I will ſuppoſe) haue no knowledge of your Church but from him, and therefore muſt laſt of all build their Faith of the Church upon their Opinion of *Xaverius*: Doe theſe remain as very Pagans after their converſion, as they were before? Are they brought to aſſent in their ſoules, and obey in their liues the Goſpell of Chriſt, only to be Tantaliz'd and not ſaved, and not benefited but deluded by it, becauſe, forſooth, it is a man and not the Church that begets faith in them? What if their motiue to beleeue be not in reaſon ſufficient? Doe they therefore not believe what they doe believe, becauſe they doe it upon inſufficient motiues? They chooſe the Faith imprudently perhaps, but yet they doe chooſe it. Vnleſſe you will haue us believe that, that which is done, is not done, becauſe it is not done upō good reaſon: which is to ſay, that never any man living ever did a fooliſh action. But yet I know not why the Authority of one holy man, which apparently has no ends upon me, joyn'd with the goodneſſe of the Chriſtian faith, might not be a far greater and more rationall motiue to me to imbrace Chriſtianity, then any I can haue to continue in Paganiſme. And therefore for ſhame, if not for loue of Truth, you muſt recant this fancie when you write again: and ſuffer true faith to be many times, where your Churches infallibility has no hand in the begetting of it. And be content to tell us hereafter, that we believe not enough, and not goe about to perſwade us, we believe nothing, for feare with telling us what we know to be manifeſtly falſe, you ſhould gain only this, *Not to be believed when you ſpeak truth.* Some pretty ſophiſmes you may happily bring us to make us believe, we believe nothing: but wiſe men know that Reaſon againſt Experience is alwaies Sophiſticall. And therefore as he that could not anſwer *Zenoe's* ſubtilities againſt the exiſtence of Motion, could yet confute them by doing that, which he pretended could not be done: So if you ſhould giue me a hundred Arguments to perſwade me, becauſe I doe not believe Tranſubſtantiation, I doe not believe in God, and the *Knots* of them I could

could not untie, yet I ſhould cut them in peeces with doing that, and knowing that I doe ſo, which you pretend I cannot doe.

50 In the thirteenth diviſion, we haue again much adoe about nothing. A great deal of ſtirre you keep in confuting ſome, *that pretend to know Canonicall Scripture to be ſuch, by the Titles of the Books.* But theſe men you doe not name, which makes me ſuſpect you cannot. Yet it is poſſible there may be ſome ſuch men in the world; for *Guſman de Alfarache* hath taught us that the Fooles hoſpitall is a large place.

51 In the fourteenth §. we haue very artificiall jugling. *D. Potter* had ſaid, *That the Scripture* (hee deſires to bee underſtood of thoſe books wherein all Chriſtians agree) *is a principle, and needs not be proued among Chriſtians.* His reaſon was, becauſe *that needs no farther proofe which is believed already.* Now by this (you ſay) he meanes either, that the Scripture is one of theſe firſt Principles, and moſt known in all ſciences, which cannot be proved: which is to ſuppoſe, it cannot be proved by the Church; and that is to ſuppoſe the Queſtion: Or hee meanes, That it is not the moſt known in Chriſtianity, & then it may be prov'd. Where we ſee plainly, That two moſt different things, *Moſt known in all Sciences*, & *Moſt known in Chriſtianity*, are captiouſly confounded. As if the Scripture might not be the firſt and moſt knowne Principle in Chriſtianity, and yet not the moſt knowne in all Sciences? Or as if to be a Firſt Principle *in Chriſtianity*, and *in all Sciences*, were all one? That Scripture is a Principle among Chriſtians, that is, ſo received by all that it need not be proved in any emergent Controverſie to any Chriſtian, but may be taken for granted, I think few will deny. You your ſelues are of this a ſufficient Teſtimony; for urging againſt us many texts of Scripture, you offer no proofe of the truth of them, preſuming we will not queſtion it. Yet this is not to deny that Tradition is a Principle more knowne then Scripture; But to ſay, it is a principle not in Chriſtianity but *in Reaſon*, nor proper to Chriſtians, but common to all men.

52 But, *it is repugnant to our practice to hold Scripture a Principle; becauſe we are wont to affirme, that one part of Scripture may be knowne to be Canonicall, and may be interpreted by another.* Where the former device is againe put in practice. For to be known to be *Canonicall*, and to be *interpreted* is not all one. That Scripture may be interpreted by Scripture, that Proteſtants grant, and Papiſts doe not deny; neither does that any way hinder but that this aſſertion--Scripture is the word of God, may be among Chriſtians a common Principle. But the firſt,-That one part of Scripture may proue another part Canonicall, and need no proofe of its own being ſo; for that, you haue produc'd divers Proteſtants that deny it; but who they are that affirme it, *nondum Conſtat.*

53 It is ſuperfluous for you to proue *out of S. Athanaſius, & S. Auſtine that we muſt receiue the ſacred Canon upon the credit of Gods Church.* Vnderſtanding by Church, as here you explaine your ſelfe, *The credit of Tradition.* And that not the Tradition of the Preſent Church, which we pretend may deviate from the Ancient, but *ſuch a*

Tradition

Tradition, which involues an evidence of Fact, and from hand to hand, from age to age, bringing us up to the times and perſons of the Apoſtles, and our Saviour himſelfe, commeth to be confirm'd by all theſe Miracles, and other Arguments, whereby they convinc'd their doctrine to be true. Thus you. Now proue the Canon of Scripture which you receive by ſuch Tradition and we will allow it. Proue your whole doctrine, or the infallibility of your Church by ſuch a Tradition, & we will yeeld to you in all things. Take the alleaged places of S. *Athanaſius*, and S. *Auſtine*, in this ſenſe, (which is your own,) and they will not preſſe us any thing at all. We will ſay, with *Athanaſius, That only foure Goſpels are to be received, becauſe the Canons of the Holy and Catholique Church* (underſtand of *all Ages* ſince the perfection of the Canon) *haue ſo determined.*

54 We will ſubſcribe to S. *Auſtin*, and ſay, That *we alſo would not believe the Goſpell, unleſſe the Authority of the Catholique Church did moue us*, (meaning by the Church, *the Church of all Ages*, and that ſucceſſion of Chriſtians which takes in *Chriſt himſelfe* and his *Apoſtles.*) Neither would *Zwinglius* haue needed to cry out upon this ſaying, had he conceived as you now doe, that by the Catholique Church, the Church of all Ages, ſince Chriſt, was to be underſtood. As for the Councell of *Carthage*, it may ſpeak not of ſuch Books only, as were certainly Canonicall, and for the regulating of Faith, but alſo of thoſe which were onely profitable, and lawfull to be read in the Church. Which in *England* is a very ſlender Argument that the book is Canonicall, where every body knowes that Apocryphall books are read as well as Canonicall. But howſoever, if you underſtand by Fathers, not only their immediate Fathers and Predeceſſors in the Goſpell, but the ſucceſſion of them from the Apoſtles; they are right in the Theſis, that *whatſoever is received from theſe Fathers, as Canonicall, is to be ſo eſteem'd*; Though in the application of it, to this or that particular book they may happily erre, and think that Book received as Canonicall, which was only received as Profitable to be read; and think that Book, received alwaies, and by all, which was rejected by ſome, and doubted of by many.

a Neq; enim ſic poſuit integritas atq; notitia literarum quamlibet illuſtris Epiſcopi, cuſtodiri, quemadmodum ſcriptura Canonica tot linguarum literis & ordine & ſucceſſione celebrationis Eccleſiaſticæ cuſtoditur; contra quam non defuerunt tamen, qui ſub nominibus Apoſtolorum multa confingerent. Fruſtra quidem; Quia illa ſic commendata, ſic celebrata, ſic nota eſt.

55 *But we cannot be certain, in what language the Scriptures remaine uncorrupted.* Not ſo certain, I grant, as of that which wee can demonſtrate: But certain enough, morally certain, as certain as the nature of the thing will beare. So certain we may be, and God requires no more. We may be as certain as S. *Auſtin* was, who in his *ſecond book of Baptiſme, againſt the Donatiſts, c.* 3. plainly implies, *the Scripture might poſſibly be corrupted.* He meanes ſure in matters of little moment, ſuch as concerne not the Covenant between God and Man. But thus he ſaith. The ſame S. *Auſtin* in his 48. *Epiſt.* cleerly intimates, a That *in his judgement, the only preſervatiue of the Scriptures integrity, was the tranſlating it into ſo many Languages, and the generall and perpetuall uſe and reading of it in the Church: for want whereof the works of particular Doctors were more expoſed to danger in this kinde*; but the Canonicall Scripture being by this meanes guarded with uni-

Verum quid poſſit adverſus literas non Canonica authoritate fundatas etiam hinc demonſtrabit impiæ conatus audaciæ, quod & adverſus eos quæ tanta notitiæ mole firmatæ ſunt, ſe erigere non prætermiſit. Aug. ep. 48. ad Vincent. contra Donat. & Rogat.

verſall care and diligence was not obnoxious to ſuch attempts. And this aſſurance of the Scripture's incorruption, is common to us with him; we therefore are as certain hereof as S. *Auſtin* was, & that I hope was certain enough. Yet if this does not ſatisfie you, I ſay farther, We are as certain hereof as your own *Pope Sixtus Quintus* was. He in his *Preface to his Bible* tells us: [b] That *in the perveſtigation of the true and genuine Text, it was perſpicuouſly manifeſt to all men, that there was no Argument more firme and certain to be relied upon, then the Faith of Ancient Books.* Now this ground wee haue to build upon as well as He had: and therefore our certainty is as great, and ſtands upon as certain ground as his did.

[b] *In hac Germani textus perveſtigatione, ſatis perſpicue inter omnes conſtat, nullum argumentum eſſe certius ac firmius, quam antiquorum probatorum codicum latinorum fidem &c. ſic* Sixtus in præfat.

56 This is not all I haue to ſay in this matter. For I will adde moreover, that we are as certaine in what Language the Scripture is uncorrupted, as any man in your Church was, untill *Clement* the 8th ſet forth your own approved *Edition of your Vulgar* tranſlation. For you doe not, nor cannot, without extreme impudence deny, that untill then, there was great variety of Copies currant in divers parts of your Church, and thoſe very frequent in various lections: all which Copies might poſſibly be falſe in ſome things, but more then one ſort of them, could not poſſibly be true in all things. Neither were it leſſe impudence to pretend, that any man in your Church, could untill *Clement's* time haue any certainty what that one true Copie and reading was (if there were any one perfectly true.) Some indeed that had got *Sixtus his Bible*, might after the Edition of that very likely think them ſelues cock-ſure of a perfect true uncorrupted Tranſlation, without being beholding to *Clement*; but how fowly they were abuſed and deceived that thought ſo, the Edition of *Clemens*, differing from that of *Sixtus* in a great multitude of places, doth ſufficiently demonſtrate.

57 This certainty therefore in what language the Scripture remaines uncorrupted, is it neceſſary to haue it, or is it not? If it be not, I hope we may doe well enough without it. If it be neceſſary, what became of your Church for 1500 yeares together? All which time you muſt confeſſe ſhe had no ſuch certainty: no one man being able truly and upon good ground to ſay, *This or that Copy of the Bible is pure, and perfect, and uncorrupted in all things.* And now at this preſent, though ſome of you are growne to a higher degree of Preſumption in this point, yet are you as farre as ever, from any true and reall, and rationall aſſurance of the abſolute purity of your Authentique Tranſlation: which I ſuppoſe my ſelfe to haue prou'd unanſwerably in divers places.

58 In the *ſixteenth Diviſion*, It is objected to Proteſtants in a long diſcourſe tranſcrib'd out of the *Proteſtants Apologie*, That *their tranſlations of the Scripture are very different, and by each other mutually condemned. Luthers Tranſlation* by *Zwinglius*, and *others*: That *of the* Zwinglians *by* Luther. *The Tranſlation* of Oecolampadius, *by the Divines of* Baſill: *that of* Caſtalio *by* Beza: *That of* Beza *by* Caſtalio. *That of* Calvin, *by* Carolus Molinæus. *That of* Geneva *by* M. Parks, & King Iames. *And laſtly one of our Tranſlations by the Puritans.*

59 All

59 All which might haue been as juſtly objected againſt that great variety of Tranſlations extant in the Primitive Church, & made uſe of by the Fathers and Doctors of it. For which I deſire not that my word, but S. *Auſtin's* may be taken. *They which haue tranſlated the Scriptures out of the Hebrew into Greek, may be numbred, but the Latine Interpreters are innumerable. For whenſoever any one, in the firſt times of Chriſtianity, met with a Greek Bible, and ſeem'd to himſelfe to haue ſome ability in both Languages, he preſently ventur'd upon an Interpretation.* So *He*, in his *ſecond book of Chriſtian doctrine. Cap.* 11. Of all theſe, that which was called the *Italian Tranſlation* was eſteemed beſt; ſo we may learne from the ſame S. *Auſtin in the* 15. *Chap. of the ſame book. Amongſt all theſe Interpretations* (ſaith he) *let the Italian be preferr'd: for it keeps cloſer to the Letter, and is perſpicuous in the ſenſe.* Yet ſo farre was the Church of that time from preſuming upon the abſolute puritie and perfection, even of this beſt Tranſlation, that S. *Hierome* thought it neceſſary to make a new Tranſlation of the Old Teſtament, out of the Hebrew fountain, (which himſelfe teſtifies in his Book *de Viris illuſtribus*,) And to correct the vulgar verſion of the New Teſtament, according to the truth of the Originall Greek; amending many errors which had crept into it, whether by the miſtake of the Author, or the negligence of the Tranſcribers; which work he undertook & performed at the requeſt of *Damaſus*, Biſhop of Rome. *You conſtraine mee* (ſaith he) *to make a new work of an old: that after the Copies of the Scriptures haue been diſperſed through the whole world, I ſhould ſit as it were an Arbitratour amongſt them, and becauſe they vary among themſelues, ſhould determine what are thoſe things* (*in them*) *which conſent with the Greek verity.* And after: *Therefore this preſent Preface promiſes the foure Goſpels only corrected by collation with Greek Copies. But that they might not be very diſſonant from the cuſtome of the Latine Reading, I haue ſo tempered with my ſtile, the Tranſlation of the Ancients, that, thoſe things amended which did ſeem to change the ſenſe, other things I haue ſuffered to remain as they were.* So that in this matter Proteſtants muſt either ſtand or fall with the Primititiue Church.

60 *The Corruption that you charge* Luther *with, and the falſification that you impute to* Zwinglius, what haue we to doe with them? or why may not we as juſtly lay to your charge the Errours which *Lyranus*, or *Paulus Brugenſis*, or *Laurentius Valla*, or *Cajetan*, or *Eraſmus*, or *Arias Montanus*, or *Auguſtus Nebienſis*, or *Pagnine*, haue committed in their Tranſlations.

61 Which yet I ſay not, as if theſe Tranſlations of *Luther* and *Zwinglius* were abſolutely indefenſible; for what ſuch great difference is there between *Faith without the Works of the Law*, and *Faith alone without the Works of the Law*? or why does not, *Without*, *Alone*, ſignifie all one with, *Alone*, *Without*? Conſider the matter a little better, and obſerue the uſe of theſe phraſes of ſpeech in our ordinary talke, and perhaps you will begin to doubt whether you had ſufficient ground for this invectiue. And then for *Zwinglius*, if it bee true (as they ſay it is) that the language our Saviour ſpake in, had no ſuch word as, *To ſignifie*,

but uſed alwaies, *to be*, inſteed of it, as it is certain the Scripture does in a hundred places; then this Tranſlation, which you ſo declaim againſt, will prove no falſification in *Zwinglius*, but a calumny in you.

62 *But the faith of Proteſtants relies upon Scripture alone; Scripture is delivered to moſt of them by Tranſlations; Tranſlations depend upon the skill and honeſty of Men, who certainly may erre becauſe they are Men, and certainly doe erre, at leaſt ſome of them, becauſe their Tranſlations are contrary. It ſeemes then the Faith, and conſequently the Salvation of Proteſtants relies upon fallible and uncertaine grounds.*

63 This Objection, though it may ſeeme to doe you great ſervice for the preſent; yet I feare you will repent the time that ever you urged it againſt us as a fault, that we make mens ſalvation *depend upon uncertainties*. For the objection returnes upon you many waies, as firſt thus; The ſalvation of many millions of Papiſts (as they ſuppoſe and teach) depends upon their having the Sacrament of Pennance truly adminiſtred unto them. This again upon the Miniſter's being a true Prieſt. That ſuch or ſuch a man is Prieſt, not himſelfe, much leſſe any other can haue any poſſible certainty: for it depends upon a great many contingent and uncertain ſuppoſals. He that will pretend to be certain of it, muſt undertake to know for a certain all theſe things that follow.

64 Firſt that he was baptized with due Matter. Secondly, with the due forme of words, (which he cannot know, unleſſe he were both preſent and attentiue.) Thirdly, he muſt know that hee was baptiz'd with due Intention, and that is, that the Miniſter of his Baptiſme was not a ſecret Iew, nor a Moore, nor an Atheiſt, (of all which kinds, I feare experience giues you juſt cauſe to feare, that *Italy* and *Spaine* haue Prieſts not a few,) but a Chriſtian in heart, as well as Profeſſion; (otherwiſe believing the Sacrament to be nothing, in giving it he could intend to giue nothing,) nor a *Samoſatenian*, nor an *Arrian*: but one that was capable of having due intention, from which they that believe not the doctrine of the Trinity are excluded by you. And laſtly, that he was neither drunk nor diſtracted at the adminiſtration of the Sacrament, nor out of negligence or malice omitted his intention.

65 Fourthly, he muſt undertake to know, that the Biſhop which ordained him Prieſt, ordained him compleatly with due Matter, Form and Intention: and conſequently, that he againe was neither Iew, nor Moore, nor Atheiſt, nor lyable to any ſuch exception, as is unconſiſtent with due Intention in giving the Sacrament of Orders.

66 Fiftly, he muſt undertake to know, that the Biſhop which made him Prieſt, was a Prieſt himſelfe, for your rule is, *Nihil dat quod non habet*: And conſequently, that there was again none of the former nullities in his Baptiſme, which might make him incapable of Ordination; nor no invalidity in his Ordination, but a true Prieſt to ordaine him again, the requiſite matter and forme and due intention all concurring.

67 Laſtly, he muſt pretend to know the ſame of him that made him Prieſt, and him that made Him Prieſt, even untill he comes to the very foun-

fountain of Prieſthood. For take any one in the whole train & ſucceſſion of Ordainers, & ſuppoſe him, by reaſon of any defect, only a ſuppoſed & not a true Prieſt, then according to your doctrine he could not give a true, but only a ſuppoſed Prieſthood; and they that receive it of him, & again, they that derive it from thē, can give no better then they received; receiving nothing but a name and ſhadow, can give nothing but a name and ſhadow: and ſo from age to age, from generation to generation being equivocall Fathers, beget only equivocall Sons; No Principle in Geometry being more certain then this, That *the unſuppliable defect of any neceſſary Antecedent, muſt needs cauſe a nullity of all thoſe Conſequences which depend upon it.* In fine, to know this one thing, you muſt firſt know ten thouſand others, whereof not any one is a thing that can be known; there being no neceſſity that it ſhould be true, which only can qualify any thing for an object of Science, but only, at the beſt, a high degree of probability that it is ſo. But then, that of ten thouſand probables, no one ſhould be falſe; that of ten thouſand requiſites, whereof any one may faile, not one ſhould be wanting, this to mee is extreamly improbable, and even coſen german to Impoſſible. So that the aſſurance hereof is like a machine compoſed of an innumerable multitude of pieces, of which it is ſtrangely unlikely but ſome will be out of order; and yet if any one be ſo, the whole fabrick of neceſſity falls to the ground. And he that ſhall put together, and maturely conſider all the poſſible waies of lapſing, and nullifying a Prieſthood in the Church of Rome, I believe will be very inclinable to think, that it is an hundred to one, that amongſt a hundred ſeeming Prieſts, there is not one true one. Nay, that it is not a thing very improbable, that amongſt thoſe many millions, which make up the Romiſh Hierarchy, there are *not twenty* true. But be the truth in this what it will be, once this is certain, that They which make mens ſalvation (as you doe) depend upon Prieſtly Abſolution, and this again (as you doe) upon the Truth and reality of the Prieſthood that gives it, and this laſtly upon a great multitude of apparent uncertainties, are not the fitteſt men in the world, to object to others as a horrible crime, *That they make mens Salvation depend upon fallible and uncertain foundations.* And let this be the firſt retortion of your Argument.

68 But ſuppoſe this difficulty aſſoyled, and that an Angell from Heaven ſhould aſcertain you (for other aſſurances you can have none) that the perſon, you make uſe of, is a true Prieſt, and a competent Miniſter of the Sacrament of Pennance; yet ſtill the doubt will remain, whether he will doe you that good which he can doe, whether he will pronounce the abſolving words with intent to abſolve you! For perhaps he may bear you ſome ſecret malice, and project to himſelfe your damnation, for a compleat Italian revenge. Perhaps (as the tale is of a Prieſt that was lately burnt in France) he may upon ſome conditions have compacted with the Divell to give no Sacraments with Intention. Laſtly, he may be (for ought you can poſſibly know) a ſecret Iew, or Moore, or Anti-Trinitarian, or perhaps ſuch a one as is ſo farre from intending your forgiveneſſe of ſinnes and ſalvation by this Sacrament,

that in his heart he laughes at all theſe things, and thinkes Sinne nothing, and Salvation a word. All theſe doubts you muſt have cleerely reſolved (which can hardly be done but by another Revelatiõ,) before you can upon good grounds aſſure your ſelfe, that your true Prieſt gives you true and effectuall abſolution. So that when you have done as much as God requires for your Salvation, yet can you by no means be ſecure, but that you may have the ill luck to be damn'd: which is to make Salvation a matter of chaunce, and not of choice, and which a man may faile of, not only by an ill life, but by ill fortune. Verily a moſt comfortable Doctrine for a conſidering man lying upon death bed, who either feeles or feares that his repentance is but attritiõ only, and not contrition, and conſequently believes that if he be not abſolved really by a true Prieſt, he cannot poſſibly eſcape damnation. Such a man for his comfort, you tell, firſt (you that will have *mens ſalvation depend upon no uncertainties,*) that though he verily believe that his ſorrow for ſinnes is a true ſorrow, and his purpoſe of amendment a true purpoſe; yet he may deceive himſelfe, perhaps it is not, and if it be not, he muſt be damned. Yet you bid him hope well: But *Spes eſt rei incertæ nomen.* You tell him ſecondly, that though the party he confeſſes to, ſeem to be a true Prieſt, yet for ought he knowes, or for ought himſelfe knowes, by reaſon of ſome ſecret undiſcernable invalidity in his Baptiſme or Ordination, he may be none: and if he be none, he can doe nothing. This is a hard ſaying, but this is not the worſt. You tell him thirdly, that he may be in ſuch a ſtate that he cannot, or if he can, that he will not give the Sacrament with due Intention: and if he does not, all's in vaine. Put caſe a man by theſe conſiderations ſhould be caſt into ſome agonies; what adviſe, what comfort would you give him? Verily I know not what you could ſay to him, but this; that firſt for the Qualification required on his part, he might know that he deſired to have true ſorrow, and that that is ſufficient. But then if he ſhould aske you, why he might not know his ſorrow to be a true ſorrow, as well as his deſire to be ſorrowfull, to be a true deſire, I believe you would be put to ſilence. Then ſecondly, to quiet his feares, concerning the Prieſt and his intention you ſhould tell him, by my advice, that Gods goodneſſe (which will not ſuffer him to damne men for not doing better then their beſt,) will ſupply all ſuch defects as to humane endeavours were unavoidable. And therefore though his Prieſt were indeed no Prieſt, yet to him he ſhould be as if he were one: and if he gave Abſolution without Intention, yet in doing ſo he ſhould hurt himſelfe only and not his penitent. This were ſome comfort indeed, and this were to ſettle mens ſalvation upon reaſonable certain grounds. But this I fear you will never ſay; for this were to reverſe many Doctrines eſtabliſhed by your Church, and beſides to degrade your Prieſthood from a great part of their honour, by leſſening the ſtrict neceſſity of the Laities dependance upon them. For it were to ſay, that *the Prieſts Intention is not neceſſary to the obtaining of abſolution*; which is to ſay, that it is not in the Parſons power to damne whom he will in his Pariſh, becauſe by this rule, God ſhould ſupply the

the defect which his malice had cauſed. And beſides it were to ſay, that *Infants dying without Baptiſme might be ſaved*, God ſupplying the want of baptiſme which to them is unavoidable. But beyond all this, it were to put into my mouth a full and ſatisfying anſwere to your Argument, which I am now returning, ſo that in anſwering my objection you ſhould anſwer your own. For then I ſhould tell you, that it were altogether as abhorrent from the goodneſſe of God, and as repugnant to it, to ſuffer an ignorant Lay-mans ſoule to periſh, meerely for being miſled by an undiſcernable falſe Tranſlation, which yet was commended to him by the Church, which (being of neceſſity to credit ſome in this matter) he had reaſon to rely upon either above all other, or as much as any other, as it is to damne a penitent ſinner for a ſecret defect in that deſired Abſolution, which his Ghoſtly Father perhaps was an Atheiſt and could not give him, or was a villain and would not. This anſwere therefore, which alone would ſerve to comfort your penitent in his perplexities, and to aſſure him that he cannot faile of Salvation if he will not, for feare of inconveniences you muſt forbeare. And ſeeing you muſt, I hope you will come down from the Pulpit, and preach no more againſt others for *making mens Salvation depend upon fallible and uncertain grounds*, leaſt by judging others, you make your ſelves and your own Church inexcuſable, who are ſtrongly guilty of this fault, above all the men and Churches of the World: whereof I have already given you two very pregnant demonſtrations, drawn from your preſumptions tying God and Salvation to your Sacraments; And the efficacy of them to your Prieſts Qualifications and Intentions.

69 Your making the Salvation of Infants depend on Baptiſme a Caſuall thing, and in the power of man to conferre, or not conferre, would yeild me a Third of the ſame nature. And your ſuſpending the ſame on the Baptizer's intention a Fourth. And laſtly your making the Reall preſence of Chriſt in the Euchariſt depend upon the caſualties of the conſecrators true Prieſthood and Intention, and yet commanding men to believe it for certain that he is preſent, and to adore the Sacrament, which according to your Doctrine, for ought they can poſſibly know, may be nothing elſe but a piece of bread, ſo expoſing them to the danger of Idolatry, and conſequently of damnation, doth offer me a Fift demonſtration of the ſame concluſion, if I thought fit to inſiſt upon them. But I have no mind to draw any more out of this Fountaine; neither doe I think it charity to cloy the Reader with uniformity, when the ſubject affords variety.

70 Sixtly, therefore I returne it thus. The faith of Papiſts relyes alone upon their Churches infallibility. That there is any Church infallible, and that Theirs is it, they pretend not to believe, but only upon *prudentiall motives*. Dependance upon prudentiall motives they confeſſe to be obnoxious to a poſſibility of erring. What then remaineth but Truth, Faith, Salvation, and all muſt in them rely upon a fallible and uncertain ground!

71 Seventhly, The faith of Papiſts relies upon the Church alone.

The

The Doctrine of the Church is delivered to moſt of them by their Pariſh Prieſt, or Ghoſtly Father, or at leaſt by a company of Prieſts, who for the moſt part ſure, are men and not Angels, in whom nothing is more certain then a moſt certain poſſibility to erre. What then remaineth but that Truth, Faith, Salvation and all, muſt in them rely upon a fallible and uncertain ground.

72 Eightly thus. It is apparent and undeniable, that many Thouſands there are, who believe your Religion upon no better grounds, then a man may have for the beliefe almoſt of any Religion. As ſome believe it, becauſe their forefathers did ſo, and they were good People. Some, becauſe they were Chriſtened, and brought up in it. Some, becauſe many Learned and Religious men are of it. Some, becauſe it is the Religion of their Country, where all other Religions are perſecuted and proſcribed. Some, becauſe Proteſtants cannot ſhew a perpetuall ſucceſſion of Profeſſors of all their Doctrine. Some, becauſe the ſervice of your Church is more ſtately, and pompous, & magnificent. Some, becauſe they find comfort in it. Some, becauſe your Religion is farther ſpread, and hath more profeſſors of it, then the Religion of Proteſtants. Some, becauſe *your Prieſts compaſſe Sea and Land to gain Proſelytes to it.* Laſtly, an infinite number, by chance, and they know not why, but only becauſe they are ſure they are in the right. This which I ſay is a moſt certain experimented truth, and if you will deale ingenuouſly, you will not deny it. And without queſtion he that builds his faith upon our *Engliſh Tranſlation*, goes upon a more prudent ground then any of theſe can, with reaſon, be pretended to be. What then can you alleadge but that, with you, rather then with us, Truth and Faith and Salvation and all relies upon fallible and uncertain grounds.

73 Ninthly. Your *Rhemiſh* and *Doway* Tranſlations are delivered to your Proſelytes, (ſuch I mean that are diſpenc'd with for the reading of them,) for the direction of their Faith and lives. And the ſame may be ſaid of your Tranſlations of the Bible into other nationall languages, in reſpect of thoſe that are licenc'd to read them. This I preſume you will confeſſe. And moreover, that theſe Tranſlations came not by inſpiration, but were the productions of humane Induſtry; and that not Angels, but men were the Authors of them. Men I ſay, meere men, ſubject to the ſame Paſſions and to the ſame poſſibility of erring with our Tranſlatours. And then how does it not unavoidably follow, that in them which depend upon theſe tranſlations for their direction, Faith, and Truth, and Salvation, and all relies upon fallible and uncertain grounds?

74 Tenthly and laſtly (to lay the axe to the root of the tree,) the *Helena* which you ſo fight for, your vulgar Tranſlation, though ſome of you believe, or pretend to believe, it to be in every part and particle of it, the pure and uncorrupted word of God; yet others among you, and thoſe as good & zealous Catholiques as you, are not ſo confident hereof.

75 Firſt, for all thoſe who have made Tranſlations of the whole Bible

Bible or any part of it different many times in ſenſe from the Vulgar, as *Lyranus, Cajetan, Pagnine, Arias, Eraſmus, Valla, Steuchus*, and others, it is apparent and even palpable, that they never dreamt of any abſolute perfection and authenticall infallibility of the *Vulgar Tranſlation*. For if they had, why did they in many places reject it and differ from it?

76 *Vega* was preſent at the Councell of *Trent*, when that decree was made, which made the *Vulgar Edition* (then not extant any where in the world) *authenticall*, and not to be rejected upon any pretenſe whatſoever. At the forming this decree *Vega* I ſay was preſent, underſtood the mind of the Councell, as well as any man, and profeſſes that he was inſtructed in it by the *Preſident* of it, the *Cardinall S. Cruce*. And yet he hath written that *the Councell in this decree, meant to pronounce this Tranſlation free* (not ſimply from all error) *but only from ſuch errors, out of which any opinion pernitious to faith and manners might be collected*. This, *Andradius* in his defence of that Councell reports of *Vega*, and aſſents to it himſelfe. *Driedo*, in his *book of the Tranſlation of Holy Scripture*, hath theſe words very pregnant and pertinent to the ſame purpoſe; *The See Apoſtolike, hath approved or accepted Hieroms Edition, not as ſo wholly conſonant to the Originall, and ſo entire and pure and reſtored in all things, that it may not be lawfull for any man, either by comparing it with the Fountaine to examine it, or in ſome places to doubt, whether or no Hierome did underſtand the true ſenſe of the Scripture; but only as an Edition to be prefer'd before all others then extant, and no where deviating from the truth in the rules of faith and good life*. *Mariana*, even where he is a moſt earneſt Advocate for the Vulgar Edition, yet acknowledges the imperfection of it in theſe words, *The faults of the Vulgar Edition are not approved by the Decree of the Councell of Trent, a multitude whereof we did collect from the variety of Copies*. And againe, *We maintaine that the Hebrew and Greeke, were by no meanes rejected by the Trent Fathers: And that the Latine edition is indeed approved, yet not ſo, as if they did deny that ſome places might be tranſlated more plainly, ſome more properly; whereof it were eaſy to produce innumerable examples*. And this he there profeſſes to have *learnt of Laines the then Generall of the Society*: who was a great part of that Councell, preſent at all the Actions of it, and of very great authority in it. *Pro Edit. vulg. c. 21. p. 99.*

77 To this ſo great authority he addes a reaſon of his opinion, which with all indifferent men will be of a farre greater authority. *If the Councell* (ſaith he) *had purpoſed to approve an Edition in all reſpects, and to make it of equall authority and credit with the Fountaines, certainly they ought with exact care firſt to have corrected the errors of the Interpreter*: which certainly they did not.

78 Laſtly *Bellarmine* himſelfe, though he will not acknowledge any imperfection in the Vulgar Edition, yet he acknowledges that the caſe may, and does oft-times ſo fall out, that *it is impoſſible to diſcerne which is the true reading of the Vulgar Edition, but only by recourſe unto the Originalls, and dependance upon them*. *Bell. de verbo Dei l. 2. c. 11. p. 120.*

79 From all which it may evidently be collected, that though ſome of you flatter your ſelves with a vain imagination of the certain abſolute purity and perfection of your Vulgar Edition; yet the matter is not ſo certain, and ſo reſolved, but that the beſt learned men amongſt you are often at a ſtand, and very doubtfull ſometimes whether your Vulgar tranſlation be true, and ſometimes whether this or that be your Vulgar Tranſlatiõ, & ſometimes undoubtedly reſolved that your Vulgar Tranſlation is no true Tranſlation, nor conſonant to the Originall, as it was at firſt delivered. And what thé can be alleadged, but that out of your own grounds it may be inferred & inforced upon you, that not only in your Lay-men, but your Clergy men & Schollers, Faith & Truth and Salvation & all depends upon fallible & uncertain grounds? And thus by ten ſeverall retortions of this one Argument, I have endeavoured to ſhew you, how ill you have complyed with your own adviſe, which was *to take heed of urging arguments that might be return'd upon you.* I ſhould now by a direct anſwer, ſhew that it preſſeth not us at all: but I have in paſſing done it already, in the end of the ſecond retortion of this argument, and thither I referre the Reader.

80 Whereas therefore, you exhort them *that will have aſſurance of true Scriptures, to fly to your Church for it*: I deſire to know (if they ſhould follow your adviſe) how they ſhould be aſſured that your Church can give them any ſuch aſſurance; which hath been *confeſſedly* ſo negligent, as to ſuffer many *whole books of Scripture* to be utterly loſt. Again, in thoſe that remain, confeſſedly ſo negligent, as to ſuffer *the Originalls of theſe that remain to be corrupted.* And laſtly, ſo careleſſe of preſerving the integrity of the Copies of her Tranſlation, as to ſuffer *infinite variety of Readings* to come in to them, without keeping *any one perfect Copy*, which might have been as the Standard, and *Polycletus* his Canon to correct the reſt by. So that which was the true reading, and which the falſe, it was utterly undiſcernable, but only by comparing them with the Originalls, which alſo ſhe pretends *to be corrupted.*

81 But *Luther himſelfe, by unfortunate experience, was at length enforced to confeſſe thus much, ſaying, If the world laſt longer, it will be again neceſſary to receive the Decrees of Councells, by reaſon of divers interpretations of Scripture which now reigne.*

82 And what if *Luther*, having a *Pope in his belly*, (as he was wont to ſay that moſt men had,) and deſiring perhaps to have his own interpretations paſſe without examining, ſpake ſuch words in heat of Argument? Doe you think it reaſonable that we ſhould ſubſcribe to *Luther's* divinations and angry ſpeeches? will you oblige your ſelfe to anſwer for all the aſſertions of your private Doctors? If not; why doe you trouble us with what *Luther* ſaies, and what *Calvin* ſaies? Yet this I ſay not, as if theſe words of *Luther* made any thing at all for your preſent purpoſe. For what if he feared, or pretended to feare, that, the infallibility of Councells being rejected, ſome men would fall into greater errors, then were impos'd upon them by the Councells? Is this to confeſſe that there is any preſent viſible Church, upon whoſe

whoſe bare Authority we may infallibly receive the true Scriptures and the true ſenſe of them? Let the Reader judge. But in my opinion, to feare a greater inconvenience may follow from the avoiding of the leſſe, is not to confeſſe that the leſſe is none at all.

83 For D. *Covels commending your Tranſlation*, what is it to the buſineſſe in hand? or how proves it the perfection of it, which is here conteſted, any more then S. *Auguſtine's* commending the Italian Tranſlation, argues the perfection of that, or that there was no neceſſity that S. *Hierome* ſhould correct it? D. *Covell* commends your Tranſlation, and ſo does the *Biſhop of Chicheſter*, and ſo does *D. Iames*, and ſo doe I. But I commend it for a *good* Tranſlation, not for a *perfect*. Good may be good, and deſerve commendations; and yet better may be better. And though he ſaies, that *the then approved Tranſlation of the Church of England, is that which cõmeth neareſt the Vulgar*, yet he does not ſay, that it agrees exactly with it. So that whereas you inferre, *that the truth of your Tranſlation muſt be the Rule to judge of the goodneſſe of ours*: this is but a vain floriſh. For to ſay of our Tranſlations, That is the beſt which comes neareſt the Vulgar, (and yet it is but one man that ſaies ſo,) is not to ſay, it is therefore the beſt becauſe it does ſo. For this may be true by accident, and yet the truth of our Tranſlation no way depend upon the truth of yours. For had that been their direction, they would not only have made a Tranſlation that ſhould come neere to yours, but ſuch a one which ſhould exactly agree with it, and be a Tranſlation of your Tranſlation.

84 *Ad* 17. §. In this Diviſion you charge us *with great uncertainty, concerning the true meaning of Scripture*. Which hath been anſwered already, by ſaying, That if you ſpeak of plain places, (and in ſuch all things neceſſary are contained,) we are ſufficiently certain of the meaning of them, neither need they any Interpreter. If of obſcure and difficult places, we confeſſe we are uncertaine of the ſenſe of many of them. But then we ſay there is no neceſſity we ſhould be certain. For if Gods will had been we ſhould haue underſtood him more certainly, he would haue ſpoken more plainly. And we ſay beſides, that as we are uncertain, ſo are You too; which he that doubts of, let him read your Commentators upon the Bible, and obſerue their various and diſſonant interpretations, and he ſhall in this point need no further ſatisfaction.

85 But ſeeing *there are contentions among us, we are taught by nature and Scripture, and experience* (ſo you tell us out of M. *Hooker*) *to ſeek for the ending of them, by ſubmitting unto ſome Iudiciall ſentence, whereunto neither part may refuſe to ſtand*. This is very true. Neither ſhould you need to perſuade us to ſeek ſuch a meanes of ending all our Controverſies, if we could tell where to finde it. But this wee know, that none is fit to pronounce, for all the world, a judiciall definitiue obliging ſentence in Controverſies of Religion, but only ſuch a Man, or ſuch a ſociety of Men, as is authoriz'd thereto by God. And beſides we are able to demonſtrate, that it hath not been the pleaſure of God to giue to any Man, or Society of Men any ſuch authority. And there-

fore though we wiſh heartily that all Controverſies were ended, as we doe that all ſinne were aboliſht, yet we haue little hope of the one, or the other, till the World be ended. And in the mean while, think it beſt to content our ſelues with, and to perſuade others unto an *Vnity of Charity and mutuall toleration*; ſeeing God hath authoriz'd no man to force all men to *Vnity of Opinion*. Neither doe we think it fit to argue thus, To us it ſeemes convenient there ſhould be one Iudge of all Controverſies for the whole world, therefore God has appointed one: But more modeſt and more reaſonable to collect thus, God hath appointed no ſuch Iudge of Controverſies, therefore, though it ſeemes to us convenient there ſhould be one, yet it is not ſo: Or though it were convenient for us to haue one, yet it hath pleaſed God (for Reaſons beſt known to himſelfe) not to allow us this convenience.

86 D. *Fields* words which follow, I confeſſe, are ſomewhat more preſſing: and if he had been infallible, and the words had not ſlipt unadviſedly from him, they were the beſt Argument in your Book. But yet it is evident out of his Book, & ſo acknowledg'd by ſome of your own, That he never thought of any one company of Chriſtians inveſted with ſuch authority from God, that all men were bound to receiue their Decrees without examination, though they ſeem contrary to Scripture and Reaſon, which the Church of Rome requires. And therefore if he haue in his Preface ſtrained too high in cõmendation of the ſubject he writes of, (as Writers very often doe in their Prefaces and Dedicatory Epiſtles) what is that to us? Beſides, by *all the Societies of the World*, it is not impoſſible, nor very improbable, hee might meane all that are, or haue been in the world, and ſo include even the *Primitiue Church*: and her Communion we ſhall embrace, her Direction we ſhall follow, her Iudgement we ſhall reſt in, if wee belieue the Scripture, endeavour to finde the true ſenſe of it, and liue according to it.

87 *Ad* 18. §. That the true Interpretation of the Scripture ought to be receaved from the Church, you need not prove, for it is very eaſily granted by them, who profeſſe themſelves very ready to receiue all Truths, much more the true ſenſe of Scripture, not only from the Church, but from any ſocietie of men, nay from any man whatſoever.

88 That the *Churches Interpretation of Scripture is alwaies true*, that is it which you would haue ſaid: and that in ſome ſenſe may bee alſo admitted. *viz.* if you ſpeake of that Church (which before you ſpake of in the 14. §.) that is, of the Church of all Ages ſince the Apoſtles. Vpon the Tradition of which Church, you there told us, *We were to receiue the Scripture, and to belieue it to bee the Word of God.* For there you teach us, that *our Faith of Scripture depends on a Principle which requires no other proofe*. And that, *ſuch is Tradition, which from hand to hand, and age to age bringing us up to the Times and Perſons of the Apoſtles and our Saviour himſelfe, commeth to be confirmed by all thoſe Miracles, and other Arguments whereby they convinced their Doctrine to be true.* Wherefore the Ancient Fathers avouch that wee muſt receiue the ſacred Scripture upon the Tradition of this Church.

The

The Tradition then of this Church you ſay muſt teach us what is Scripture: and we are willing to believe it. And now if you make it good unto us, that the ſame Tradition down from the Apoſtles, hath delivered from age to age, and from hand to hand, any interpretation of any Scripture, we are ready to embrace that alſo. But now, if you will argue thus: The Church in one ſenſe, tells us what is Scripture, & we believe, therefore if the Church taken in another ſenſe, tell us, this or that is the meaning of the Scripture, we are to believe that alſo; this is too tranſparent Sophiſtrie, to take any but thoſe that are willing to be taken.

89 If there be any Traditive Interpretation of Scripture, produce it, and proue it to be ſo; and we embrace it. But the Tradition of all ages is one thing; and the authority of the preſent Church, much more of the Roman Church, which is but a Part, and a corrupted Part of the Catholique Church, is another. And therefore though we are ready to receiue both Scripture and the ſenſe of Scripture upon the authority of *Originall Tradition*, yet we receiue neither the one, nor the other, upon the Authority of your Church.

90 Firſt for the Scripture, how can wee receiue them upon the Authority of your Church: who hold now thoſe Books to be Canonicall, which formerly you rejected from the Canon? I inſtance, in the *Book of Macchabees*, and the *Epiſtle to the Hebrews*. The firſt of theſe you held not to be Canonicall in *S. Gregories* time, or elſe hee was no member of your Church, for it is apparent [a] He held otherwiſe. The ſecond you rejected from the Canon in S. *Hieroms* time, as it is euident out of [b] many places of his Works.

[a] See *Greg. Mor. l. 19. c. 13.*

[b] Thus he teſtifies. *Com in Eſa. c. 6.* in theſe words. *Unde & Paulus Apoſt. in Epiſt. ad Heb. quam Latina conſuetudo non recipit* and again in c. 8. in theſe, *In Ep. quæ ad Hebræos ſcribitur. (licet eam Latina Conſuetudo inter Canonicas Scripturas nō recipiat.) &c.*

91 If you ſay (which is all you can ſay) that *Herom ſpake this of the particular Roman Church, not of the Roman Catholique Church*; I anſwer, there was none ſuch in his time, None that was called ſo. Secondly, what he ſpake of the Roman Church, muſt be true of all other Churches, if your Doctrine of the neceſſity of the Conformity of all other Churches to that Church were then Catholique Doctrine. Now then chooſe whether you will, either that the particular Roman Church, was not then beleived to be the Miſtreſſe of all other Churches (notwithſtanding, *Ad hanc Eccleſiam neceſſe eſt omnem conuenire Eccleſiam, hoc eſt, omnes qui ſunt undiq; fideles*; which Card. *Perron*, and his *Tranſlatreſſe* ſo often tranſlates falſe:) Or if you ſay ſhee was, you will runne into a greater inconvenience, and be forced to ſay, that all the Churches of that time, rejected from the Canon the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, together with the Roman Church. And conſequently that the Catholique Church may erre in rejecting from the Canon Scriptures truly Canonicall.

92 Secondly, How can we receive the Scripture upon the authority of the Roman Church, which hath delivered at ſeverall times Scriptures in many places, different and repugnant, for Authenticall & Canonicall? Which is moſt evident out of the place of *Malachie*, which is ſo quoted for the Sacrifice of the Maſſe, that either all the ancient Fathers had falſe Bibles, or yours is falſe. Moſt evident likewiſe

wiſe from the comparing of the ſtory of *Iacob* in *Geneſis*, with that which is cited out of it, in the *Epiſtle to the Hebrewes*, according to the vulgar Edition. But aboue all, to any one, who ſhall compare the Bibles of *Sixtus* and *Clement*, ſo evident, that the wit of man cannot diſguiſe it.

93 And thus you ſee what reaſon we haue to belieue your Antecedent, *That your Church it is which muſt declare, what Books bee true Scripture.* Now for the conſequence, that certainty is as liable to exception as the Antecedent. For if it were true, that God had promiſed to aſſiſt you, for the delivering of true Scripture, would this oblige Him, or would it follow from hence that He had oblig'd himſelfe, to teach you, not only ſufficiently, but *effectually* and *irreſiſtibly* the true ſenſe of Scripture? God is not defectiue in things neceſſary: neither will he leave himſelfe without witneſſe, nor the World without meanes of knowing his will and doing it. And therefore it was neceſſary that by his Providence he ſhould preſerve the Scripture from any undiſcernable corruptiõ, in thoſe things which he would haue known: otherwiſe it is apparent, it had not been his will, that theſe things ſhould be known, the only meanes of continuing the knowledge of them being periſhed. But now neither is God laviſh in ſuperfluities, and therefore having given us meanes ſufficient for our direction, and power ſufficient to make uſe of theſe meanes, he will not conſtraine or neceſſitate us to make uſe of theſe meanes. For that were to croſſe the end of our Creation, which was to be glorified by our free obedience: whereas neceſſity and freedome cannot ſtand together. That were to reverſe the Law which he hath preſcribed to himſelfe in his dealing with men, and that is, *to ſet life and death before him, and to leaue him in the hands of his own Counſell.* God gaue the Wiſemen a Starre to lead them to *Chriſt*, but he did not neceſſitate them to follow the guidance of this ſtarre: that was left to their liberty. God gaue the Children of *Iſrael a Fire to lead them by night, and a Pillar of Cloud by day*, but he conſtrained no man to follow them: that was left to their liberty. So he giues the Church, the Scripture: which in thoſe things which are to be believed or done, are plain and eaſie to be follow'd, like the Wiſe men's Starre. Now that which he deſires of us on our part, is the Obedience of Faith, and loue of the Truth, and deſire to finde the true ſenſe of it, and induſtry in ſearching it, and humility in following, and Conſtancy in profeſſing it: all which if he ſhould work in us by an abſolute irreſiſtible neceſſity, he could no more require of us, as our duty, then he can of the Sunne to ſhine, of the Sea to ebb & flowe, and of all other Creatures to doe thoſe things which by meere neceſſity they muſt doe, and cannot chooſe. Beſides, what an impudence is it to pretend that *your Church is infallibly directed concerning the true meaning of the Scripture*, whereas there are thouſands of places of Scripture, which you doe not pretend certainly to underſtand, and about the Interpretation whereof, your own Doctors differ among themſelues? If your Church be infallibly directed concerning the true meaning of Scripture, why doe not your Doctors follow her infallible direction?

And

And if they doe, how comes ſuch difference among them in their Interpretations ?

94 Again, why does your Church thus put her candle under a Buſhell, and keep her Talent of interpreting Scripture infallibly, thus long wrapt up in napkins ? Why ſets ſhe not forth Infallible Commentaries or Expoſitions upon all the Bible ? Is it becauſe this would not be profitable for Chriſtians, that Scripture ſhould be Interpreted? It is blaſphemous to ſay ſo. The Scripture it ſelfe tells us, *All Scripture is profitable*. And the Scripture is not ſo much the Words as the Senſe. And if it be not profitable, why does ſhee imploy particular Doctors to interpret Scriptures fallibly? unleſſe we muſt think that fallible Interpretations of Scripture are profitable, and infallible interpretations would not be ſo?

95 If you ſay *the Holy Ghoſt, which aſſiſts the Church in interpreting, will move the Church to interpret when he ſhall think fit, and that the Church will doe it when the Holy Ghoſt ſhall move her to doe it:* I demand whether the Holy Ghoſt's moving of the Church to ſuch works as theſe be reſiſtible by the Church, or irreſiſtible. If reſiſtible, then the Holy Ghoſt may move, and the Church may not be moved. As certainly the Holy Gheſt doth alwaies move to an action, when he ſhewes us plainly that it would be for the good of men, and honour of God. As he that hath any ſenſe will acknowledge that an infallible expoſition of Scripture could not but be, and there is nō conceivable reaſon, why ſuch a work ſhould be put off a day, but only becauſe you are conſcious to your ſelves, you cannot doe it, and therefore make excuſes. But if the moving of the Holy Ghoſt be irreſiſtible, and you are not yet ſo mov'd to goe about this work; then I confeſſe you are excuſed. But then I would know, whether thoſe Popes which ſo long deferred the calling of a Councell for the Reformation of your Church, at length pretended to be effected by the Councell of Trent, whether they may excuſe themſelves, for that they were not moved by the Holy Ghoſt to doe it? I would know likewiſe, as this motion is irreſiſtible when it comes, ſo whether it be ſo ſimply neceſſary to the moving of your Church to any ſuch publique Action, that it cannot poſſibly move without it? That is, whether the Pope now could not, if he would, ſeat himſelfe *in Cathedra*, and fall to writing expoſitions upon the Bible for the directions of Chriſtians to the true ſenſe of it? If you ſay he cannot, you will make your ſelfe ridiculous. If he can, then I would know, whether he ſhould be infallibly directed in theſe expoſitions, or no? If he ſhould, then what need he to ſtay for irreſiſtible motion? Why does he not goe about this noble worke preſently? If he ſhould not, How ſhall we know that the calling of the Councell of Trent was not upon his own voluntary motion, or upon humane importunity and ſuggeſtion, and not upon the motion of the Holy Ghoſt? And conſequently how ſhall we know whether he were aſſiſtant to it or no, ſeeing he aſſiſts none but what he himſelfe moves to? And whether he did move the Pope to call this Councell, is a ſecret thing, which we cannot poſſibly know, nor perhaps the Pope himſelfe.

96 If you ſay, your meaning is only, *That the Church ſhall be infallibly guarded from giving any falſe ſenſe of any Scripture, and not infallibly aſſiſted poſitively to give the true ſenſe of all Scripture*: I put to you your own Queſtion, why ſhould we believe the Holy Ghoſt will ſtay there? Or, why may we not as well think he will ſtay at the firſt thing, that is, in teaching the Church what Bookes be true Scripture? For if the Holy Ghoſts aſſiſtance be promiſed to all things profitable, then will he be with them infallibly, not only to guard them from all errors, but to guide them to all profitable truths, ſuch as the true ſenſes of all Scripture would be. Neither could he ſtay there, but defend them irreſiſtibly from all Vices; Nor there neither, but infuſe into them irreſiſtibly all Vertues: for all theſe things would be much for the benefit of Chriſtians. If you ſay, he cannot doe this without taking away their free will in living; I ſay neither can he neceſſitate men to believe aright, without taking away their freewill in believing and in profeſſing their belief.

97 To the place of S. *Auſtine*, I anſwere, That not the authority of the preſent Church, much leſſe of a Part of it (as the Roman Church is) was that which alone mov'd Saint *Auſtine* to believe the Goſpell, but the perpetuall Tradition of the Church of all Ages. Which you your ſelfe have taught us to be the *only Principle by which the Scripture is prov'd, and which it ſelfe needs no proof*; and to which you have referred this very ſaying of S. *Auſtine*, *Ego vero Evangelio non crederem niſi &c. p.* 55. And in the next place which you cite out of his book *De Vtil. Cred. c.* 14. he ſhewes, that his *motives to believe, were, Fame, Celebrity, Conſent, Antiquity*. And ſeeing this Tradition, this Conſent, this Antiquity did as fully and powerfully move him not to believe *Manichæus*, as to believe the Goſpell, (the Chriſtian Tradition being as full againſt *Manichæus* as it was for the Goſpell) therefore he did well to conclude upon theſe grounds, that he had as much reaſon to disbelieve *Manichæus*, as to believe the Goſpell. Now if you can truly ſay, that the ſame Fame, Celebrity, Conſent, Antiquity, that the ſame Vniverſall and Originall Tradition, lyes againſt *Luther* and *Calvin*, as did againſt *Manichæus*, you may doe well to apply the Argument againſt them; otherwiſe it will be to little purpoſe to ſubſtitute their names in ſteade of *Manichæus*, unleſſe you can ſhew the thing agrees to them as well as him.

98 If you ſay, that S. *Auſtin ſpeakes here of the authority of the Preſent Church, abſtracting from conſent with the Ancient*, and therefore you, ſeeing you have the preſent Church on your ſide againſt *Luther* and *Calvin*, as S. *Auſtin* againſt *Manichæus*, may urge the ſame words againſt them which S. *Auſtin* did againſt him;

99 I anſwer, Firſt that it is a vaine preſumption of yours that the *Catholique Church is of your ſide*. Secondly, that if S. *Auſtine* ſpeake here of that preſent Church, which moved him to believe the Goſpel, without conſideration of the Antiquity of it, & its both Perſonall and Doctrinall ſucceſſion from the Apoſtles; His argument will be like a *Buskin* that will ſerve any legge. It will ſerve to keepe an *Arrian*, or a

Grecian

Grecian from being a Roman Catholique, as well as a Catholique from being an *Arrian*, or a *Grecian*? In as much as the *Arrians* and *Grecians*, did pretend to the title of Catholiques, and the Church, as much as the Papiſts now doe. If then you ſhould haue come to an ancient *Goth* or *Vandall*, whom the *Arrians* converted to Chriſtianity, and ſhould haue mov'd him to your Religion; might he not ſay the very ſame words to you as *S. Auſtin* to the *Manichæans*? *I would not beleive the Goſpell, unleſſe the authority of the Church did move me. Them therefore whom I obeyed, ſaying beleive the Goſpell, why ſhould I not obey ſaying to me, doe not beleive the Homoouſians? Chooſe what thou pleaſeſt: if thou ſhalt ſay beleive the Arrians, they warne me not to give any credit to you. If therefore I beleive them, I cannot beleive thee. If thou ſay doe not beleive the Arrians, thou ſhalt not doe well to force me to the faith of the Homoouſians, becauſe by the preaching of the Arrians I beleived the Goſpell it ſelfe. If you ſay, you did well to beleive them, commending the Goſpell, but you did not well to beleive them diſcommending the Homoouſians: Doeſt thou think me ſo very fooliſh, that without any reaſon at all, I ſhould beleive what thou wilt, and not beleive what thou wilt not?* It were eaſie to put theſe words into the mouth of a *Grecian*, *Abyſſine*, *Georgian*, or any other of any Religion. And I pray bethinke your ſelves, what you would ſay to ſuch a one in ſuch a caſe, and imagine that we ſay the very ſame to you.

100 Whereas you aske, *Whether Proteſtants doe not perfectly reſemble thoſe men to whom S. Auſtine ſpake, when they will have men to believe the Roman Church delivering Scripture, but not to believe her condemning Luther?* I demand againe, whether you be well in your wits to ſay, that Proteſtants would have men believe the Roman Church delivering Scripture, whereas they accuſe her to deliver many bookes for Scripture which are not ſo? and doe not bid men to receive any book which ſhe delivers, for that reaſon, becauſe ſhe delivers it? And if you meant only, Proteſtants will have men to believe ſome bookes to be Scripture which the Roman Church delivers for ſuch, may not we then aske, as you doe, Doe not Papiſts perfectly reſemble theſe men, which will have men believe the Church of England delivering Scripture, but not to believe her condemning the Church of Rome?

101 And whereas you ſay *S. Auſtine may ſeeme to have ſpoken Prophetically againſt Proteſtants, when he ſaid, Why ſhould I not moſt diligently enquire, what Chriſt commanded, of them before all others, by whoſe Authority I was moved to believe, that Chriſt Commanded any good thing?* I anſwer. Vntill you can ſhew that Proteſtants believe that Chriſt commanded any good thing, that is, That they believe the truth of Chriſtian Religion upon the Authority of the Church of Rome, this place muſt be wholly impertinent to your purpoſe; which is to make Proteſtants believe your Church to be the infallible expounder of Scriptures and judge of Controverſies: nay rather is it not directly againſt your purpoſe? For why may not a member of the Church of England, who received his baptiſme, education and Faith

from the Miniſtery of this Church, ſay juſt ſo to you as S. *Auſtine* here to the Manichees? Why ſhould I not moſt diligently inquire, what Chriſt commanded, of them (the Church of England) before all others, by whoſe Authority I was mov'd to believe, that Chriſt commanded any good thing, Can you, F. or K. or whoſoever you are, better declare to me what he ſaid, whom I would not have thought to have been or to be, if the belief thereof had been recommended by you to me? This therefore (that *Chriſt Ieſus* did thoſe miracles, and taught that Doctrine which is contained evidently in the undoubted Bookes of the New Teſtament) I believed by Fame, ſtrengthned with Celebrity & Conſent, (even of thoſe which in other things are at infinite variance one with another,) and laſtly by Antiquity (which gives an univerſall and a conſtant atteſtation to them). But every one may ſee that you, ſo few (in compariſon of all thoſe upon whoſe conſent we ground our belief of Scripture,) ſo turbulent, (that you damne all to the fire, and to Hell, that any way differ from you; that you profeſſe it is lawfull for you, to uſe violence and power whenſoever you can have it, for the planting of your own doctrine, and the extirpation of the contrary;) laſtly ſo new in many of your Doctrines, (as in the lawfulneſſe, and expedience of debarring the Laity the Sacramentall Cup; the lawfulneſſe and expedience of your Latine Service, Tranſubſtantiation, Indulgences, Purgatory, the Popes infallibility, his Authority over Kings &c.) ſo new I ſay, in compariſon of the undoubted bookes of Scripture, which evidently containeth, or rather is our Religion, and the ſole, and adequate object of our faith: I ſay every one may ſee that you, ſo few, ſo turbulent, ſo new, can produce nothing deſerving Authority (with wiſe and conſiderate men). What madneſſe is this? Believe them the conſent of Chriſtians which are now, and have been ever ſince Chriſt in the World, that we ought to believe Chriſt; but learn of us what Chriſt ſaid, which contradict and damne all other parts of Chriſtendome. Why I beſeech you? Surely if they were not at all, and could not teach me any thing, I would more eaſily perſwade my ſelfe, that I were not to believe in Chriſt, then that I ſhould learn any thing concerning him, from any other, then them by whom I believed him: at leaſt, then that I ſhould learn what his Religion was from you, who have wronged ſo exceedingly his Miracles and his Doctrine, by forging ſo evidently ſo many falſe Miracles for the Confirmation of your new Doctrine; which might give us juſt occaſion, had we no other aſſurance of them but your Authority, to ſuſpect the true ones. Who with forging ſo many falſe Stories, and falſe Authors, have taken a faire way to make the faith of all Stories queſtionable; if we had no other ground for our belief of them but your Authority: who have brought in Doctrines plainly and directly contrary to that which you confeſſe to be the word of Chriſt, and which, for the moſt, part make either for the honour or profit of the Teachers of them: which (if there were no difference between the Chriſtian and the Roman Church) would be very apt to make ſuſpicious men believe that Chriſtian Religion was a humane invention,

taught

taught by ſome cunning Impoſtors, only to make themſelves rich and powerfull; who make a profeſſion of corrupting all ſorts of Authors: a ready courſe to make it juſtly queſtionable whether any remain uncorrupted. For if you take this Authority upon you, upon the ſixe Ages laſt paſt; how ſhall we know, that the Church of that time, did not uſurpe the ſame authority upon the Authors of the ſixe laſt Ages before them, and ſo upwards untill we come to Chriſt himſelfe? Whoſe queſtion'd Doctrines, none of them came from the fountain of Apoſtolike tradition, but have inſinuated themſelves into the Streames, by little and little, ſome in one age, and ſome in another, ſome more Anciently, ſome more lately, and ſome yet are Embrio's, yet hatching, and in the ſhell; as the Popes infallibility, the Bleſſed Virgins immaculate conception, the Popes power over the Temporalties of Kings, the Doctrine of Predetermination, &c. all which yet are, or in time may be impos'd upon Chriſtians under the Title of *Originall and Apoſtolike Tradition*, and that with that neceſſity, that they are told, they were as good believe nothing at all, as not believe theſe things to have come from the Apoſtles, which they know to have been brought in but yeſterday: which whether it be not a ready and likely way to make men conclude thus with themſelves--I am told, that I were as good believe nothing at all, as believe ſome points which the Church teaches me, and not others: & ſomethings which ſhe teaches to be Ancient and Certain, I plainly ſee to be New & Falſe, therefore I will believe nothing at all. Whether I ſay the foreſaid grounds be not a ready and likely way to make men conclude thus, and whether this concluſion be not too often made in Italy, & Spain, and France, and in England too, I leave it to the judgement of thoſe that have wiſdome and experience. Seeing therefore the Roman Church is ſo farre from being a ſufficient Foundation for our belief in Chriſt, that it is in ſundry regards a dangerous temptation againſt it; why ſhould I not much rather conclude, Seeing we receive not the knowledge of Chriſt and Scriptures from the Church of Rome, neither from her muſt we take his Doctrine, or the Interpretation of Scripture?

102 *Ad* §. 19. In this number, this Argument is contained. *The Iudge of Controverſies ought to be intelligible to learned and unlearned; The Scripture is not ſo, and the Church is ſo; Therefore the Church is the Iudge, and not the Scripture.*

103 To this I anſwere: As to be underſtandible is a condition requiſite to a Iudge, ſo is not that alone ſufficient to make a Iudge; otherwiſe you might make your ſelfe Iudge of Controverſies, by arguing; The Scripture is not intelligible by all, but I am, therefore I am Iudge of Controverſies. If you ſay your intent was to conclude againſt the Scripture, and not for the Church: I demand why then, but to delude the ſimple with ſophiſtry, did you ſay in the cloſe of this §. *Such is the Church, and the Scripture is not ſuch?* but that you would leave it to them to inferre in the end, (which indeed was more then you undertook in the beginning) *Therefore the Church is Iudge and the Scripture not.* I ſay Secondly; that you ſtill runne upon a falſe ſuppoſition:

that God hath appointed ſome Iudge of all Controverſies that may happen among Chriſtians, about the ſenſe of obſcure Texts of Scripture: whereas he has left every one to his liberty herein, in thoſe words of S. *Paul*, *Quiſq; abundet in ſenſu ſuo &c.* I ſay thirdly. Whereas ſome Proteſtants make the Scripture Iudge of Controverſies, that they have the authority of Fathers to warrant their manner of ſpeaking: as of * *Optatus.*

* *Contra Parmen. l. 5. in Prin.*

104 But ſpeaking truly and properly the Scripture is not a Iudge nor cannot be, but only, a *ſufficient Rule*, for thoſe to judge by, that believe it to be the word of God (as the Church of England and the Church of Rome both doe,) what they are to believe, and what they are not to believe. I ſay ſufficiently perfect, and ſufficiently intelligible in things neceſſary, to all that have underſtanding, whether they be learned or unlearned. And my reaſon hereof is convincing and Demonſtrative; becauſe nothing is neceſſary to be believed, but what is plainly revealed. For to ſay, that when a place of Scripture, by reaſon of ambiguous termes, lies indifferent between divers ſenſes, whereof one is true, and the other is falſe, that God obliges men under pain of damnation, not to miſtake through error and humane frailty, is to make God a Tyrant, and to ſay that he requires us certainly to attain that end, for the attaining whereof we have no certain meanes; which is to ſay, that, like *Pharaoh*, he gives no ſtraw, and requires brick; that he reapes where he ſowes not; that he gathers where he ſtrewes not, that he will not be pleas'd with our utmoſt endeavours to pleaſe him, without full and exact and never failing performance; that his will is we ſhould doe what he knowes we cannot doe; that he will not accept of us according to that which we have, but requireth of us what we have not. Which whether it can conſiſt with his goodnes, with his wiſdome, & with his word, I leave it to honeſt men to judge. If I ſhould ſend a ſervant to Paris, or Rome, or Ieruſalem, and he uſing his utmoſt diligence not to miſtake his way, yet notwithſtanding, meeting often with ſuch places where the road is divided into ſeverall waies, whereof every one is as likely to be true, and as likely to be falſe as any other, ſhould at length miſtake and goe out of the way; would not any man ſay that I were an impotent, fooliſh and unjuſt maſter, if I ſhould be offended with him for doing ſo? And ſhall we not tremble to impute that to God, which we would take in foule ſcorne, if it were imputed to our ſelves? Certainly, I for my part fear I ſhould not loue God if I ſhould think ſo ſtrangely of him.

105 Againe. When you ſay, *that unlearned, and ignorant men cannot underſtand Scripture*, I would deſire you to come out of the clouds, and tell us what you meane: Whether, that they cannot underſtand all Scripture, or that they cannot underſtand any Scripture, or that they cannot underſtand ſo much as is ſufficient for their direction to Heaven. If the firſt; I believe the Learned are in the ſame caſe. If the Second; every mans experience will confute you: for who is there that is not capable of a ſufficient underſtanding of the Story, the Precepts, the Promiſes, and the Threats of the Goſpelle? If the third;

that

that they may uuderſtand ſomething, but not enough for their Salvations; I aske you, firſt. Why then doth S. *Paul* ſay to *Timothy*, *The Scriptures are able to make him wiſe unto Salvation*? Why does Saint *Auſtine* ſay, *Ea quæ manifeſtè poſita ſunt in ſacris Scripturis, omnia continent quæ pertinent ad Fidem Moreſq; vivendi*? Why does every one of the four Evangeliſts intitle their book *The Goſpell*, if any neceſſary and eſſentiall part of the Goſpell were left out of it? Can we imagine, that either they omitted ſomething neceſſary, out of ignorance not knowing it to be neceſſary? Or, knowing it to be ſo, malitiouſly concealed it? Or out of negligence did the work they had undertaken by halfes? If none of theſe things can without Blaſphemy be imputed to them, conſidering they were aſſiſted by the Holy Ghoſt in this work, then certainly it moſt evidently followes, that every one of them writ the whole Goſpell of Chriſt; I mean all the eſſentiall and neceſſary parts of it. So that if we had no other book of Scripture, but one of them alone, we ſhould not want any thing neceſſary to Salvation. And what one of them has more then another, it is only profitable, and not neceſſary. Neceſſary indeed to be believed, becauſe revealed; but not therefore revealed, becauſe neceſſary to be believed.

106 Neither did they write only for the learned, but for all men. This being one eſpecial meanes of the preaching of the Goſpel, which was commanded to be preached, not only to learned men but *to all men*. And therefore, unleſſe we will imagine the Holy Ghoſt and them to have been wilfully wanting to their own deſire and purpoſe, we muſt conceive, that they intended to ſpeak plain, even to the capacity of the ſimpleſt; at leaſt touching all things neceſſary to be publiſhed by them, and believed by us.

107 And whereas you pretend it *is ſo eaſie, and obvious both for the learned and the ignorant, both to know which is the Church, and what are the Decrees of the Church, and what is the ſenſe of thoſe Decrees*: I ſay, this is a vaine pretenſe.

108 For firſt; How ſhall an unlearned man whom you haue ſuppoſed now ignorant of Scripture, how ſhall he know which of all the Societies of Chriſtians is indeed the Church? You will ſay perhaps, *he muſt examine them by the notes of the Church, which are perpetuall Viſibilitie, Succeſſion, Conformitie with the ancient Church. &c.* But how ſhall he know, firſt, that theſe are the notes of the Church, unleſſe by Scripture, which you ſay he underſtands not? You may ſay perhaps, he may be told ſo. But ſeeing men may deceive, and be deceived, and their words are no demonſtrations, how ſhall he be aſſured that what they ſay is true? So that at the firſt he meets with an impregnable difficulty, and cannot know the Church but by ſuch notes, which whether they be the notes of the Church he cannot poſſibly know. But let us ſuppoſe this *Iſthmus* digged through, and that he is aſſured theſe are the notes of the true Church: How can he poſſible be a competent Iudge, which ſociety of Chriſtians hath title to theſe notes, and which hath not? Seeing this triall of neceſſity requires a great ſufficiency of knowledge of the monuments of Chriſtian Antiquity, which

no unlearned can haue, becauſe he that hath it cannot be unlearned. As for example, how ſhall he poſſibly be able to know whether the Church of *Rome* hath had a perpetuall Succeſſion of Viſible Profeſſors, which held alwayes the ſame Doctrine which they now hold, without holding any thing to the contrary; unleſſe he hath firſt examined, what was the Doctrine of the Church in the firſt age, what in the ſecond, and ſo forth? And whether this be not a more difficult work, then to ſtay at the firſt Age, and to examine the Church by the conformity of her Doctrine, with the Doctrine of the firſt age, every man of ordinary underſtanding may judge.

108 Let us imagine him advanc'd a ſtep farther, and to know which is the Church: how ſhall he know what that Church hath decreed, ſeeing the Church hath not been ſo carefull in keeping of her decrees, but that many are loſt, and many corrupted? Beſides, when even the Learned among you are not agreed concerning divers things, whether they be *De Fide* or not; how ſhall the unlearned doe? Then for the ſenſe of the Decrees, how can he be more capable of the underſtanding of them, then of plain Texts of Scripture, which you will not ſuffer him to underſtand? Eſpecially, ſeeing the Decrees of divers Popes and Councells are conceived ſo obſcurely, that the Learned cannot agree about the ſenſe of them. And then they are written all in ſuch languages which the ignorant underſtand not, and therefore muſt of neceſſity rely herein upon the uncertain and fallible authority of ſome particular men, who informe them that there is ſuch a Decree. And if the Decrees were tranſlated into Vulgar languages, why the Tranſlators ſhould not be as fallible as you ſay the Tranſlators of Scripture are, who can poſſibly imagine?

109 Laſtly, how ſhall an unlearned man, or indeed any man, be aſſured of the certainty of that Decree, the certainty whereof depends upon ſuppoſitions which are impoſſible to be known whether they be true or no? For it is not the Decree of a Councell, unleſſe it be confirmed by a true Pope. Now the Pope cannot be a true Pope if he came in by Simony: which whether he did or no, who can anſwer mee? He cannot be true Pope unleſſe he were baptized, and baptized he was not, unleſſe the Miniſter had due Intention. So likewiſe he cannot be a true Pope, unleſſe he were rightly ordained Prieſt, and that again depends upon the Ordainers ſecret Intention, and alſo upon his having the Epiſcopall Character. All which things, as I have formerly proved, depend upon ſo many uncertain ſuppoſitions, that no humane judgement can poſſibly be reſolved in them. I conclude therefore, that not the learneſt man amongſt you all, no not the Pope himſelfe, can, according to the grounds you goe upon, have any certainty, that any Decree of any Councell is good and valid, and conſequently, not any aſſurance that it is indeed the Decree of a Councell.

110 *Ad* §. 20. If by a *private ſpirit*, you mean, a particular perſwaſion that a Doctrine is true, which ſome men pretend, but cannot prove to come from the ſpirit of God: I ſay to referre Controverſies to Scripture, is not to referre them to this kind of private Spirit. For

is

is there not a manifeſt difference between ſaying, *the ſpirit of God tels me that this is the meaning of ſuch a Text* (which no man can poſſibly know to be true, it being a ſecret thing) & between ſaying, *theſe & theſe Reaſons I have to ſhew, that this or that is true doctrine, or that this or that is the meaning of ſuch a Scripture?* Reaſon being a Publique and certain thing and expoſed to all mens tryall and examination. But now if by *privat ſpirit* you underſtand every mans particular Reaſon, then your firſt and ſecond inconvenience will preſently be reduced to one; and ſhortly to none at all.

111 *Ad* §. 20. And does not alſo giving the office of Iudicature to the Church, come to conferre it upon every particular man? For before any man believes the Church infallible, muſt he not have reaſon to induce him to believe it to be ſo? and muſt he not judge of thoſe reaſons, whether they be indeed good and firme, or captious and ſophiſticall? Or would you have all men believe all your Doctrine upon the Churches infallibility, and the Churches infallibility they know not why?

112 Secondly, ſuppoſing they are to be guided by the Church, they muſt uſe their own particular reaſon to find out which is the Church. And to that purpoſe you your ſelves give a great many notes, which you pretend firſt to be Certain notes of the Church, and then to be peculiar to your Church, and agreeable to none elſe; but you doe not ſo much as pretend, that either of thoſe pretenſes is evident of it ſelfe, and therefore you goe about to prove them both by reaſons; and thoſe reaſons I hope every particular man is to judge of, whether they doe indeed conclude and convince that which they are alleadged for: that is, that theſe markes are indeed certain notes of the Church, and then that your Church hath them, and no other.

113 One of theſe notes, indeed the only note of a true and uncorrupted Church, is conformity with Antiquity; I mean the moſt ancient Church of all, that is the Primitive and Apoſtolique. Now how is it poſſible any man ſhould examine your Church by this note, but he muſt by his own particular judgement, find out what was the doctrine of the Primitive Church, and what is the Doctrine of the preſent Church, and be able to anſwer all theſe Arguments which are brought to prove repugnance between them? otherwiſe he ſhall but pretend to make uſe of this note for the finding the true Church, but indeed make no uſe of it, but receive the Church at a venture, as the moſt of you doe; not one in a hundred being able to give any tolerable reaſon for it. So that in ſtead of reducing men to particular reaſon, you reduce them to none at all, but to chance and paſſion, and prejudice and ſuch other waies, which if they lead one to the truth, they lead hundreds, nay thouſands to falſhood. But it is a pretty thing to conſider, how theſe men can blow hot and cold out of the ſame mouth to ſerve ſeverall purpoſes. Is there hope of gaining a Proſelite? Then they will tell you, God hath given every man Reaſon to follow; and if the blind lead the blind, both ſhall fall into the Ditch. That it is no good reaſon for a mans religion, that he was borne and brought up in it:

it: For then a Turke ſhould have as much reaſon to be a Turke, as a Chriſtian to be a Chriſtian. That every man hath a judgement of Diſcretion; which if they will make uſe of they ſhall eaſily finde: that the true Church hath alwaies ſuch and ſuch markes, and that their Church has them, and no other but theirs. But then if any of theirs be perſwaded to a ſyncere and ſufficient tryall of their Church, even by their own notes of it, and to try whether they be indeed ſo conformable to Antiquity as they pretend, then their note is changed: you muſt not uſe your own reaſon nor your judgement, but referre all to the Church, and believe her to be conformable to Antiquity, though they have no reaſon for it, nay though they have evident reaſon to the contrary. For my part, I am certain that God hath given us our Reaſon to diſcern between Truth and Falſhood, and he that makes not this uſe of it, but beleeves things he knowes not why, I ſay it is by chance that he believes the Truth, and not by choice: and that I cannot but feare, that God will not accept of this *Sacrifice of fooles*.

114 But you that would not have men follow their reaſon, what would you have them to follow? their Paſſion? Or pluck out their eyes and goe blindfold? *No*, you ſay *you would have them follow Authority*. On gods name let them; we alſo would have them follow Authority; for it is upon the Authority of Vniverſall Tradition, that we would have them believe Scripture. But then as for the Authority which you would have them follow, you will let them ſee reaſon why they ſhould follow it. And is not this to goe a little about? to leave reaſon for a ſhort turne, and then to come to it again, and to doe that which you condemne in others? It being indeed a plain impoſſibility for any man to ſubmit his reaſon but to reaſon: for he that does it to Authority, muſt of neceſſity think himſelfe to have greater reaſon to believe that Authority. Therefore the confeſſion cited by *Brerely*, you need not think to have been extorted from *Luther* and the reſt. It came very freely from them, and what they ſay you practiſe as much as they.

115 And whereas you ſay that a *Proteſtant admits of Fathers, Councells, Church, as farre as they agree with Scripture, which upon the matter is himſelfe*: I ſay you admit neither of them, nor the Scripture it ſelfe, but only ſo farre as it agrees with your Church: and your Church you admit becauſe you think you have reaſon to doe ſo: ſo that by you as well as by Proteſtants all is finally reſolved into your own reaſon.

116 Nor doe Heretiques only but Romiſh Catholiques alſo ſet up as many judges, as there are men and women in the Chriſtian world. For doe not your men and women judge your Religion to be true, before they believe it, as well as the men and women of other Religions? Oh but you ſay, *They receive it not becauſe they think it agreeable to Scripture, but becauſe the Church tells them ſo*. But then I hope they believe the Church becauſe their own reaſon tells them they are to doe ſo. So that the difference between a Papiſt and a Proteſtant is this, not that the one judges and the other does not judge, but that the one judges his guide to be infallible, the other his way to be manifeſt.

manifeſt. *This ſame pernitious Doctrine is taught by Brentius, Zanchius, Cartwright, and others.* It is ſo in very deed: But it is taught alſo by ſome others, whom you little think of. It is taught by S. *Paul*, where he ſaies, *Try all things, hold faſt that which is good.* It is taught by S. *Iohn*, in theſe words, *Believe not every Spirit; but try the Spirits whether they be of God or no.* It is taught by S. *Peter*, in theſe, *Bee yee ready to render a reaſon of the hope that is in you.* Laſtly, this very pernitious Doctrine is taught by our *Saviour*, in theſe words, *If the blinde lead the blind, both ſhall fall into the ditch.* And *why of your ſelues iudge you not what is right?* All which ſpeeches, if they doe not adviſe men to make uſe of their Reaſon for the choice of their Religion, I muſt confeſſe my ſelfe to underſtand nothing. Laſtly, not to bee infinite, it is taught by M. *Knot* himſelfe, not in one page only, or chapter of his *Book*, but all his Book over; the very writing and publiſhing whereof, ſuppoſeth this for certaine, that the readers are to be Iudges, whether his Reaſons which he brings, be ſtrong and convincing; of which ſort wee haue hetherto met with none: or elſe captious; or impertinences, as indifferent men ſhall (as I ſuppoſe) haue cauſe to judge them.

117 But you demand, *What good Stateſmen would they be, who ſhould ideate, or fancy ſuch a Commonwealth, as theſe men haue framed to themſelues a Church?* Truly if this be all the fault they haue; that they ſay, *Every man is to uſe his own iudgement in the choice of his Religion, and not to believe this or that ſenſe of Scripture, upon the bare Authority of any Learned man or men, when he conceiues he has reaſons to the contrary, which are of more weight then their Authority*: I know no reaſon but, notwithſtanding all this, they might be as good Stateſmen as any of the Society. But what has this to doe with Common-wealths, where men are bound only to externall obedience, unto the Laws and judgements of Courts, but not to an internall approbation of them, no nor to conceale their Iudgment of them, if they diſapprove them? As if I conceiued I had reaſon to miſlike the law of puniſhing ſimple theft with death, as S^r *Thomas Moore* did, I might profeſſe lawfully my judgement, and repreſent my Reaſons to the King or Common-wealth in a Parliament, as S^r *Thomas Moore* did, without committing any fault, or fearing any puniſhment.

118 To the place of S. *Auſtin*, wherewith this Paragraph is concluded, I ſhall need giue no other Reply, but onely to deſire you to ſpeak like an honeſt man, and to ſay, whether it be all one for a man, *to allow and diſallow in every Scripture what he pleaſes*, which is, either to daſh out of Scripture ſuch Texts or ſuch Chapters, becauſe they croſſe his opinion? or to ſay (which is worſe,) *Though they be Scripture they are not true?* Whether I ſay for a man thus to allow and diſallow in Scripture what he pleaſes, be all one, and no greater fault, then to allow that ſenſe of Scripture which he conceiues to be true and genuine, and deduc'd out of the words, and to diſallow the contrary? For Gods ſake, S^r, tell me plainly; In thoſe Texts of Scripture, which you alleage for the infallibility of your Church, doe not you allow what ſenſe you think true, and diſallow the contrary? And doe you not this by

the direction of your private reaſon? If you doe, why doe you condemne it in others? If you doe not, I pray you tell me what direction you follow? or whether you follow none at all? If none at all, this is like drawing Lots, or throwing the Dice for the choice of a Religion. If any other: I beſeech you tell me what it is. Perhaps you will ſay, *the Churches Authority*; and that will be to dance finely in a round, thus, To believe the Churches Infallible Authority, becauſe the Scriptures avouch it; & to believe that Scriptures ſay and mean ſo, becauſe they are ſo expounded by the Church. Is not this for a Father to beget his Sonne, and the Sonne to beget his Father? For a foundation to ſupport the houſe, and the houſe to ſupport the foundation? Would not *Campian* have cryed out at it, *Ecce quos gyros, quos Mæandros?* And to what end was this going about, when you might as well at firſt have concluded the Church infallible becauſe ſhe ſaies ſo; as thus to put in Scripture for a meere ſtale, and to ſay, the Church is infallible becauſe the Scripture ſaies ſo, and the Scripture meanes ſo becauſe the Church ſaies ſo, which is infallible? Is it not moſt evident therefore to every intelligent man, that you are enforced of neceſſity to doe that your ſelfe, which ſo tragically you declaime againſt in others? The Church, you ſay, is infallible; I am very doubtfull of it: How ſhall I know it? The Scripture you ſay affirmes it, as in the 59. of *Eſay, My ſpirit that is in thee, &c.* Well I confeſſe I finde there theſe words: but I am ſtill doubtfull, whether they be ſpoken of the Church of Chriſt: & if they be, whether they mean as you pretend. You ſay, the Church ſaies ſo, which is infallible. Yea but that is the Queſtion, and therefore not to be begg'd but proved. Neither is it ſo evident as to need no proofe: otherwiſe why brought you this Text to proue it? Nor is it of ſuch a ſtrange quality, aboue all other Propoſitions, as to bee able to proue it ſelfe. What then remaines but that you ſay, Reaſons drawn out of the Circumſtances of the Text, will evince that this is the ſenſe of it. Perhaps they will. But Reaſons cannot convince mee, unleſſe I judge of them by my Reaſon; and for every man or woman to relye on that, in the choice of their Religion, and in the interpreting of Scripture, you ſay is a horrible abſurditie; and therefore muſt neither make uſe of your own in this matter, nor deſire mee to make uſe of it.

119 But *Vniverſall Tradition* (you ſay, and ſo doe I too,) *is of it ſelfe credible: and that has in all ages taught the Churches infallibility with full conſent.* If it haue, I am ready to believe it. But that it has I hope you would not haue me take upon your word: for that were to build my ſelfe upon the Church, and the Church upon You. Let then the Tradition appeare; for a ſecret Tradition is ſomewhat like a ſilent Thunder. You will perhaps produce, for the confirmation of it, ſome ſayings of ſome Fathers, who in every Age taught this Doctrine; (as *Gualterius* in his Chronologie undertakes to doe, but with ſo ill ſucceſſe, that I heard an able Man of your Religion profeſſe, that *in the firſt three Centuries, there was not one Authority pertinent*:) but how will you warrant that none of them teach the contrary? Again, how

ſhal

ſhall I be aſſured that the places haue indeed this ſenſe in them? Seeing there is not one Father for 500. yeares after Chriſt, that does ſay in plain termes, *The Church of Rome is infallible.* What, ſhall wee believe your Church that this is their meaning? But this will be again to goe into the Circle, which made us giddy before; To proue the Church Infallible becauſe Tradition ſaies ſo, Tradition to ſay ſo, becauſe the Fathers ſay ſo, The Fathers to ſay ſo, becauſe the Church ſaies ſo, which is infallible. Yea, *but reaſon will ſhew this to be the meaning of them.* Yes, if we may uſe our Reaſon, and rely upon it. Otherwiſe, as light ſhewes nothing to the blinde, or to him that uſes not his eyes; ſo reaſon cannot proue any thing to him that either has not, or uſes not his reaſon to judge of them.

120 Thus you haue excluded your ſelfe from all proofe of your Churches infallibility from Scripture or Tradition. And if you flye laſtly to Reaſon it ſelfe for ſuccour, may not it juſtly ſay to you, as *Iephte* ſaid to his Brethren, *Yee haue caſt me out and baniſhed me, and doe you now come to me for ſuccour?* But if there be no certainty in Reaſon, how ſhall I be aſſured of the certainty of thoſe which you alleage for this purpoſe? Either I may judge of them, or not: if not, why doe you propoſe them? If I may, why doe you ſay I may not, and make it ſuch a monſtrous abſurdity, That men in the choyce of their Religion ſhould make uſe of their Reaſon? which yet, without all queſtion, none but unreaſonable men can deny, to haue been the chiefeſt ende why Reaſon was given them.

122 *Ad* §22. *An Heretique he is* (ſaith D. Potter) *who oppoſeth any truth, which to be a divine revelation he is convinced in conſcience by any meanes whatſoever: Be it by a Preacher or Lay-man, be it by reading Scripture, or hearing them read.* And from hence you infer, that *he makes all theſe ſafe propounders of Faith.* A moſt ſtrange and illogicall deduction! For may not a private man by evident reaſon convince another man, that ſuch or ſuch a Doctrine is divine revelation, and yet though he be a true propounder in this point, yet propound another thing falſely, and without proofe, and conſequently not be a ſafe propounder in every point? Your Preachers in their Sermons, do they not propoſe to men divine Revelations, and doe they not ſometimes convince men in conſcience, by evident proofe from Scripture, that the things they ſpeak are Divine revelations? And whoſoever, being thus convinc'd, ſhould oppoſe this Divine revelation, ſhould hee not be an Heretique, according to your own grounds, for calling Gods own Truth into queſtion? And would you think your ſelfe well dealt with, if I ſhould collect from hence, that you make every Preacher a ſafe, that is, an infallible Propounder of Faith? Be the meanes of Propoſall what it will, ſufficient or inſufficient, worthy of credit, or not worthy, though it were, if it were poſſible, the barking of a Dog, or the chirping of a Bird, or were it the diſcourſe of the Divell himſelfe, yet if I be, I will not ſay convinc'd, but perſuaded, though falſly, that it is a Divine revelation, and ſhall deny to believe it, I ſhall be a formall, though not a materiall Heretique. For he that believes, though falſly

any thing to be Divine revelation, & yet will not believe it to be true, muſt of neceſſity believe God to be falſe, which according to your own Doctrine, is the formality of an Heretique.

122 And how it can be any way advantagious to Civill government, that men without warrant from God ſhould uſurpe a tyranny over other mens conſciences, and preſcribe unto them without reaſon, and ſometimes againſt reaſon, what they ſhall believe, you muſt ſhew us plainer if you deſire we ſhould believe. For to ſay, *Verily I doe not ſee but that it muſt be ſo*, is no good demonſtration. For whereas you ſay, *that a man may be a paſſionate & ſeditious creature*, from whence you would have us inferre, that he may make uſe of his interpretation to ſatisfie his paſſion, and raiſe ſedition: There were ſome colour in this conſequence, if we (as you doe) made private men infallible interpreters for others; for then indeed they might lead Diſciples after them, and uſe them as inſtruments for their vile purpoſes: But when we ſay they can only interpret for themſelves, what harme they can doe by their paſſionate or ſeditious interpretations, but only endanger both their temporall and eternall happineſſe, I cannot imagine. For though we deny the Pope or Church of *Rome* to be an infallible Iudge, yet we doe not deny, but that there are Iudges which may proceed with certainty enough againſt all ſeditious Perſons, ſuch as draw men to diſobedience either againſt Church or State, as well as againſt Rebells, and Traytors, and Theeves, and Murderers.

* See *Chryſoſt. Hom. 1. in Mat. Iſidor. Peluſ. l. 3. ep. 106.* and alſo *Baſil. in Pſ. 28.* and then you ſhall confeſſe that by other meanes beſides theſe, God did communicate himſelfe unto men & made them receive and underſtand his lawes: ſee alſo to the ſame purpoſe Heb. 1, 1.

123 *Ad § 23.* The next § in the begining argues thus: *For many ages there was no Scripture in the World: and for many more, there was none in many places of the world; yet men wanted not then and there ſome certain direction what to believe: Therefore there was then an infallible Iudge.* Iuſt as if I ſhould ſay, *Yorke* is not my way from *Oxford* to *London*, therefore *Briſtol* is: Or a dogge is not a horſe, therefore he is a man. As if God had no other waies of revealing himſelfe to men, but only by Scripture and an infallible Church. S. *Chryſoſtome* and *Iſidorus Peluſiota* conceaved he might uſe other meanes. And S. *Paul* telleth us that the γνωστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ *might be known by his workes*; and that *they had the Law written in their hearts*. Either of theſe waies might make ſome faithfull men without either neceſſity of Scripture or Church.

124 *But D. Potter ſaies*, you ſay, *In the Iewiſh Church there was a living Iudge, indowed with an abſolute infallible direction in caſes of moment: as all points belonging to divine Faith are.* And where was that infallible direction in the Iewiſh Church when they ſhould have received Chriſt for their Meſſias, and refuſed him? Or perhaps this was not a caſe of moment. D. *Potter* indeed might ſay very well, not that the high Prieſt was infallible, (for certainly he was not) but that his determination was to be of neceſſity obeyed, though for the juſtice of it there was no neceſſity that it ſhould be believed. Beſides, it is one thing to ſay, that the living judge in the Iewiſh Church, had an infallible direction: another, that he was neceſſitated to follow this direction. This is the priviledge which you challenge. But it is that, not this

this, which the Doctor attributes to the Iewes. As a man may truely ſay, the wiſe men had an infallible direction to Chriſt, without ſaying or thinking that they were conſtrained to follow it, and could not doe otherwiſe.

125 *But either the Church retaines ſtill her infallibility, or it was deveſted of it upon the receiving of Holy Scripture; which is abſurd.* An argument me thinkes like this, Either you have hornes or you have loſt them: but you never loſt them, therefore you have them ſtill. If you ſay you never had hornes; ſo ſay I, for ought appeares by your reaſons, the Church never had infallibility.

126 *But ſome Scriptures were received in ſome places and not in others: therefore if Scriptures were the Iudge of Controverſies, ſome Churches had one Iudge and ſome another.* And what great inconvenience is there in that, that one part of *England* ſhould have one Iudge, and another another? eſpecially ſeeing the bookes of Scripture which were received by thoſe that received feweſt, had as much of the doctrine of Chriſtianity in them, as they all had which were received by any; all the neceſſary parts of the Goſpell being contained in every one of the four Goſpells, as I have prov'd: So that they which had all the bookes of the New Teſtament had nothing ſuperfluous: For it was not ſuperfluous but profitable, that the ſame thing ſhould be ſaid divers times, and be teſtified by divers witneſſes: And they that had but one of the four Goſpells wanted nothing neceſſary: and therefore it is vainly infer'd by you, that *with months and yeares, as new Canonicall Scriptures grew to be publiſhed, the Church altered her rule of Faith and judge of Controverſies.*

127 *Hereſies* you ſay, *would ariſe after the Apoſtles time and after the writing of Scriptures: Theſe cannot be diſcovered, condemned & avoyded, unleſſe the Church be infallible: Therefore there muſt be a Church infallible.* But I pray tell me, Why cannot Hereſies be ſufficiently diſcovered, condemned, & avoided, by them which believe Scripture to be the rule of Faith? If Scripture be ſufficient to informe us what is the faith, it muſt of neceſſity be alſo ſufficient to teach us what is Hereſy: ſeeing Hereſy is nothing but a manifeſt deviation from, and an oppoſition to the faith. That which is ſtreight will plainly teach us what is crooked; and one contrary cannot but manifeſt the other. If any one ſhould deny, that there is a God: That this God is omnipotent, omniſcient, good, juſt, true, mercifull, a rewarder of them that ſeek him, a puniſher of them that obſtinatly offend him; that Ieſus Chriſt is the Sonne of God, and the Saviour of the World: that it is he by obedience to whom men muſt look to be ſaved: If any man ſhould deny either his Birth, or Paſsion, or Reſurrection, or Aſcention, or ſitting at the right hand of God: his having all power given him in Heaven and Earth: That it is he whom God hath appointed to be judge of the quick and the dead: that all men ſhall riſe again at the laſt day: That they which believe and repent ſhall be ſav'd: That they which doe not believe or repent ſhall be damned: If a man ſhould hold, that either the keeping of the *Moſaicall* Law is neceſſary to Salvation: or that good works are

not neceſſary to Salvation: In a word, if any man ſhould obſtinatly contradict the truth of any thing plainly delivered in Scripture, who does not ſee, that every one which believes the Scripture, hath a ſufficient meanes to diſcover, and condemne, and avoid that Hereſy, without any need of an infallible guide? If you ſay, that *the obſcure places of Scripture contain matters of Faith*: I anſwere, that it is a matter of faith to believe that the ſenſe of them, whatſoever it is, which was intended by God is true; for he that does not doe ſo calls Gods Truth into queſtion. But to believe this or that to be the true ſenſe of them, or, to believe the true ſenſe of them, and to avoid the falſe, is not neceſſary either to Faith or Salvation. For if God would have had his meaning in theſe places certainly known, how could it ſtand with his wiſdome, to be ſo wanting to his own will and end, as to ſpeak obſcurely? or how can it conſiſt with his juſtice, to require of men to know certainly the meaning of thoſe words, which he himſelfe hath not revealed? Suppoſe there were an abſolute Monarch, that in his own abſence from one of his Kingdomes, had written Lawes for the government of it, ſome very plainly, and ſome very ambiguouſly, and obſcurely, and his Subjects ſhould keep thoſe that were plainly written with all exactneſſe, and for thoſe that were obſcure, uſe their beſt diligence to find his meaning in them, and obey them according to the ſenſe of them which they conceived; ſhould this King either with juſtice or wiſdome be offended with theſe Subjects, if by reaſon of the obſcurity of them, they miſtook the ſenſe of them, and faile of performance, by reaſon of their errour?

128 But, *It is more uſefull & fit*, you ſay, *for the deciding of Controverſies, to haue beſides an infallible rule to goe by, a living infallible Iudge to determine them: & from hence* you *conclude, that certainly there is ſuch a Iudge*. But why then may not another ſay, that it is yet more uſefull for many excellent purpoſes, that all the Patriarchs ſhould bee infallible, then that the Pope only ſhould? Another, that it would bee yet more uſefull, that all the Archbiſhops of every Province ſhould be ſo, then that the Patriarchs only ſhould be ſo. Another, That it would be yet more uſefull, if all the Biſhops of every Dioceſſe were ſo. Another, that it would be yet more available, that all the Parſons of every Pariſh ſhould be ſo. Another, that it would be yet more excellent, if all the Fathers of Families were ſo. And laſtly, another, that it were much more to be deſired that every Man and every Woman were ſo: juſt as much as the prevention of Controverſies, is better then the deciſion of them, and the prevention of Hereſies better then the condemnation of them; and upon this ground conclude, by your own very cõſequence, That not only a generall Councell, nor only the Pope, but all the Patriarchs, Archbiſhops, Biſhops, Paſtors, Fathers, nay all the men in the World are infallible. If you ſay now, as I am ſure you will, that this concluſion is moſt groſſe, and abſurd againſt ſenſe and experience, then muſt alſo the ground be falſe, from which it evidently and undeniably follows, *viz.* that, That courſe of dealing with men ſeems alwaies more fit to Divine Providence, which ſeemes moſt fit to humane reaſon.

129 And ſo likewiſe, That there ſhould men ſucceed the Apoſtles, which could ſhew themſelues to be their ſucceſſours, by doing of Miracles, by ſpeaking all kinde of languages, by delivering men to Satan, as S. *Paul* did *Hymenæus*, and the inceſtuous *Corinthian*, it is manifeſt in humane reaſon it were incomparably more fit and uſefull for the deciſion of Controverſies, then that the ſucceſſour of the Apoſtles ſhould haue none of theſe gifts, and for want of the ſignes of Apoſtleſhip, be juſtly queſtionable whether he be his ſucceſſour or no: and will you now conclude, That the Popes haue the gift of doing Miracles, as well as the Apoſtles had?

130 It were in all reaſon very uſefull and requiſite, that the Pope ſhould, by the aſſiſtance of Gods Spirit, be freed from the vices & paſſions of men, leſt otherwiſe, the Authority given him for the good of the Church, he might imploy (as divers Popes you well know haue done) to the diſturbance, and oppreſſion and miſchiefe of it. And will you conclude from henee, That Popes are not ſubject to the ſins and paſſions of other men? That there never haue been ambitious, covetous, luſtfull, tyrannous Popes.

131 Who ſees not that for mens direction it were much more beneficiall for the Church, that Infallibility ſhould be ſetled in the Popes Perſon, then in a generall Councell: That ſo the meanes of deciding Controverſies might be ſpeedy, eaſy and perpetuall, whereas that of generall Councells is not ſo. And will you hence inferre, that not the Church Repreſentative, but the Pope is indeed the infallible Iudge of Controverſies? certainly if you ſhould, the *Sorbon* Doctors would not think this a good concluſion.

132 It had been very commodious (one would think) that, ſeeing either Gods pleaſure was the Scripture ſhould be tranſlated, or elſe in his Providence he knew it would be ſo, that he had appointed ſome men for this buſineſſe, and by his Spirit aſſiſted them in it, that ſo we might have Tranſlations as Authenticall as the Originall: yet you ſee God did not think fit to doe ſo.

133 It had been very commodious (one would think) that the Scripture ſhould have been, at leaſt for all things neceſſary, a Rule, plain and perfect: And yet you ſay, it is both imperfect and obſcure, even in things neceſſary.

134 It had been moſt requiſite (one would think) that the Copies of the Bibles, ſhould have been preſerved free from variety of readings, which makes men very uncertain in many places, which is the word of God, and which is the errour or preſumption of man: and yet we ſee God hath not thought fit ſo to provide for us.

135 Who can conceive, but that an Apoſtolike Interpretation of all the difficult places of Scripture, would have been ſtrãgely beneficiall to the Church, eſpecially there being ſuch danger in miſtaking the ſenſe of them, as is by you pretended, and God in his providence foreſeeing that the greateſt part of Chriſtians, would not accept of the Pope for the Iudge of Controverſies? And yet we ſee God hath not ſo ordered the matter.

136 Who doth not ſee, that ſuppoſing the Biſhop of Rome, had been appointed Head of the Church, and Iudge of Controverſies, that it would have been infinitely beneficiall to the Church, perhaps as much as all the reſt of the Bible, that in ſome Book of Scripture which was to be undoubtedly received, this one Propoſition had been ſet down in Termes, *The Biſhops of Rome ſhall be alwaies Monarchs of the Church, & they either alone, or with their adherents, the Guides of faith, and the Iudges of Controverſies that ſhall ariſe amongſt Chriſtians?* This, if you will deal ingenuouſly, you cannot but acknowledge; for then all true Chriſtians would have ſubmitted to him, as willingly as to Chriſt himſelfe, neither needed you and your fellowes, have troubled your ſelfe to invent ſo many Sophiſmes for the proofe of it. There would have been no more doubt of it among Chriſtians, then there is of the Nativity, Paſſion, Reſurrection or Aſcention of Chriſt. You were beſt now rubbe your forehead hard, and conclude upon us, that becauſe this would have been ſo uſefull to have been done, therefore it is done. Or if you be (as I know you are) too ingenuous to ſay ſo, then muſt you acknowledge, that the ground of your Argument, which is the very ground of all theſe abſurdities, is moſt abſurd; and that it is our duty to be humbly thankfull for thoſe ſufficient, nay abundant meanes of Salvation, which God hath of his own gooneſſe granted us: and not conclude, he hath done that which he hath not done, becauſe forſooth, in our vain judgements it ſeemes convenient he ſhould have done ſo.

137 But you demand *what repugnance there is betwixt infallibility in the Church, and exiſtence of Scripture, that the production of the one muſt be the deſtruction of the other?* Out of which words I can frame no other argument for you thē this. *There is no Repugnance between the Scriptures exiſtence, and the Churches infallibility, therefore the Church is infallible.* Which conſequence will then be good, when you can ſhew, that nothing can be untrue, but that only which is impoſſible; that whatſoever may be done, that alſo is done. Which, if it were true, would conclude both you and mē to be infallible, as well as either your Church, or Pope: inasmuch as there is no more repugnance between the Scriptures exiſtence and our infallibility, then there is between theirs.

138 *But if Proteſtants will have the Scripture alone for their Iudge, let them firſt produce ſome Scripture, affirming, that by the entring thereof, infallibility went out of the Church.* This Argument put in forme runs thus: No Scripture affirmes that by the entring thereof, infallibility went out of the Church: Therefore there is an infallible Church, & therefore the Scripture alone is not Iudge, that is, the Rule to judge by. But as no Scripture affirmes that by the entring of it, Infallibility went out of the Church, ſo neither doe we, neither have we any need to doe ſo. But we ſay, that it continued in the Church even together with the Scriptures, ſo long as Chriſt & his Apoſtles were living, and then departed: God in his providence having provided a plain and infallible Rule, to ſupply the defect of liuing and infallible Guides. Certainly

tainly if your cauſe were good, ſo great a wit as yours is, would deviſe better Arguments to maintain it. We can ſhew no Scripture affirming Infallibility to haue gone out of the Church, therefore it is Infallible. Somewhat like his diſcourſe that ſaid, It could not bee prov'd out of Scripture, that the *King of Sweden* was dead, therefore hee is ſtill living. Me thinks in all reaſon, you that challenge privileges, and exemption from the condition of Men, which is to be ſubject to errour; You that by vertue of this privilege uſurp authority over mens conſciences, ſhould produce your Letters-patents from the King of Heaven, & ſhew ſome expreſſe warrant for this Authority you take upon you, otherwiſe you know the rule is, *Vbi contrarium non manifeſtè probatur, præſumitur pro libertate.*

139 *But* D. Potter *may remember what himſelfe teacheth, That the Church is ſtill endued with Infallibility in points Fundamentall, and conſequently that Infallibility in the Church doth well agree with the Truth, the Sanctitie, yea with the ſufficiency of Scripture, for all matters neceſſary to ſalvation.* Still your diſcourſe is ſo far from hitting the white, that it roves quite beſides the But. You conclude that the infallibility of the Church may well agree with the Truth, the Sanctity, the Sufficiency of Scripture. But what is this but to abuſe your Reader with the proofe of that which no man denies? The Queſtion is not, whether an infallible Church might agree with Scripture, but whether, there be an Infallible Church? *Iam dic Poſthume de tribus Capellis.* Beſides, you muſt know there is a wide difference between, *being infallible in Fundamentals*, and being an *infallible Guide even in Fundamentals.* *D. Potter* ſaies, that the Church is the former: that is, There ſhall be ſome men in the world, while the world laſts, which erre not in Fundamentals; for otherwiſe there ſhould be no Church: For to ſay, the Church, while it is the Church, may erre in Fundamentalls, implies cõtradiction, and is all one as to ſay, The Church: while it is the Church, may not be the Church. So that to ſay, that the Church is infallible in Fundamentalls, ſignifies no more but this, There ſhall be a Church in the world for ever. But wee utterly deny the Church to be the latter; for to ſay ſo, were to oblige our ſelves to finde ſome certain Society of men, of whom we might be certain, that they neither doe, nor can erre in Fundamentals, nor in declaring what is Fundamentall, what is not Fundamentall: and conſequently to make any Church an infallible Guide in Fundamentals, would be to make it infallible in all things, which ſhe propoſes and requires to be believed. This therefore we deny both to your and all other Churches of any one denomination, as the *Greek*, the *Roman*, the *Abyſſine*: that is indeed, we deny it ſimply to any Church. For no Church can poſſibly be fit to be a Guide, but only a Church of ſome certain denominatiõ. For otherwiſe no man can poſſibly know which is the true Church, but by a pre-examination of the doctrine controverted, and that were not to be guided by the Church to the true doctrine, but by the true doctrine to the Church. Hereafter therefore, when you heare Proteſtants ſay, The Church is Infallible in Fundamentalls, you muſt not

conceiue them, as if they meant as you doe, that ſome Society of Chriſtians, which may be known by adhering to ſome one Head, for example, the Pope, or the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, is infallible in theſe things: but only thus, That true Religion ſhall never be ſo farre driven out of the world, but that it ſhall alwaies haue ſome where or other, ſome that believe and profeſſe it, in all things neceſſary to ſalvation.

140 But, *you would therefore gladly know out of what Text he imagines that the Church, by the comming of Scripture, was deprived of infallibility in ſome points, and not in others?* And I alſo would gladly know, why you doe thus frame to your ſelf vaine imaginations, & thē father them upon others? We yeeld unto you, That there ſhall be a Church which never erreth in ſome points becauſe (as wee conceive,) God hath promiſed ſo much; but nor, there ſhall be ſuch a Church which doth or can erre in no points, becauſe we finde not that God hath promiſed ſuch a Church; and therefore wee may not promiſe ſuch a one to our ſelves. But for the Churches being deprived by the Scripture of Infallibility, in ſome points and not in others, that is a wild notion of your own, which we haue nothing to doe with.

141 But he affirmeth, that *the Iewiſh Church retained Infallibility in her ſelfe; and therefore it is unjuſtly, and unworthily done of him to depriue the Church of Chriſt of it.* That the Iewes had ſometimes an infallible miraculous direction from God, in ſome caſes of moment, hee doth affirme and had good warrant: but that the Synagogue was abſolutely Infallible, he no where affirmes, and therefore it is unjuſtly & unworthily done of you to obtrude it upon him. And indeed how can the Infallibility of the Synagogue be conceived, but only by ſetling it in the High Prieſt, and the company adhering and ſubordinate unto him? And whether the high Prieſt was Infallible, when he believed not Chriſt to be the Meſſias, but condemn'd and excommunicated thē that ſo profeſſed, and cauſed him to be crucified for ſaying ſo, I leaue it to Chriſtians to judge. But then ſuppoſe God had been ſo pleaſed to doe as he did not, to appoint the Synagogue an infallible guide: Could you by your rules of Logick conſtrain him, to appoint ſuch a one to Chriſtians alſo, or ſay unto him, that, in wiſdome he could not doe otherwiſe? Vaine man that will be thus alwaies tying God to your imaginations! It is well for us that he leaves us not without directions to him, but if he will doe this ſometime by liuing Guides, ſometime by written rules, what is that to you? may not he doe what he will with his own?

142 *And whereas you ſay for the further enforcing of this Argugument, that there is greater reaſon to think the Church ſhould be infallible, then the Synagogue: becauſe to the Synagogue all Laws and Ceremonies &c. were more particularly, and minutely delivered, then in the new Teſtament is done, our Saviour leaving particulars to the determination of the Church.* But I pray walk not thus in generality, but tell us what *particulars?* If you mean particular rites, & ceremonies, and orders for goverment, we grant it, and you know we doe ſo. Our Savi-

our

our only hath left a generall injunction by S.*Paul*, *Let All things bee done decently and in Order*. But what Order is fitteſt, i. e. what Time, what Place, what Manner, &c. is fitteſt, that he hath left to the diſcretion of the Governers of the Church. But if you mean, that hee hath only concerning maters of faith, the ſubject in Queſtion, preſcribed in generall, that we are to heare the Church, and left it to the Church to determine what particulars we are to belieue: The Church being nothing elſe but an aggregation of Believers, this in effect is to ſay, He hath left it to all Believers to determine what Particulars they are to believe. Beſides it is ſo apparently falſe, that I wonder you could content your ſelfe, or think we ſhould be contented with a bare ſaying, without any ſhew or pretence of proofe.

143 As for D.*Potters* objection againſt this Argument, *That as well you might inferre, that Chriſtians muſt haue all one King, becauſe the Iewes had ſo*, For ought I can perceive, notwithſtanding any thing anſwered by you, it may ſtand ſtill in force, though the truth is, it is urg'd by him not againſt the Infallibility but the Monarchy of the Church. For whereas you ſay, the diſparity is very cleare: Hee that ſhould urge this argument for one Monarch over the whole world, would ſay that this is to deny the Concluſion, and reply unto you, that there is diſparity, as matters are now order'd, but that there ſhould not be ſo. For that there was no more reaſon to believe that the Eccleſiaſticall government of the Iews was a Pattern for the Eccleſiaſticall government of Chriſtians, then the Civill of the Iewes, for the Civill of the Chriſtians. He would tell you, that the Church of Chriſt, and all Chriſtian Commonwealths, and Kingdomes, are one and the ſame thing: and therefore he ſees no reaſon why the Synagogue ſhould be a Type and Figure of the Church, and not of the Commonwealth. He would tell you, that as the Church ſucceeded the Iewiſh Synagogue, ſo Chriſtian Princes ſhould ſucceed to Iewiſh Magiſtrates: that is the Temporal Governours of the Church ſhould be Chriſtians. He would tell you, that as the Church is compar'd to a houſe, a Kingdome, an Army, a Body, ſo all diſtinct Kingdomes might and ſhould be one Armie, one Familie, &c. and that it is not ſo, is the thing he complaines of. And therefore you ought not to think it enough to ſay it is not ſo, but you ſhould ſhew why it ſhould not be ſo; and why this argument will not follow, The Iewes had one King, therefore all Chriſtians ought to haue: as well as this, The Iewes had one High Prieſt over them all, therefore all Chriſtians alſo ought to haue. Hee might tell you moreover, that the Church may haue one Maſter, one Generall, one Head, one King, and yet he not be the Pope, but Chriſt. He might tell you, that you beg the Queſtion, in ſaying without proof, that it is neceſſary to ſalvation, that all (whether Chriſtians or Churches) have recourſe to one Church, if you mean by one Church, one particular Church, which is to govern and direct all others: and that unleſſe you mean ſo, you ſay nothing to the purpoſe. And beſides, he might tell you, and that very truly, that it may ſeeme altogether as available for the Temporall good of Chriſtians to be under one Tem-

poral Prince, or Cõmonwealth, as for their ſalvatiõ, to be ſubordinate to one Viſible Head. I ſay as neceſſary, both for the prevention of the effuſion of the Blood of Chriſtians by Chriſtians, & for the defence of Chriſtendome, from the hoſtile invaſions of Turks, & Pagans. And frõ all this he might infer, that though now, by the fault of men, there were in ſeverall Kingdomes, ſeverall Lawes, Goverments and Powers; yet that it were much more expedient, that there were but one. Nay, not only expedient, but neceſſary; if once your ground be ſetled for a generall rule, that what kinde of government the Iewes had, that the Chriſtians muſt haue. And if you limit the generality of this Propoſition, and frame the Argument thus: What kinde of Eccleſiaſticall government the Iews had, that the Chriſtians muſt haue, But They were governed by one High Prieſt, therefore Theſe muſt be ſo: He will ſay that the firſt propoſition of this ſyllogiſme, is altogether as doubtfull as the concluſion; and therefore neither fit nor ſufficient to prove it, untill it ſelfe be proved. And then beſides, that there is as great reaſon to believe this, That what kinde of Civill government the Iews had, that the Chriſtians muſt haue. And ſo D. *Potters* objection remaines ſtill unanſwered: That there is as much reaſon to conclude a neceſſity of one King over all Chriſtian Kingdomes, from the Iews having one King; as one Biſhop over all Churches, from their being under one High Prieſt.

Irenæus l. 3. c. 3. 144 *Ad* §. 24. Neither is this Diſcourſe confirm'd by *Irenæus* at all. Whether by this diſcourſe you mean that immediatly forgoing, of the analogy between the Church and the Synagogue, to which this ſpeech of *Irenæus*, alleadged here by you, is utterly and plainly impertinent; Or whether by this diſcourſe, you mean (as I think you doe) not your diſcourſe, but your concluſion which you diſcourſe on, that is, that *Your Church is the infallible Iudge in Controverſies*. For neither has *Irenæus* one ſyllable to this purpoſe; neither can it be deduced out of what he ſaies, with any colour of conſequence. For firſt in ſaying, *What if the Apoſtles had not left Scripture, ought we not to have followed the order of Tradition?* And in ſaying, *That to this order many Nations yeild aſſent, who believe in Chriſt, having Salvation written in their hearts, by the Spirit of God, without Letters or Inke, and diligently keeping ancient Tradition*: Doth he not plainly ſhew, that the Tradition he ſpeakes of, is nothing elſe, but the very ſame that is written: nothing but to believe in Chriſt? To which, whether Scripture alone, to them that believe it, be not a ſufficient guide, I leave it to you to judge. And are not his wordes juſt as if a man ſhould ſay, If God had not given us the light of the Sunne, we muſt have made uſe of candles and torches: If we had had no eyes, we muſt have felt out our way: If we had no leggs, we muſt have uſed crutches. And doth not this in effect import, that while we have the Sunne, we need no candles? While we have our eyes, we need not feele out our way? While we enjoy our leggs, we need not crutches? And by like reaſon, *Irenæus* in ſaying, *If we had had no Scripture, we muſt have followed Tradition, and they that have none, doe well to doe ſo*, doth he not plainly import

port, that to them that have Scripture, and believe it, Tradition is unneceſſary? which could not be, if the Scripture did not contain evidently the whole tradition. Which whether *Irenæus* believed or no, theſe words of his may informe you, *Non enim per alios &c. we have received the diſpoſition of our Salvation from no others, but from them, by whom the Goſpell came unto us. Which Goſpell truly, the Apoſtles firſt preached, and afterwards by the will of God, delivered in writing to us, to be the Pillar and Foundation of our faith.* Vpon which place *Bellarmine's* two obſervations, and his acknowledgment enſuing upon them, are very conſiderable, and as I conceive, as home to my purpoſe as I would wiſh them. His firſt *Notandum* is, *That in the Chriſtian Doctrine, ſome things are ſimply neceſſary for the Salvation of all men; as the knowledge of the Articles of the Apoſtles Creed; and beſides, the knowledg of the ten Commandements, and ſome of the Sacraments. Other things not ſo neceſſary, but that a man may be ſaved, without the explicit knowledge, and belief, and profeſſion of them.* His Second Note is, *That thoſe things which were ſimply neceſſary, the Apoſtles were wont to preach to all men; But of other things not all to all, but ſome things to all, to wit, thoſe things which were profitable for all, other things only to Prelats and Prieſts.* Theſe things premiſed, he acknowledgeth, *That all thoſe things were written by the Apoſtles, which are neceſſary for all, and which they were wont openly to preach to all; But that other things were not all written: And therefore, when Irenæus ſaies that the Apoſtles wrot what they Preach in the World, it is true,* ſaith he, *and not againſt Traditions, becauſe they preached not to the People all things, but only thoſe things, which were neceſſary or profitable for them.* *Bellarm. de verbo Dei l. 4. c. 11.*

145 So that at the moſt, you can inferre from hence, but only a ſuppoſitive neceſſity of having an infallible Guide, and that grounded upon a falſe ſuppoſition, In caſe we had no Scripture, but an abſolute neceſſity hereof, and to them who have and believe the Scripture, which is your aſſumption, cannot with any colour from hence be concluded, but rather the contrary.

146 Neither becauſe (as He ſaies) it was *then eaſy to receive the Truth from Gods Church, then,* in the Age next after the Apoſtles, Then, when all the ancient and Apoſtolike Churches were at an agreement about the Fundamentalls of Faith: Will it therefore follow that now, 1600 yeares after, when the ancient Churches are divided almoſt into as many Religions as they are Churches, every one being the Church to it ſelfe, and hereticall to all other, that it is as eaſy, but extremely difficult or rather impoſſible, to find the Church firſt independently of the true Doctrine, and then to find the truth by the Church.

147 As for the laſt clauſe of the ſentence, it will not any whit advantage, but rather prejudice your aſſertion. Neither will I ſeek to avoid the preſſure of it, by ſaying, that he ſpeaks of *ſmall Queſtions*, and therefore not of Queſtions touching things neceſſary to Salvation, which can hardly be called ſmall Queſtions; But I will favour you ſo farre, as to ſuppoſe, that ſaying this of ſmall Queſtions, it is probable, he would have ſaid it much more of the Great: but I will anſwere that

which is moſt certain and evident, and which I am confident, you your ſelfe, were you as impudent as I believe you modeſt, would not deny; that the ancient Apoſtolique Churches are not now, as they were in *Irenæus's* time: then they were all at unity about matters of faith, which unity was a good aſſurance that what they ſo agreed in, came from ſome one common Fountaine, and they had no other then of Apoſtolike Preaching. And this is the very ground of *Tertullian's* ſo often miſtaken *Preſcription againſt Heretiques, Variaſſe debuerat Error Eccleſiarum, quod autem apud multos unum eſt, non eſt erratum ſed traditum*: If the Churches had erred they could not but have varied, but that which is one among ſo many, came not by Error but Tradition. But now the caſe is altered, and the miſchiefe is, that theſe ancient Churches are divided among themſelves; and if we have recourſe to them, one of them will ſay this is the way to heaven, another that. So that now in place of receiving from them certain and cleare truths, we muſt expect nothing but certain and cleare contradictions.

148 Neither will the *Apoſtles depoſiting with the Church, all things belonging to truth*, be any proof that the Church ſhall certainly keep this *depoſitum*, entire, and ſyncere, without adding to it, or taking from it; for this whole *depoſitum* was committed to every particular Church, nay, to every particular man, which the Apoſtles converted. And yet no man, I think, will ſay, that there was any certainty, that it ſhould be kept whole and inviolate by every man, and every Church. It is apparent out of Scripture, it was committed to *Timothy*, and by him conſigned to other faithfull men: and yet S. *Paul* thought it not ſuperfluous, earneſtly to exhort him to the carefull keeping of it: which exhortation you muſt grant had been vain and ſuperfluous, if the not keeping of it had been impoſſible. And therefore though *Irenæus* ſaies, *The Apoſtles fully depoſited in the Church all truth*, yet he ſaies not, neither can we inferre from what he ſaies, that the Church ſhould alwaies infallibly keep this *depoſitum*, entire without the loſſe of any truth, and ſyncere without the mixture of any falſhood.

149 *Ad* §. 25. But you proceed and tell us, *That beſide all this, the Doctrine of Proteſtants is deſtructive of it ſelfe. For either they have certain and Infallible meanes not to erre in interpreting; or not. If not, Scripture to them cannot be a ſufficient ground for infallible faith: If they have, and ſo cannot erre in interpreting Scripture, then they are able with infallibility to heare and determine all controverſies of faith; and ſo they may be, and are Iudges of Controverſies, although they uſe the Scripture as a Rule. And thus againſt their own doctrine, they conſtitute another Iudge of Controverſies beſide Scripture alone.* And may not we with as much reaſon ſubſtitute Church and Papiſts, inſtead of Scripture and Proteſtants, and ſay unto you, Beſides all this, the doctrine of Papiſts is deſtructive of it ſelfe. For either they have certain and infallible meanes not to erre, in the choice of the Church, and interpreting her decrees, or they have not: If not, then the Church to them cannot be a ſufficient (but meerely a phantaſticall) ground for infallible faith, nor a meet Iudge of Controverſies: (For unleſſe I be infallibly ſure that

that the Church is Infallible, how can I be upon her Authority infallibly ſure, that any thing ſhe ſaies is Infallible?) If they have certain infallible meanes, and ſo cannot erre in the choice of their Church, and in interpreting her decrees, then they are able with Infallibility to heare, examine, and determine all controverſies of faith, although they pretend to make the Church their Guide. And thus againſt their own Doctrine, they conſtitute another Iudge of controverſies, beſides the Church alone. Nay every one makes himſelfe a chooſer of his own Religion, and of his own ſenſe of the Churches decrees, which very thing in Proteſtants they ſo highly condemne: and ſo in judging others, condemne themſelves.

150 Neither in ſaying thus haue I only cry'd quittance with you: but that you may ſee how much you are in my debt, I will ſhew unto you, that for your Sophiſme againſt our way, I haue given you a Demonſtration againſt yours. Firſt, I ſay, your Argument againſt us, is a tranſparent fallacy. The firſt part of it lyes thus: Proteſtants haue no meanes to interpret, without errour, obſcure and ambiguous places of Scripture; therefore plain places of Scripture cānot be to thē a ſufficiēt ground of Faith. But though we pretend not to certain meanes of not erring, in interpreting all Scripture, particularly ſuch places as are obſcure and ambiguous, yet this me thinks ſhould be no impediment but that we may have certain meanes of not erring in and about the ſenſe of thoſe places, which are ſo plain and cleer that they need no Interpreters; and in ſuch we ſay our Faith is contain'd. If you aske me how I can be ſure that I know the true meaning of theſe places? I aske you again, can you be ſure that you underſtand what I, or any man elſe ſaies? They that heard our Saviour and the Apoſtles preach, could they haue ſufficient aſſurance, that they underſtood at any time, what they would have them doe? if not, to what end did they heare them? If they could, why may we not be as well aſſured, that we underſtand ſufficiently, what we conceive plaine in their writings?

151 Againe, I pray tell us, whether you doe certainly know the ſenſe of theſe Scriptures, with which you pretend you are led to the knowledge of your Church? If you doe not, how know you that there is any Church Infallible, and that theſe are the notes of it, & that this is the Church that hath theſe notes? If you doe, then give us leave to haue the ſame meanes, and the ſame abilities to know other plain places, which you have to know theſe. For if all Scripture be obſcure, how come you to know the ſenſe of theſe places? If ſome places of it be plain, why ſhould we ſtay here?

152 And now, to come to the other part of your dilemma; in ſaying, *If they have certain meanes, and ſo cannot erre*, mee thinkes you forget your ſelfe very much, and ſeeme to make no difference, between, having certain meanes to doe a thing, and the actuall doing of it. As if you ſhould conclude, becauſe all men have certain meanes of Salvation, therefore all men certainly muſt be ſaved, and cannot doe otherwiſe; as if whoſoever had a horſe muſt preſently get up and ride; Whoſoever had meanes to find out a way, could not neglect thoſe

meanes

meanes and ſo miſtake it, God be thanked, that we have ſufficient meanes to be certain enough of the truth of our Faith. But the Priviledge of not being in poſſibility of erring, that we challenge not, becauſe we have as little reaſon as you to doe ſo: and you have none at all. If you aske, ſeeing we may poſſibly erre, how can we be aſſured we doe not? I ask you again, ſeeing your eye-ſight may deceive you, how can you be ſure you ſee the Sunne, when you doe ſee it? Perhaps you may be in a dream, and perhaps you, and all the men in the World have been ſo, when they thought they were awake, and then only awake, when they thought they dreamt. But this I am ſure of, as ſure as that God is good, that he will require no impoſſibilities of us: not an Infallible, nor a certainly-unerring belief, unleſſe he hath given us certain meanes to avoid error; and if we uſe thoſe which we have, will never require of us, that we uſe that which we have not.

153 Now from this miſtaken ground, that it is all one to have meanes of avoiding errour, and to be in no danger nor poſſibility of errour; You inferre vpon us as an abſurd concluſion, *That we make our ſelves able to determine Controverſies of faith with Infallibility, and Iudges of Controverſies.* For the latter part of this inference, we acknowledge and imbrace it. We doe make our ſelves Iudges of controverſies: that is, we doe make uſe of our own underſtanding in the choice of our Religion. But this, if it be a crime, is common to us with you, (as I have proved above) and the difference is, not that wee are chooſers, and you not chooſers, but that we, as we conceive, chooſe wiſely, but you being wilfully blind chooſe to follow thoſe that are ſo too; not remembring what our Saviour hath told you, *when the blind lead the blind, both ſhall fall into the ditch.* But then again I muſt tell you, you have done ill to confound together, Iudges, and infallible Iudges; unleſſe you will ſay, either that we have no Iudges in our Courts of Civill judicature, or that they are all Infallible.

154 Thus haue we caſt off your dilemma, and broken both the hornes of it. But now my retortion lies heavy upon you, and will not be turned off. For firſt you content not your ſelves with a morall certainty of the things you beleive, nor with ſuch a degree of aſſurance of them, as is ſufficient to produce obedience to the condition of the new Covenant, which is all that we require. Gods Spirit, if he pleaſe, may work more, a certainty of adherence beyond a certainty of evidence. But neither God doth, nor man may require of us as our dutie, to give a greater aſſent to the concluſion then the premiſes deſerue; to build an infallible Faith upon Motives that are only highly credible, and not infallible, as it were a great and heavy building upon a foundation that hath not ſtrength proportionable. But though God require not of us ſuch unreaſonable things, You doe, and tell men they cannot be ſaved, unleſſe they beleive your propoſals with an infallible Faith. To which end they muſt beleive alſo your Propounder, your Church, to be ſimply Infallible. Now how is it poſſible for them to give a rationall aſſent to the Churches infallibility, unleſſe they have ſome infallible meanes to know that ſhe is infallible? Neither can they infallibly

libly know the infallibility of this meanes, but by ſome other, and ſo on for ever: unleſſe they can dig ſo deep as to come at length to the Rock, that is, *to ſettle all upon ſomething evident of it ſelfe*, which is not ſo much as pretended. But the laſt reſolution of all is into Motives, which indeed upon examination will ſcarce appeare probable, but are not ſo much as avouched to be any more then very credible. For example, if I aske you why you doe beleive Tranſubſtantiatiō? What can you anſwer, but becauſe it is a Revelation of the Prime Verity. I demaund again, how can you aſſure your ſelfe or me of that, being ready to embrace it if it may appeare to be ſo? And what can you ſay, but that you know it to be ſo, becauſe the Church ſaies ſo, which is Infallible. If I aske, what meane You by your Church? You can tell me nothing, but the company of Chriſtians which adhere to the *Pope*. I demaund then laſtly: Why ſhould I beleive this company to be the infallible Propounder of Divine Revelation? And then you tell me, that there are many Motives to induce a man to this beleife. But are theſe Motives laſtly infallible? No ſay you, but very credible. Well, let them paſſe for ſuch, becauſe now we have not leaſure to examine them. Yet me thinks ſeeing the Motives to believe the Churches infallibility, are only very credible, it ſhould alſo be but as credible that your Church is Infallible, and as credible, and no more, perhaps ſomewhat leſſe, that her propoſals, particularly Tranſubſtantiation, are Divine Revelations. And me thinks You ſhould require only a Morall, and modeſt aſſent to them, and not a Divine as you call it, and infallible Faith. But then of theſe Motives to the Churches Infallibility, I hope you will give us leave to conſider, and judge whether they be indeed Motives, and ſufficient; or whether they be not Motives at all, or not ſufficient; or whether theſe Motives or inducements to your Church be not impeached, and oppoſed with Compulſives, and enforcements from it; or laſtly, whether theſe Motives which You uſe, be not indeed only Motives to Chriſtianity, and not to *Popery*: giue me leave for diſtinction ſake to call your Religion ſo. If we may not judge of theſe things, how can my judgment be moved with that which comes not within its cognizance? If I may, then at leaſt I am to be a Iudge of all theſe Controverſies. 1. Whether every one of theſe Motives be indeed a Motive to any Church? 2. If to ſome, whether to Yours? 3. If to Yours, whether ſufficient, or inſufficient? 4. Whether other Societies haue not as many, and as great Motives to draw me to them? 5. Whether I haue not greater reaſon to beleive you doe erre, then that you cannot? And now Sir I pray let me trouble You with a few more Queſtions. Am I a ſufficient Iudge of theſe Controverſies, or no? If of theſe, why ſhall I ſtay here, why not of others? Why not of all? Nay doth not the true examining of theſe few, containe and lay upon me the examination of all? What other Motives to your Church have you, but your Notes of it? *Bellarmine* gives ſome 14. or 15. And one of theſe fifteene containes in it the examination of all controverſies, and not only ſo, but of all uncontroverted Doctrines. For how ſhall I, or can I know the Church of *Romes*

conformity with the Ancient Church, unleſſe I know firſt what the Ancient Church did hold, and then what the Church of *Rome* doth hold; and laſtly, whether they be conformable, or if in my judgment they ſeeme not conformable, I am then to think the Church of *Rome* not to be the Church, for want of the Note which ſhe pretends is proper, and perpetuall to it. So that for ought I can ſee, Iudges we are and muſt be of all ſides, every one for himſelfe, and God for us all.

155 *Ad § 26.* I anſwere; This aſſertion, that *Scripture alone is Iudge of all Controverſies in Faith*, if it be taken properly, is neither a Fundamentall nor Vnfundamentall point of Faith, nor no point of Faith at all, but a plaine falſhood. It is not *a Iudge of Controverſies but a Rule to Iudge them by*; and that not an abſolutly perfect Rule, but as perfect as a written Rule can be; which muſt alwayes need ſomething elſe, which is either evidently true, or evidently credible to give atteſtation to it, and that in this caſe is Vniverſall Tradition. So that Vniverſall Tradition is the Rule to judge all Controverſies by. But then becauſe nothing beſides Scripture, comes to us with as full a ſtreame of Tradition as Scripture, Scripture alone, and no unwritten Doctrine, nor no Infallibility of any Church, having atteſtation from Tradition truely Vniverſall; for this reaſon we conceive, as the Apoſtles perſons while they were liuing were the only Iudges of controverſies, ſo their Writings, now they are dead, are the only Rule for us to judge them by: There being nothing unwritten, which can goe in upon halfe ſo faire cards, for the title of Apoſtolike Tradition, as theſe things which by the confeſſion of both Sides are not ſo: I mean *the doctrine of the Milleneries*, and *of the neceſſity of the Euchariſt for Infants*.

156 Yet when we ſay, the Scripture is the only Rule to judge all Controverſies by, me thinks you ſhould eaſily conceiue, that wee would be underſtood of all thoſe that are poſſible to be judg'd by Scripture, and of thoſe that ariſe among ſuch as believe the Scripture. For if I had a controverſie with an Atheiſt whether there were a God or no, I would not ſay, that the Scripture were a Rule to judge this by: ſeeing that doubting whether there be a God or no, he muſt needs doubt whether the Scripture be the word of God: or if hee does not, hee grants the Queſtion, and is not the man we ſpeak of. So likewiſe, if I had a controverſie about the Truth of Chriſt with a Iew, it would be vainly done of me, ſhould I preſſe him which the Authority of the new Teſtament which he believes not, untill out of ſome principles common to us both, I had perſuaded him that it is the Word of God. The New Teſtament therefore while he remaines a Iew would not be a fit Rule to decide this Controverſie; In as much as that which is doubted of it ſelfe, is not fit to determine other doubts. So likewiſe if there were any that believed Chriſtian Religion, and yet believed not the Bible to be the Word of God, though they believed the matter of it to be true, (which is no impoſſible ſuppoſition, for I may believe a book of S. *Auſtines*, to containe nothing but the Truth of God, & yet not to haue been inſpired by God himſelfe,) againſt ſuch men therefore there were no diſputing out of the Bible; becauſe nothing in queſtion

ſtion can be a proof to it ſelfe. When therefore we ſay the Scripture is a ſufficient meanes to determine all controverſies, we ſay not this, either to Atheiſts, Iewes, Turks, or ſuch Chriſtians (if there be any ſuch) as believe not Scripture to be the word of God. But among ſuch men only, as are already agreed upon this, That the Scripture is the Word of God, we ſay all controverſies that ariſe about Faith, are either not at all decidable & conſequently not neceſſary to be believed one way or other, or they may be determined by Scripture. In a Word, That all things neceſſary to be believed are evidently contain'd in Scripture, and what is not there evidently contained, cannot be neceſſary to be believed. And our reaſon hereof is convincing; becauſe nothing can challenge our beliefe, but what hath deſcended to us from Chriſt by Originall and Vniverſall Tradition: Now nothing but Scripture hath thus deſcended to us, Therefore nothing but Scripture can challenge our beliefe. Now then to come up cloſer to you, and to anſwer to your Queſtion, not as you put it, but as you ſhould haue put it: I ſay, That this poſition, *Scripture alone is the rule whereby they which beliue it to be Gods Word are to judge all Controverſies in Faith*, is no fundamẽtall point. Though not for your Reaſons: For your firſt and ſtrongeſt reaſon you ſee is plainly voided and cut off by my ſtating of the Queſtion as I haue done, and ſuppoſing in it that the parties at variance are agreed about this, That the Scripture is the word of God; and conſequently that this is none of their Controverſies. To your ſecond, That *Controverſies cannot be ended without ſome living Authority*, We haue ſaid already, that neceſſary Controverſies may be & are decided. And if they be not ended, this is not through defect of the Rule, but through the default of Men. And for theſe that cannot thus be ended, it is not neceſſary they ſhould be ended. For if God did require the ending of them, he would have provided ſome certain meanes for the ending of them. And to your Third, I ſay, that your pretence of uſing theſe meanes is but hypocriticall: for you uſe them with prejudice, and with a ſetled reſolution not to believe any thing which theſe meanes happily may ſuggeſt into you, if it any way croſſe your pre-conceav'd perſuaſion of your Churches infalliblity. You give not your ſelves liberty of judgement in the uſe of them, nor ſuffer your ſelves to bee led by them to the Truth, to which they would lead you, would you but be as willing to believe this conſequence, Our Church doth oppoſe Scripture, therefore it doth erre, therefore it is not Infallible, as you are reſolute to believe this, The Church is infallible, therefore it doth not erre, and therefore it doth not oppoſe Scripture, though it ſeem to doe ſo never ſo plainly.

157 You pray, but it is not that God would bring you to the true Religion, but that he would confirm you in your own. You conferre places, but it is that you may confirm, or colour over with plauſible diſguiſes your erroneous doctrine, not that you may judge of them & forſake them if there be reaſon for it. You conſult the Originalls, but you regard them not when they make againſt your Doctrine or Tranſlation.

158 You adde not only the Authority, but the Infallibility, not of Gods Church, but of the Roman, a very corrupt and degenerous part of it: whereof D. *Potter* never confeſſed, that it cannot erre damnably. And which being a company made up of particular men, can afford you no help, but the induſtry, learning, and wit of private men: and that theſe helps may not help you out of your errour, tell you, that you muſt make uſe of none of all theſe to diſcover any errour in the Church, but only to maintaine her impoſſibility of erring. And laſtly, D. *Potter* aſſures himſelfe that your Doctrine and practiſes are damnable enough in themſelves; Only he hopes (and *ſpes eſt rei incertæ nomen*) he hopes, I ſay, that the Truths which you retain, eſpecially the neceſſity of repentance and faith in Chriſt, will bee as an antidote to you againſt the errours which you maintain; and that your ſuperſtructions may burne, yet they amongſt you, *Qui ſequuntur Abſalonem in ſimplicitate cordis* may be ſaved, *yet ſo as by fire.* Yet his thinking ſo is no reaſon for you or me to think ſo, unleſſe you ſuppoſe him infallible; and if you doe, why doe you write againſt him?

159 Notwithſtanding, though not for theſe reaſons, yet for others, I conceive this Doctrine not Fundamentall: Becauſe if a man ſhould believe Chriſtian Religion wholly, and entirely, and live according to it, ſuch a man, though he ſhould not know or not believe the Scripture to be a Rule of Faith, no nor to be the word of God, my opinion is he may be ſaved; and my reaſon is, becauſe he performes the entire condition of the new Covenant, which is, that we believe the matter of the Goſpell, and not that it is contained in theſe or theſe Bookes. So that the Bookes of Scripture are not ſo much the objects of our faith, as the inſtruments of conveying it to our underſtanding; and not ſo much of the being of the Chriſtian Doctrine, as requiſite to the well being of it. *Irenæus* tels us (as M. K. acknowledgeth) of ſome barbarous Nations, that *believed the Doctrine of Chriſt, and yet believed not the Scripture to be the word of God, for they never heard of it, and Faith comes by hearing:* But theſe barbarous people might be ſaved: therefore men might be ſaved without believing the Scripture to be the word of God; much more without believing it to bea Rule, and a perfect Rule of Faith. Neither doubt I, but if the bookes of Scripture had been propoſed to them by the other parts of the Church, where they had been before received, and had been doubted of, or even rejected by thoſe barbarous nations, but ſtill by the bare beliefe and practiſe of Chriſtianity, they might be ſaved: God requiring of us under pain of damnation, only to believe the verities therein contained, and not the divine Authority of the bookes wherein they are contained. Not but that it were now very ſtrange and unreaſonable, if a man ſhould believe the matter of theſe bookes, and not the Authority of the bookes: and therefore if a man ſhould profeſſe the not believing of theſe, I ſhould have reaſon to fear he did not believe that. But there is not alwaies an equall neceſſity for the belief of thoſe things, for the belief whereof there is an equall reaſon. We have I believe as great reaſon to believe there was ſuch a man as *Henry the eight*

K. of

K. of England, as that *Ieſus Chriſt* ſuffered under *Pontius Pilate*: yet this is neceſſary to be believed, and that is not ſo. So that if any man ſhould doubt of or disbelieve that, it were moſt unreaſonably done of of him, yet it were no mortall ſinne, nor no ſinne at all: God having no where commanded men under pain of damnation to believe all which reaſon induceth them to believe. Therefore as an Executor, that ſhould performe the whole will of the dead, ſhould fully ſatisfy the Law, though he did not believe that Parchment to be his written Will, which indeed is ſo: So I believe, that he who believes all the particular doctrines which integrate Chriſtianity, and lives according to them, ſhould be ſaved, though he neither believed nor knew that the Goſpels were written by the Evangeliſts, or the Epiſtles by the Apoſtles.

160 This diſcourſe whether it be rationall and concluding or no, I ſubmit to better judgement; But ſure I am, that the corollary which you draw from this poſition, *that this point is not Fundamentall*, is very inconſequent; that is, *that we are uncertain of the truth of it*, becauſe we ſay the whole Church, much more particular Churches and privat men may erre in points not Fundamentall. A pretty ſophiſme, depending upon this Principle, that whoſoever poſſibly may erre, he cannot be certain that he doth not erre. And upon this ground, what ſhall hinder me from concluding, that ſeeing you alſo hold, that neither particular Churches, nor private men are Infallible even in Fundamentalls, that even the Fundamentalls of Chriſtianity, remain to you uncertain? A Iudge may poſſibly erre in judgement, can he therefore never have aſſurance that he hath judged right? A travailer may poſſibly miſtake his way, muſt I therefore be doubtfull whether I am in the right way from my Hall to my Chamber? Or can our London carrier have no certainty, in the middle of the day, when he is ſober and in his wits, that he is in the way to London? Theſe you ſee are right worthy conſequences, and yet they are as like your own, as an egge to an egge, or milke to milke.

161 And *for the ſelfe ſame reaſon* (you ſay) *we are not certain, that the Church is not Iudge of Controverſies*: But now this ſelfe ſame appears to be no reaſon, and therefore, for all this, we may be certain enough that the Church is no Iudge of Controverſies. The ground of this ſophiſme is very like the former, *viz.* that we can be certain of the falſhood of no propoſitions, but theſe only which are damnable errors. But I pray good Sir, give me your opinion of theſe: The Snow is black, the Fire is cold, that M. *Knot* is Archbiſhop of *Toledo*, that the whole is not greater then a part of the whole, that twiſe two make not foure: In your opinion, good Sir, are theſe damnable Hæreſies? or becauſe they are not ſo, have we no certainty of the falſhood of them? I beſeech you Sir to conſider ſeriouſly, with what ſtrange captions, you have gone about to delude your King and your Country; and if you be convinced, they are ſo, give glory to God, and let the world know it, by your deſerting that Religion, which ſtands upon ſuch deceitfull foundations.

162 Beſides (you ſay) *among publique concluſions defended in Oxford, the yeare 1633. to the Queſtions, Whether the Church have authority to determine controverſies of Faith? And to interpret holy Scripture? The anſwere to both is affirmative.* But what now if I ſhould tell you, that in the year 1632. among publique Concluſions defended in Doway, one was, *That God predeterminates men to all their Actions good, bad, and indifferent?* Will you think your ſelfe obliged to be of this opinion? If you will, ſay ſo: If not, doe as you would be done by. Again, me thinkes ſo ſubtil a man as you are, ſhould eaſily apprehend a wide difference between Authority to doe a thing, and Infallibility in doing it: & againe, between a conditionall infallibility & an abſolute. The former, the Doctor together with the Article of the Church of England, attributeth to the Church, nay to particular Churches; and I ſubſcribe to his opinion: that is, an Authority of determining controverſies of faith, according to plain and evident Scripture and Vniverſall Tradition, and Infallibility while they proceed according to this Rule. As if there ſhould ariſe an Heretique, that ſhould call in Queſtion Chriſts Paſſion and Reſurrection, the Church had Authority to decide this Controverſy, and infallible direction how to doe it, and to excommunicate this man, if he ſhould perſiſt in errour. I hope you will not deny but that the Iudges have Authority to determine criminall and Civill Controverſies; and yet I hope you will not ſay, that they are abſolutely Infallible in their determinations. Infallible while they proceed according to Law, and if they doe ſo: but not infallibly certain that they ſhall ever doe ſo. But that the Church ſhould be infallibly aſſiſted by Gods ſpirit to decide rightly all emergent Controverſies, even ſuch as might be held diverſly of divers men, *Salva compage fidei*, and that we might be abſolutely certain that the Church ſhould never faile to decree the truth, whether ſhe uſed meanes or no, whether ſhe proceed according to her Rule or not; or laſtly that we might be abſolutely certain that ſhe would never fail to proceed according to her Rule, this the defender of theſe concluſions ſaid not: and therefore ſaid no more to your purpoſe, then you have all this while, that is, juſt nothing.

163. Ad §. 27. To the place of *S. Auſtin* alleaged in this paragraph. I Anſwer. Firſt that in many things you will not bee tried by *S. Auguſtines* judgement, nor ſubmit to his authority; not concerning Appeals to Rome, not concerning Tranſubſtantiation, not touching the uſe and worſhiping of Images, not concerning the State of Saints ſoules before the day of judgement, not touching the Virgin Maries freedome from actuall and originall ſinne, not touching the neceſſity of the Euchariſt for Infants, not touching the damning Infants to hell that dye without Baptiſme, not touching the knowledge of Saints departed, not touching Purgatory, not touching the fallibility of Councells, even generall Councells, not touching perfection and perſpicuity of Scripture in matters neceſſary to Salvation, not touching Auricular Confeſſion, not touching the halfe Communion, not touching Prayers in an unknown tongue; In theſe things, I ſay, you will not ſtand to *S. Auſtines* judgement, and therefore can with no reaſon

or

or equity require us to doe ſo in this matter. 2. To S. *Auguſtine* in heat of diſputation againſt the Donatiſts, and ranſacking all places for arguments againſt them, we oppoſe S. *Auſtine* out of this heat, delivering the doctrine of Chriſtianity calmely, and moderately; where he ſaies, *In iis quæ apertè poſita ſunt in ſacris Scripturis, omnia ea reperiuntur quæ continent fidem, moreſq; vivendi.* 3 Wee ſay, he ſpeaks not of the Roman but the Catholique Church, of farre greater extent, and therefore of farre greater credit and authority then the Roman Church. 4 He ſpeaks of a point not expreſſed, but yet not contradicted by Scripture; whereas the errors we charge you with, are contradicted by Scripture. 5 He ſaies not that Chriſt has recommended the Church to us for *an Infallible definer of all emergent controverſies*, but for a *credible witneſſe of Ancient Tradition*. Whoſoever therefore refuſeth to follow the practiſe of the Church (underſtand *of all places and ages*) though he be thought to reſiſt our Saviour, what is that to us, who caſt off no practiſes of the Church, but ſuch as are evidently poſt-nate to the time of the Apoſtles, and plainly contrary to the practiſe of former and purer times. Laſtly it is evident, and even to impudence it ſelfe undeniable, that upon this ground, of beleiving all things taught by the preſent Church as taught by Chriſt, Error was held, for example, the neceſſity of the Euchariſt for infants, and that in S. *Auſtines* time, and that by S. *Auſtine* himſelfe: and therefore without controverſy this is no certain ground for truth, which may ſupport falſhood as well as truth.

164 To the Argument wherewith you conclude, I Anſwere, That though the viſible Church ſhall alwaies without faile propoſe ſo much of Gods revelation, as is ſufficient to bring men to Heaven, for otherwiſe it will not be the viſible Church, yet it may ſometimes adde to this revelation things ſuperfluous, nay hurtfull, nay in themſelves damnable, though not unpardonable; and ſometimes take from it things very expedient and profitable, and therefore it is poſſible, without ſinne, to reſiſt in ſome things the Viſible Church of Chriſt. But you preſſe us farther, and demand, *what viſible Church was extant, when Luther began, whether it were the Roman or Proteſtant Church?* As if it muſt of neceſſity either be Proteſtant or Roman, or Roman of neceſſity, if it were not Proteſtant! yet this is the moſt uſuall fallacy of all your diſputers, by ſome ſpecious Arguments to perſwade weak men that the Church of Proteſtants cannot be the true Church; and thence to inferre, that without doubt it muſt be the Roman. But why may not the Roman be content to be a part of it, and the Grecian another? And if one muſt be the whole, why not the Greek Church, as well as the Roman? there being not one Note of your Church which agrees not to her as well as to your own; unleſſe it be, that ſhe is poor, and oppreſſed by the Turk, and you are in glory and ſplendor.

165 Neither is it ſo eaſy to be determined as you pretend, *That Luther and other Proteſtants oppoſed the whole viſible Church in matters of Faith*, neither is it ſo evident that *the Viſible Church may not fall into*

ſuch

ſuch a ſtate wherein ſhe may be juſtly oppoſed. And laſtly for calling the diſtinction of *points into Fundamentall and not Fundamentall*, an evaſion, I believe you will find it eaſier to call it ſo, then to prove it ſo. But that ſhall be the iſſue of the Controverſy in the next Chapter.

CHAP. III.

That the diſtinction of points fundamentall and not fundamentall, is neither pertinent, nor true in our preſent Controverſie. And that the Catholike Viſible Church cannot erre, in either kinde of the ſaid points.

THIS diſtinction is abuſed by Proteſtants to many purpoſes of theirs, and therefore if it be either untrue or impertinent (as they underſtand, and apply it) the whole edifice built thereon, muſt be ruinous and falſe. For if you object their bitter and continued diſcords in matters of faith, without any means of agreement; they inſtantly tell you (as *Charity miſtaken* plainly ſhewes) that they differ only in points not fundamentall. If you convince them, even by their own Confeſſions, that the ancient Fathers taught divers points held by the *Roman* Church againſt Proteſtants; they reply, that thoſe Fathers may nevertheleſſe be ſaved, becauſe thoſe errours were not fundamentall. If you will them to remember, that Chriſt muſt alwaies haue a viſible Church on earth, with adminiſtration of Sacraments, and ſucceſſion of Paſtors, and that when *Luther* appeared there was no Church diſtinct from the Roman, whoſe *Communion* and *doctrine*, *Luther* then forſook, and for that cauſe muſt be guilty of *Schiſme* and *Hereſie*; they haue an Anſwer (ſuch as it is) that the Catholike Church cannot periſh, yet may erre in points not fundamentall, and therefore *Luther* and other Proteſtants were obliged to forſake her for ſuch errors, under paine of *Damnation*; as if (forſooth) it were *Damnable*, to hold an error not *Fundamentall*, not *Damnable*. If you wonder how they can teach, that both Catholiques, and Proteſtants may be ſaved in their ſeverall profeſſions; they ſalve this contradiction, by ſaying, that we both agree in all fundamentall points of faith, which is enough for ſalvation. And yet, which is prodigiouſly ſtrange, they could never be induced to give a Catalogue what points in particular be fundamentall, but only by ſome generall deſcription, or by referring us to the *Apoſtles Creed*, without determining, what points therein be fundamentall, or not fundamentall for the matter; and in what ſenſe, they be, or be not ſuch: and yet concerning the meaning of divers points contained, or reduced to the *Creed*, they differ both from us, and among themſelves. And indeed, it being impoſſible for them to exhibit any ſuch Catalogue, the ſaid diſtinction of points, although it were pertinent, and true, cannot ſerve them to any purpoſe, but ſtill they muſt remaine uncertaine, whether or not they diſagree from one another; from the ancient Fathers; and from the Catholique Church, in points fundamentall: which is to ſay, they have no certainty, whether they enjoy the ſubſtance of Chriſtian Faith, without which they cannot hope to be ſaved. But of this more heerafter.

2 And to the end, that what ſhall be ſaid concerning this diſtinction, may be better underſtood, wee are to obſerve; that there be two precepts, which concerne the vertue of faith, or our obligation to *believe* divine truths. The one is by Divines called *Affirmative*, whereby we are obliged to have a poſitive explicite belief of ſome chief Articles of Chriſtian faith. The other is termed *Negative*, which ſtrictly binds us not not to disbelieve, that is, not to believe the contrary of any one point ſufficiently repreſented to our underſtanding, as revealed, or ſpoken by Almighty God. The ſaid *Affirmative Precept* (according to the nature of ſuch commands) injoynes ſome act to be performed, but not at all *times*, nor doth it equally bind all ſorts of *perſons*, in reſpect of all *Objects* to be believed. For *objects*; we grant that ſome are more neceſſary to be explicitely, and ſeverall believed then other: either becauſe they are in themſelves more great, and weighty; or els in regard they inſtruct us in ſome neceſſary Chriſtian duty towards God, our ſelves, or our Neighbour. For *perſons*; no doubt but ſome are obliged to know diſtinctly more then others, by reaſon of their office, vocation, capacity or the like. For *times*; we are not obliged to be ſtill in act of exerciſing acts of faith, but according as ſeverall occaſions permit, or require. The ſecond kind of precept called *Negative*, doth (according to the nature of all ſuch commands) oblige *univerſally*, all *perſons*, in reſpect of all *objects*; and at all *times*; *ſemper & pro ſemper*, as Divines ſpeak. This generall doctrine will be more cleere by examples. I am not obliged to be alwaies helping my Neighbour, becauſe the *Affirmative* precept of *Charity*, bindeth only in ſome particular caſes: But I am alwaies bound by a *Negative* precept, never to doe him any

any hurt, or wrong. I am not alwaies bound to utter what I know to be true: yet I am obliged, never to ſpeak any one leaſt untruth, againſt my knowledge. And (to come to our preſent purpoſe) there is no *Affirmative* precept, commanding us to be at *all times* actually believing any *one*, or *all* Articles of faith: But we are obliged, *never* to exerciſe any act againſt any one truth, known to be revealed. All ſorts of *perſons* are not bound explicitely, and diſtinctly to know all things teſtified by God either in Scripture, or otherwiſe: but every one is obliged, not to believe the contrary of any one point, known to be teſtified by God. For that were in fact to affirme, that God could be deceived, or would deceive, which were to overthrow the whole certainty of our faith, wherein the thing moſt principall, is not the point which we believe, which Divines call the *Materiall Object*, but the chiefeſt is the *Motive* for which we believe, to wit, Almighty Gods infallible revelation, or authority, which they terme the *Formall Object* of our faith. In two ſenſes therefore, and with a double relation, points of faith may be called fundamentall, and neceſſary to ſalvation, The one is taken with reference to the *Affirmative* Precept, when the points are of ſuch quality that there is obligation to know and believe them explicitely and ſeverally. In this ſenſe we grant that there is difference betwixt points of faith, which *D. Potter* (a) to no purpoſe laboureth to prove againſt his Adverſary, who in expreſſe words doth grant and explicate (b) it. But the *Doctor* thought good to diſſemble the matter, and not to ſay one pertinent word in defence of his diſtinction, as it was impugned by *Charity Miſtaken*, and as it is wont to be applied by Proteſtants. The other ſenſe, according to which points of faith may be called *Fundamentall*, and neceſſary to ſalvation, with reference to the *Negative* precept of faith, is ſuch, that we cannot without grievous ſinne, and forfeiture of ſalvation, disbelieve any one point, ſufficiently propounded, as revealed by Almighty God. And in this ſenſe we avouch, that there is no diſtinction in points of faith, as if to reject ſome muſt bee damnable, and to reject others, equally propoſed as Gods word, might ſtand with ſalvation. Yea the obligation of the *Negative* precept is farre more ſtrict, then is that of the *Affirmative*, which God freely impoſed, and may freely releaſe. But it is impoſſible, that he can diſpenſe, or give leave to diſbelieue, or deny what he affirmeth: & in this ſenſe, ſin & damnation are more inſeparable from *error* in points *not fundamentall*, then from *ignorance* in Articles *fundamentall*. All this I ſhew by an example, which I wiſh to be particularly noted for the preſent, and for divers other occaſions hereafter. The *Creed* of the *Apoſtles* containes divers fundamentall points of faith, as the Deity, Trinity of Perſons, Incarnation, Paſſion, and Reſurrection of our Saviour Chriſt &c. It containes alſo ſome points, for their matter, and nature in themſelves not fundamentall; as under what Iudge our Saviour ſuffered, that he was buried, the circumſtance of the time of his Reſurrection the third day &c. But yet nevertheleſſe, whoſoever once knowes that theſe points are contained in the Apoſtles *Creed*, the deniall of them is damnable, and is in that ſenſe a *fundamentall* error: and this is the preciſe point of the preſent queſtion.

a *Pag.* 209.

b Charity Miſtaken cap. 8. *Pag.* 75.

3 And all that hitherto hath been ſaid, is ſo manifeſtly true, that no Proteſtant or Chriſtian, if he doe but underſtand the termes, and ſtate of the Queſtion, can poſſibly deny it: In ſo much as I am amazed, that men who otherwiſe are endued with excellent wits, ſhould ſo enſlave themſelves to their Predeceſſors in Proteſtantiſme; as ſtill to harp on this diſtinction, and never regard how impertinently, & untruly it was implied by them at firſt, to make all Proteſtants ſeem to be of one fayth, becauſe forſooth they agree in fundamentall points. For the difference among Proteſtants, conſiſts not in that ſome believe ſome points, of which others are ignorant, or not bound expreſſely to know (as the diſtinction ought to be applied;) but that ſome of them diſbelieve, and directly, wittingly, and willingly oppoſe what others doe believe to be teſtified by the word of God, wherein there is no difference betweeen points fundamentall, and not fundamentall; Becauſe till points fundamentall be ſufficiently propoſed as revealed by God, it is not againſt faith to reject them, or rather without ſufficient propoſition it is not poſſible prudently to believe them; and the like is of points not fundamentall, which aſſoone as they come to be ſufficiently propounded as divine Truths, they can no more be denyed, then points fundamentall propounded after the ſame manner. Neither will it avayle them to their other end, that for preſervation of the Church in being, it is ſufficient that ſhe doe not erre in points fundamentall. For if in the mean time ſhe maintain any one Errour againſt Gods revelation, be the thing in it ſelfe never ſo ſmall, her Errour is damnable, and deſtructive of ſalvation.

4 But *D. Potter* forgetting to what purpoſe Proteſtants make uſe of their diſtinction, doth finally overthrow it, and yields to as much as we can deſire For, ſpeaking of that *meaſure* (c) *& quantity of faith without which none can be ſaved*, he ſayth: *It is enough to believe ſome things by a vertuall faith, or by a generall, and as it were, a negative faith, whereby they are not denyed or contradicted.* Now our queſtion is in caſe that divine truths, although not fundamentall, be denied and contradicted; and therefore, even according to him, all ſuch deniall excludes ſalvation. After, he ſpeaks more plainly. *It is true* (ſaith he) *whatſoever* (d) *is revealed in Scripture, or propounded by the Church out of Scripture, is in ſome ſenſe fundamentall, in regard of the divine authority of God, and his word, by which it is recommended: that is, ſuch as may not be denied, or contradicted without Infidelity: ſuch as every Chriſtian is bound with humility, and reverence to believe, whenſoever the knowledge thereof is offered to him.* And further: *Where* (e) *the revealed will or word of God is ſufficiently propounded; there he that oppoſeth, is convinced of error, and he who is thus convinced is an Heretique, and Hereſie is a work of the fleſh which excludeth from hea-*

c *Pag.* 211.

d *Pag.* 212.

e *Pag.* 250.

ven. (*Gal.* 5. 20. 21.) *And hence it followeth, that it is* FVNDAMENTALL *to a Chriſtians* FAITH, *and neceſſary for his ſalvation, that he believe all revealed Truths of God, whereof he may be convinced that they are from God.* Can any thing be ſpoken more clearly or directly for us, that it is a *Fundamentall* error to deny any one point, though never ſo ſmall, if once it be ſufficiently propounded, as a divine truth, and that there is, in this ſenſe, no diſtinction betwixt points fundamentall, and not fundamentall? And if any ſhould chance to imagine, that it is againſt the foundation of faith, not to believe points *Fundamentall*, although they be not ſufficiently propounded, *D. Potter* doth not admit of this (f) difference betwixt points fundamentall, and not fundamentall. For he teacheth, that *ſufficient propoſition of revealed truth is required before a man can be convinced*, and for want of ſufficient conviction he excuſeth the Diſciples from hereſy, although they believed not our Saviours Reſurrection, (g) which is a very fundamentall point of faith. Thus then I argue out of *D. Potters* own confeſſion: No error is damnable unleſſe the contrary truth be ſufficiently propounded as revealed by God: Every error is damnable, if the contrary truth be ſufficiently propounded as revealed by God: Therefore all errors are alike for the generall effect of damnation, if the difference ariſe not from the manner of being propounded. And what now is become of their diſtinction?

f *Pag.* 246.

g *Pag.* 246.

5 I will therefore conclude with this Argument. According to all Philoſophy and Divinity, the *Vnity*, and diſtinction of every thing followeth the Nature and Eſſence thereof, and therefore if the *Nature* and *being* of faith, be not taken from the matter which a man believes, but from the motive for which he believes, (which is Gods word or Revelation) we muſt likewiſe affirme that the *Vnity*, and *Diverſity* of faith, muſt be meaſured by Gods revelation (which is alike for all objects) and not by the ſmalneſſe, or greatneſſe of the matter which we believe. Now, that the nature of faith is not taken from the greatneſſe, or ſmalneſſe of the things believed, is manifeſt; becauſe otherwiſe one who believes only fundamentall points, and another who together with them, doth alſo believe points not fundamentall, ſhould have faith of different natures, yea there ſhould be as many differences of faith, as there are different points which men believe, according to different capacities, or inſtruction &c. all which conſequences are abſurd, and therefore we muſt ſay, that *Vnity in Faith* doth not depend upon points fundamentall, or not fundamentall, but upon Gods revelation equally or unequally propoſed: and Proteſtants pretending an *Vnity* only by reaſon of their agreement in fundamentall points, doe indeed induce as great a multiplicity of faith as there is multitude of different objects which are believed by them, and ſince they diſagree in things *Equally revealed* by Almighty God, it is evident that they forſake the very *Formall motive* of faith, which is Gods revelation and conſequently looſe all *Faith*, and *Vnity* therein.

6 The firſt part of the Title of this Chapter (*That the diſtinction of points fundamentall and not fundamentall in the ſenſe of Proteſtants, is both impertinent and untrue*) being demonſtrated; let us now come to the ſecond: *That the Church is infallible in all her definitions, whether they concerne points fundamentall, or not fundamentall.* And this I prove by theſe reaſons.

7 It hath been ſhewed in the precedent Chapter, that the Church is Iudge of Controverſies; which ſhe could not be, if ſhe could erre in any one point, as *Doctor Potter* would not deny, if he were once perſwaded that ſhe is Iudge. Becauſe if ſhe could erre in ſome points, we could not rely upon her *Authority* and Iudgment in any one thing.

8 This ſame is proved by the reaſon we alleadged before, that ſeeing the Church was infallible in all her definitions ere Scripture was written (unleſſe we will take away all certainty of faith for that time) we cannot with any ſhew of reaſon affirme, that ſhee hath been deprived thereof by the adjoyned comfort, and helpe of ſacred writ.

9 Moreover to ſay, that the Catholique Church may propoſe any falſe doctrine, maketh her lyable to *damnable* ſinne and error; and yet D. *Potter* teacheth that the Church cannot erre *damnably*. For if in that kind of Oath, which Divines call *Aſſertorium*, wherein God is called to witneſſe, every falſhood is a deadly ſinne in any private perſon whatſoever, although the thing be of it ſelfe neither materiall, nor prejudiciall to any; becauſe the quantity, or greatneſſe of that ſinne is not meaſured ſo much by the thing which is affirmed, as by the manner, and authority whereby it is avouched, and by the injury that is offered to Almighty God in applying his teſtimony to a falſhood: in which reſpect it is the unanimous conſent of all Divines, that in ſuch kind of Oathes, no *levitas materiæ*, that is, *ſmallnes of matter*, can excuſe from a morall ſacrilcdge, againſt the *morall* vertue of Religion which reſpects worſhip due to God: If I ſay, every leaſt falſhood be deadly ſinne in the foreſaid kind of Oath; much more pernicious a ſinne muſt it be in the *publique perſon* of the Catholique Church to propound untrue Articles of faith, thereby faſtning Gods *prime Verity* to falſhood, and inducing and obliging the world to doe the ſame. Beſides, according to the doctrine of all Divines, it is not only injurious to Gods Eternall Verity, to diſbelieve things by him revealed, but alſo to propoſe as revealed truths, things not revealed: as in common wealths it is a haynous offence to coyne either by counterfeiting the metall or the ſtamp, or to apply the Kings ſeale to a writing counterfeit, although the contents were ſuppoſed to be true. And whereas, to ſhew the deteſtable ſinne of ſuch pernitious fictions, the Church doth moſt exemplarly puniſh all broachers of fained revelations, viſions; miracles, prophecies &c. as in particular appeareth in the Councell of (h) *Lateran*, excommunicating ſuch perſons; if the Church her ſelfe could propoſe falſe revelations, ſhe herſelfe ſhould have been the firſt, & chiefeſt

h *Sub. Leon.* 10. *Seſſ.* 11.

deſerves

deſerver to have been cenſured, and as it were excommunicated by herſelfe. For (as the holy Ghoſt ſaith in (i) *Iob*) *doth God need your lye, that for him you may ſpeak deceipts?* And that of the *Apocalyps* is moſt truly verified in fictitious revelations: *If any* (k) *ſhall adde to theſe things, God will adde unto him the plagues which are written in this booke*: and *D. Potter* ſaith, *to adde* (l) *to it* (ſpeaking of the Creed) *is high preſumption, almoſt as great as to detract from it.* And therefore to ſay the Church may adde falſe Revelations, is to accuſe her of high preſumption, and of pernitious errour excluding ſalvation.

i *Cap.* 13.*v.*7. k *Cap. ult.v.* 18. l *Pag.* 122.

10 Perhaps ſome will here reply that although the Church may erre, yet it is not imputed to her for ſinne, by reaſon ſhee doth not erre upon malice, or wittingly, but by ignorance, or miſtake.

11 But it is eaſily demonſtrated that this excuſe cannot ſerve. For if the Church be aſſiſted only for points fundamentall, ſhe cannot but know, that ſhe may erre in points not fundamentall, at leaſt ſhe cannot be certain that ſhe cannot erre, and therefore cannot be excuſed from headlong and pernitious temerity, in propoſing points not fundamentall, to be believed by Chriſtians, as matters of faith, wherein ſhe can have no certainty, yea which alwaies imply a falſhood. For although the thing might chance to be true, and perhaps alſo revealed; yet for the *matter*, ſhe for her part, doth alwaies expoſe her ſelfe to danger of falſhood and error; and in fact doth alwaies erre in the *manner* in which ſhe doth propound any matter not fundamentall; becauſe ſhee propoſeth it as a point of faith *certainly* true, which yet is alwaies uncertain, if ſhe in ſuch things may be deceived.

12 Beſides, if the Church may erre in points not fundamentall, ſhe may erre in propoſing ſome Scripture for Canonicall, which is not ſuch: or elſe not erre in keeping and conſerving from corruptions ſuch Scriptures as are already believed to be Canonicall. For I will ſuppoſe, that in ſuch Apocryphall Scripture as ſhe delivers, there is no fundamentall error againſt faith, or that there is no falſhood at all, but only want of divine teſtification: in which caſe *D. Potter* muſt either grant, that it is a fundamentall error, to apply divine revelation to any point not revealed, or elſe muſt yeeld, that the Church may erre in her *Propoſition*, or *Cuſtody* of the Canon of Scripture: And ſo we cannot be ſure whether ſhe have not been deceived already, in Bookes recommended by her, and accepted by Chriſtians. And thus we ſhall have no certainty of Scripture, if the Church want certainty in all her definitions. And it is worthy to be obſerved, that ſome Bookes of Scripture which were not alwaies knowen to be Canonicall, have been afterward received for ſuch; but never any one book, or ſyllable defined by the Church to be Canonicall, was afterward queſtioned, or rejected for Apocryphall. A ſigne, that Gods Church is infallibly aſſiſted by the holy Ghoſt, never to propoſe as divine truth, any thing not revealed by God: and that, *Omiſſion* to define points not ſufficiently diſcuſſed is laudable, but *Commiſſion* in propounding things not revealed, inexcuſable; into which precipitation our Saviour Chriſt never hath, nor never will permit his Church to fall.

13 Nay, to limit the generall promiſes of our Saviour Chriſt made to his Church to points only fundamentall, namely, that *the gates* (m) *of hell ſhall not prevail againſt her*: and that, *the holy Ghoſt* (n) *ſhall lead her into all truth &c.* is to deſtroy all faith. For we may by that doctrine, and manner of interpreting the Scripture, limit the Infallibility of the Apoſtles words, & preaching, only to points fundanentall: and whatſoever generall Texts of Scripture ſhall be alleadged for their infallibility, they may, by *D. Potters* example be explicated, and reſtrained to points fundamentall. By the ſame reaſon it may be farther affirmed, that the Apoſtles, and other writers of Canonicall Scripture, were endued with infallibility, only in ſetting down points fundamentall. For if it be urged, that *all Scripture is divinely inſpired*; that it is the word of God &c. *D. Potter* hath afforded you a ready anſwer, to ſay, that *Scripture is inſpired* &c. only in thoſe parts, or parcels, wherein it delivereth fundamentall points. In this manner *D. Fotherby* ſaith: *The Apoſtle* (o) *twice in one Chapter profeſſed, that this he ſpeaketh, and not the Lord; He is very well content that where he lacks the warrant of the expreſſe word of God, that part of his writings ſhould be eſteemed as the word of man. D. Potter* alſo ſpeaks very dangerouſly towards this purpoſe, *Sect.* 5. where he endeavoureth to prove, that the infallibility of the Church is limited to points fundamentall, becauſe *as Nature, ſo God is neither defective in* (p) *neceſſaries, nor laviſh in ſuperfluities*. Which reaſon doth likewiſe prove that the infallibility of Scripture, and of the Apoſtles muſt be reſtrained to points neceſſary to ſalvation, that ſo God be not accuſed, *as defective in neceſſaries, or laviſh in ſuperfluities*. In the ſame place he hath a diſcourſe much tending to this purpoſe, where ſpeaking of theſe words: *The Spirit ſhall lead you into all truth, and ſhall abide with* (q) *you for ever*, he ſaith: *Though that promiſe was* (r) *directly, and primarily made to the Apoſtles (who had the Spirits guidance in a more high and abſolute manner, then any ſince them) yet it was made to them for the behoof of the Church, and is verified in the Church Vniverſall. But all truth is not ſimply all, but all of ſome kind. To be led into all truths, is to know, and believe them. And who is ſo ſimple as to be ignorant, that there are many millions of truths (in Nature, Hiſtory, Divinity) whereof the Church is ſimply ignorant. How many truths lye unrevealed in the infinite treaſury of Gods wiſdome, wherewith the Church is not acquainted &c. ſo then, the truth it ſelfe enforceth us to underſtand by (all truths) not ſimply all, not all which God can poſſibly reveal, but all pertaining to the ſubſtance of faith, all truth abſolutely neceſſary to ſalvation.* Mark what he ſaith. That promiſe (*The Spirit ſhall lead you into all truth,*) *was made direct-*

m Mat. 16. 18. n Ioan. 16. 13. o In his Sermons. Serm. 2. pag. 50. p *Pag.* 150. q Ioan. c. 16. 13. & c. 14. 16. r *Pag.* 151. 152.

ly to the Apoſtles, and is verified in the univerſall Church, but by all truth is not underſtood ſimply all, but all appertaining to the ſubſtance of faith, and abſolutely neceſſary to ſalvation. Doth it not hence follow, that the promiſe made to the Apoſtles of being led into all truth, is to be underſtood only of all truth abſolutely neceſſary to ſalvation? and conſequently their preaching, and writing, were not infallible in points not fundamentall? or if the Apoſtles were infallible in all things which they propoſed as divine truth, the like muſt be affirmed of the Church, becauſe *D. Potter* teacheth, the ſaid promiſe *to be verified in the Church.* And as he limits the aforeſaid words to points fundamentall; ſo may he reſtrain, what other text ſoever that can be brought for the univerſall infallibility of the Apoſtles or Scriptures. So he may; and ſo he muſt, leaſt otherwiſe he receive this anſwer of his own from himſelfe, *How many truths lye unrevealed in the infinite treaſurie of Gods wiſdome, wherewith the Church is not acquainted?* And therefore to verify ſuch generall ſayings, they muſt be underſtood of truths abſolutely neceſſary to Salvation. Are not theſe fearfull conſequences? And yet *D. Potter* will never be able to avoid them, till he come to acknowledge the infallibility of the Church in all points by her propoſed as divine truths; and thus it is univerſally true that ſhe is led into all truth, in regard that our Saviour never permits her to define, or teach any falſhood.

14 All, that with any colour may be replied to this argument is; That if once we call any one Book, or parcell of Scripture in queſtion; although for the matter it contain no fundamentall error, yet it is of great importance and fundamentall, by reaſon of the conſequence; becauſe if once we doubt of one Book received for Canonicall, the whole canon is made doubtfull and uncertain, and therefore the infallibility of Scripture muſt be univerſall, and not confined within compaſſe of points fundamentall.

15 I anſwere: For the thing it ſelfe it is very true, that if I doubt of any one parcell of Scripture received for ſuch, I may doubt of all: and thence by the ſame parity I inferre, that if we did doubt of the Churches infallibility in ſome points, we could not believe her in any one, and conſequently not in propounding *Canonicall* Bookes, or any other points fundamentall, or not fundamentall; which thing being moſt abſurd, and withall moſt impious, we muſt take away the ground thereof, and believe that ſhe cannot erre in any point great or ſmall: and ſo this reply doth much more ſtrengthen what we intend to prove. Yet I adde, that Proteſtants cannot make uſe of this reply with any good coherence to this their diſtinction, and ſome other doctrines which they defend. For if D. *Potter* can tell what points in particular be fundamentall (as in his 7. *Sect.* he pretendeth) then he may be ſure, that whenſoever he meets with ſuch points in Scripture, in them it is infallibly *true*, although it might erre in others: and not only *true* but *cleere*, becauſe Proteſtants teach, that in matters neceſſary to Salvation, the Scripture is ſo cleere, that all ſuch neceſſary truths are either manifeſtly contained therein, or may be cleerely deduced from it. Which Doctrines being put together, to wit: That Scriptures cannot erre in points fundamentall; that they cleerely containe all ſuch points; and that they can tell what points in particular be ſuch, I mean fundamentall; it is manifeſt, that it is ſufficient for Salvation, that Scripture be infallible only in points fundamentall. For ſuppoſing theſe doctrines of theirs to be true, they may be ſure to find in Scripture all points neceſſary to Salvation, although it were fallible in other points of leſſe moment. Neyther will they be able to avoid this impiety againſt holy Scripture, till they renounce their other doctrines, and in particular, till they believe that Chriſts promiſe to his Church, are not limited to points fundamentall.

16 Beſides, from the fallibility of Chriſts Catholique Church in ſome points, it followeth, that no true Proteſtant learned, or unlearned, doth or can with aſſurance believe the univerſall Church in any one point of doctrine. Not in points of leſſer moment, which they call *not fundamentall*; becauſe they believe that in ſuch points ſhe may erre. Not in *fundamentalls*; becauſe they muſt know what points be fundamentall, before they goe to learn of her, leaſt otherwiſe they be rather deluded, then inſtructed; in regard that her certain, and infallible direction extends only to points fundamentall. Now, if before they addreſſe themſelves to the Church, they muſt know what points are fundamentall, they learn not of her, but will be as fit to teach, as to be taught by her: How then are all Chriſtians ſo often, ſo ſeriouſly, upon ſo dreadfull menaces, by Fathers, Scriptures, and our bleſſed Saviour himſelfe, counſelled and commanded to ſeeke, to hear, to obey the Church? *S. Auſtine* was of a very different mind from Proteſtants: *If* (ſaith he) *the* (s) *Church through the whole world practiſe any of theſe things, to diſpute whether that ought to be ſo done, is a moſt inſolent madneſſe.* And in another place he ſaith, *That which* (t) *the whole Church holds, and is not ordained by Councels, but hath alwaies been kept, is moſt rightly believed to be delivered by Apoſtolicall authority.* The ſame holy Father teacheth, that the cuſtome of baptizing children cannot be proved by Scripture alone, and yet that it is to be believed, as derived from the Apoſtles. *The cuſtome of our Mother the* (u) *Church* (ſaith he) *in baptizing infants is in no wiſe to be contemned, nor to be accounted ſuperfluous, nor is it at all to be believed, unleſſe it were an Apoſtolicall Tradition.* And elſwhere. *Chriſt* (w) *is of profit to Children baptized; Is he therefore of profit to perſons not believing? But God forbid, that I ſhould ſay infants doe not believe. I haue already ſaid, he believes in another, who ſinned in another. It is ſaid, he believes, and it is of force, and he is reckoned among the faithfull that are baptized. This the authority of our Mother the Church hath; againſt this ſtrength, againſt this invincible wall whoſoever ruſheth ſhall be cruſhed in pieces.* To this argument the Proteſtants in the Conference

s *Epiſt.* 118.
t *Lib.* 4. *de Bapt. c.* 24.
u *Lib.* 10. *de Geneſi ad liter. cap.* 23.
w *Serm.* 14. *de verbis Apoſt. c.* 18.

ference at *Ratisbon*, gaue this round answer: *Nos ab Augustino (x) hac in parte liberè dissentimus.* *In this we plainly disagree from Augustine.* Now if this doctrine of baptizing Infants be not fundamentall in D. *Potters* sense, then according to S. *Augustine*, the infallibility of the Church extends to points not fundamentall. But if on the other side it be a fundamentall point; then according to the same holy *Doctour*, we must rely on the authority of the Church, for some fundamentall point, not contained in Scripture, but delivered by Tradition. The like argument I frame out of the same Father about the not rebaptizing of those who were baptized by Heretiques, whereof he excellently to our present purpose speaketh in this manner. *Wee follow (y) indeed in this matter even the most certaine authority of Canonicall Scriptures.* But how? Consider his words: *Although verily there be brought no example for this point out of the Canonicall Scriptures, yet even in this point the truth of the same Scriptures is held by us, while we doe that, which the authority of Scriptures doth recommend, that so, because the holy Scripture cannot deceaue us, whosoeuer is afraid to be deceaued by the obscurity of this question, must haue recourse to the same Church concerning it, which without any ambiguity the holy Scripture doth demonstrate to us.* Among many other points in the aforesaid words, we are to obserue, that according to this holy Father, when we prove some points not particularly contained in Scripture, by the authority of the Church, even in that case we ought not to be said to believe such points without Scripture, because Scripture it selfe recommends the Church; and therefore relying on her we relye on Scripture, without danger of being deceaved by the obscurity of any question defined by the Church. And elsewhere he saith *Seeing this is (z) written in no Scripture, we must believe the testimony of the Church, which Christ declareth to speak the truth.* But it seemes D. *Potter* is of opinion that this doctrine about not rebaptizing such as were baptized by Heretiques, is no necessary point of faith, nor the contrary an heresie: wherein he contradicteth S. *Augustine*, from whom we haue now heard, that what the Church teacheth, is truly said to be taught by Scripture; and consequently to deny this particular point, delivered by the Church, is to oppose Scripture it selfe. Yet if he will needs hold, that this point is not fundamentall, we must conclude out of S. *Augustine*, (as we did concerning the baptizing of Children) that the infallibility of the Church reacheth to points not fundamentall. The same Father in another place, concerning this very question of the validity of Baptisme conferred by Heretiques, saith: *The (a) Apostles indeed haue prescribed nothing of this, but this Custome ought to be believed to be originally taken from their tradition, as there are many things that the universall Church obserueth which are therefore with good reason believed to haue been commanded by the Apostles, although they be not written.* No lesse cleer is S. *Chrysostome* for the infallibility of the Traditions of the Church. For treating these words (2. *Thess.* 2. *Stand, & hold the Traditions which you haue learned whether by speech or by Epistle*) saith: *Hence it is (b) manifest that they delivered not all things by letter, but many things also without writing, and these also are worthy of belief. Let us therefore account the tradition of the Church to be worthy of belief. It is a Tradition: Seek no more.* Which words are so plainly against Protestants, that *Whitaker* is as plaine with S. *Chrysostome*, saying: *I answer (c) that this is an inconsiderate speech, and unworthy so great a Father.* But let us conclude with S. *Augustine*, that the Church cannot approue any errour against faith, or good manners. *The Church* (saith he) *being (d) placed between much chaffe and cockle, doth tolerate many things; but yet she doth not approue, nor dissemble, not doe those things which are against faith, or good life.*

x *See Proto-coll. Monach. edit. 2. p. 367.*

y *Lib. 1. cont. Cresc. cap. 32. & 34.*

z *De unit. Eccles. c. 19.*

a *De Bapt. cont. Donat. lib. 5. cap. 23.*

b *Hom. 4.*

c *De Sacra Script. p. 678.*

d *Ep. 119.*

17 And as I haue proued that Protestants, according to their grounds, cannot yeeld infallible assent to the Church in any one point: so by the same reason I prove, that they cannot rely upon Scripture it selfe in any one point of faith. Not in points of lesser moment (or not fundamentall) because in such points the Catholique Church, (according to D. *Potter*) and much more any Protestant may erre, and thinke it is contained in Scripture, when it is not. Not in points fundamentall, because they must first know what points be fundamentall, before they can bee assured, that they cannot erre in understanding the Scripture, and consequently independantly of Scripture, they must foreknow all fundamentall points of faith: and therefore they doe not indeed rely upon Scripture, either for fundamentall, or not fundamentall points.

18 Besides, I mainly urge D. *Potter*, and other Protestants, that they tell us of certain points which they call fundamentall, and we cannot wrest from them a list in particular of such points, without which no man can tell whether or no he erre in points fundamentall, and be capable of salvation. And which is most lamentable, insteed of giving us such a Catalogue, they fall to wrangle among themselves about the making of it.

19 *Calvin* holds the (e) Popes Primacy, Invocation of Saints, Free will, and such like, to bee fundamentall errours overthrowing the Gospell. Others are not of his minde, as *Melanchthon* who saith, in (f) the opinion of himselfe, and other his Brethren, *That the Monarchy of the Bishop of Rome is of use, or profit to this end, that Consent of Doctrine may be retained. An agreement therefore may easily be established in this Article of the Popes Primacy, if other Articles could be agreed upon.* If the Popes Primacy be a meanes, *that consent of Doctrine may be retained*, first submit to it, and other articles will be *easily agreed upon*. *Luther* also saith of the Popes Primacy, it may be *borne* (g) *withall*. And why then, O *Luther*, did you not beare with it? And how can you, and your followers be excused from damnable Schisme, who chose rather to devide Gods Church, then to beare with that, which you confesse may be *borne withall*? But let us goe forward. That the doctrine of freewill, Prayer for the dead, worshipping of Images, Worship and Invocation of

e *Instit. l. 4. Cap. 2,*

f *Cent. Ep. Theol. ep. 74.*

g *In Assertionib. art. 36.*

Saints, Reall preſence, Tranſubſtantiation, Receaving under one kinde, Satisfaction, and Merit of works, and the Maſſe, be not fundamentall Errours, is taught (*reſpectivè*) by divers Proteſtants carefully alleaged in the *Proteſtants* (h) *Apologie*, &c. as namely by *Perkins*, *Cartwright*, *Frith*, *Fulke*, *Spark*, *Goade*, *Luther*, *Reynolds*, *Whitaker*, *Tindall*, *Francis Iohnſon*, with others. Contrary to theſe, is the *Confeſſion of the Chriſtian faith*, ſo called by Proteſtants, which I mentioned (i) heretofore, wherein we are damned unto *unquenchable fire*, for the doctrine of Maſſe, Prayer to Saints, and for the dead, Freewill, Preſence at Idol-ſervice, Mans merit, with ſuch like. Iuſtification by faith alone is by ſome Proteſtants affirmed to be the *ſoule of the* (k) *Church*: *The only principall origen of* (l) *Salvation*: *of all other points of* (m) *doctrine the chiefeſt and weightieſt*. Which yet, as we haue ſeen, is contrary to other Proteſtants, who teach that merit of good works is not a fundamentall Error; yea, divers Proteſtants defend merit of good works, as may bee ſeen in (n) *Breereley*. One would think that the Kings Supremacy, for which ſome bleſſed men loſt their lives was once among Proteſtants held for a Capitall point; but now *D. Andrewes* late of *Wincheſter* in his book againſt *Bellarmine* tells us, that it is ſufficient to reckon it among *true Doctrines*, And *Wotton* denies that *Proteſtants* (o) *hold the Kings Supremacy to be an eſſentiall point of faith*. O freedome of the new Goſpell! Hold with Catholiques, the Pope; or with Proteſtants, the King; or with Puritanes, neither Pope, nor King, to be Head of the Church, all is one, you may be ſaved. Some, as *Caſtalio*, (p) and the whole Sect of the Academicall Proteſtants, hold, that doctrines about the Supper, Baptiſme, the ſtate and office of Chriſt, how he is one with his Father, the Trinity, Predeſtination, and divers other ſuch queſtions are not neceſſary to Salvation. And (that you may obſerve how ungrounded, and partiall their Aſſertions be) *Perkins* teacheth, that the Reall preſence of our Saviours Body in the Sacrament, as it is believed by Catholiques, is a fundamentall errour; and yet affirmeth the Conſubſtantiation of Lutherans not to be ſuch, notwithſtanding that divers chiefe *Lutherans*, to their Conſubſtantiation joyne the prodigious Hereſie of Vbiquitation. *D. Vſher* in his Sermon of the *Vnity of the Catholique faith*, grants Salvation to the *Æthiopians*, who yet with Chriſtian Baptiſme joyne Circumciſion. *D. Potter* (q) cites the doctrine of ſome, whom he termeth men of great learning and judgement: that, *all who profeſſe to loue and honour* IESVS CHRIST *are in the viſible Chriſtian Church, and by Catholiques to be reputed Brethren*. One of theſe men of gre at learning and judgement, is *Thomas Morton*, by *D. Potter* cited in his Margent, whoſe love and honour to *Ieſus-Chriſt*, you may perceive, by his ſaying, that the *Churches of Arians* (who denied our Saviour Chriſt to be God) *are to be accounted the Church of God, becauſe they doe hold the foundation of the Goſpell, which is Faith in Ieſus-Chriſt the Sonne of God, and Saviour of the world*. And, which is more, it ſeemeth by theſe charitable men, that for being a member of the Church it is not neceſſary to believe one only God. For *D. Potter* (r) among the arguments to proue *Hookers* and *Mortons* opinion, brings this: *The people of the ten Tribes after their defection, notwithſtanding their groſſe corruptions, & Idolatry*, remained ſtill a true Church. We may alſo, as it ſeemeth by theſe mens reaſoning, deny the Reſurrection, and yet be members of the true Church. For a learned man (ſaith *D. Potter* (s) in behalfe of *Hookers*, and *Mortons* opinion) was anciently made a Biſhop of the Catholique Church, though he did profeſſedly doubt of the laſt Reſurrection of our bodies. Deere Saviour! What times doe we behold? If one may be a member of the true Church, and yet deny the Trinity of the Perſons, the Godhead of our Saviour, the neceſſity of Baptiſme, if we may uſe Circumciſion, and with the worſhip of God joyne Idolatry, wherein doe we differ from Turks, and Iewes? or rather are we not worſe, then eyther of them? If they who deny our Saviours divinity might be accounted the Church of God, how will they deny that favour to thoſe ancient Heretiques, who denied our Saviours true humanity? and ſo the totall deniall of Chriſt will not exclude one from being a member of the true Church. S. *Hilary* (t) maketh it of equall neceſſity for Salvation, that we believe our Saviour to be true God, and true Man, ſaying: *This manner of Confeſſion we are to hold, that we remember him to be the Sonne of God, and the Sonne of Man, becauſe the one without the other, can giue no hope of Salvation*. And yet *D. Potter* ſaith of the aforeſaid doctrine of *Hooker* and *Morton*: *The* (u) *Reader may be pleaſed to approue, or reject it, as he ſhall finde cauſe*. And in another place (w) he ſheweth ſo much good liking of this doctrine, that he explicateth and proveth the Churches perpetuall Viſibility by it. And in the ſecond Edition of his book, he is carefull to declare, and illuſtrate it more at large, then he had done before: howſoever, this ſufficiently ſheweth, that they haue no certainty, what points be fundamentall. As for the *Arians* in particular, the Author whom *D. Potter* cites for a *moderate Catholique*, but is indeed a plain *Heretique*, or rather Atheiſt, *Lucian*-like jeſting at all Religion, (x) placeth *Arianiſme* among fundamentall Errours: But contrarily an Engliſh Proteſtant Divine masked under the name of *Irenæus Philalethes*, in a little Book in Latine intituled, *Diſſertatio de pace & concordia Eccleſiæ*, endeavoureth to proue, that even the deniall of the bleſſed Trinity may ſtand with ſalvation. Divers Proteſtants haue taught, that the Roman Church, erreth in fundamentall points, But *D. Potter*, and others teach the contrary, which could not happen if they could agree what be fundamentall points. You brand the *Donatiſts* with the note of an Errour, *in the matter* (y) *and the nature of it properly hereticall*; becauſe they taught that the Church remained only with them, in the part of *Donatus*: And yet many Proteſtants are ſo farre from holding that Doctrine to be a fundamentall errour, that themſelves goe further, and ſay; that for divers ages before *Luther* there was no true Viſible Church at all. It is then too too apparent, that you haue no agreement in ſpecifying, what be fundamentall

h *Tract.* 1. *c.* 2. *Sect.* 14. *after F.*

i *Cap.* 1. *v.* 4.

k *Clark in the Tower diſputation, the* 4. *daies conference.*

l *Fox Act. & Mon. p.* 402.

m *The Confeſſion of Bohemia in the Harmony of Confeſſions pag.* 253.

n *Tract.* 3. *Sect.* 7. *under m. n.* 15.

o *In his anſwer to a Popiſh pamphlet p.* 68.

p *Vid. Gul. Reginald. Calv. Turciſ. lib.* 2. *c.* 6.

q *Pag.* 113. 114.

Morton in his Treatiſe of the kingdome of Iſraël. p. 94

r *Pag.* 121.

s *Pag.* 122.

t *Comment. in Mat. c.* 16.

u *Pag.* 123.

w *Pag.* 253.

x *A moderate examination & c. c.* 1. *paulò poſt initium.*

y *Pag.* 126.

damentall

damentall points; neither haue you any meanes to determine what they be; for if you have any such meanes, why doe you not agree? You tell us, the *Creed* containes all points fundamentall: which although it were true, yet you see it serves not to bring you to a particular knowledge, & agreement in such points. And no wonder. For (besides what I haue said already in the begining of this Chapter, and am to deliver more at large in the next) after so much labour and spent paper to prove that the *Creed* containes all fundamentall points, you conclude: *It remaines* (a) *very probable, that the Creed is the perfect Summary of those fundamentall truths, whereof consists the Vnity of faith, and of the Catholique Church.* Very *probable*? Then, according to all good Logick, the contrary may *remain very probable*, and so all remain as full of uncertainty, as before. The whole *Rule*, say you, & the sole *Iudge* of your faith, must be Scripture. Scripture doth indeed deliver divine Truths, but seldome doth qualify them, or declare whether they be, or be not, absolutely necessary to salvation. You fall (b) heavy upon *Charity Mistaken*, because he demands a particular Catalogue of fundamentall points, which yet you are obliged in conscience to doe, if you be able. For without such a Catalogue, no man can be assured whether or no, he haue faith sufficient to Salvation. And therefore take it not in ill part, if we againe and againe demand such a Catalogue. And that you may see we proceed fairely, I will performe, on our behalfe, what we request of you, and doe here deliver a Catalogue, wherein are comprized all points by us taught to be necessary to Salvation, in these words. *We are obliged, under paine of damnation, to believe whatsoever the Catholique visible Church of Christ proposeth, as revealed by Almighty God.* If any be of another minde, all Catholiques denounce him to be no Catholique. But enough of this. And I go forward with the Infallibility of the Church in all points.

a Pag. 241.

b P. 215.

20 For, euen out of your own doctrine, that the Church cannot erre in points necessary to salvation, any wise man will inferre, that it behoves all, who haue care of their soules, not to forsake her in any one point. 1. Because they are assured, that although her doctrine proved not to be true in some point, yet even according to D. *Potter*, the errour cannot be fundamentall, nor destructiue of faith, and salvation: neither can they be accused of any least imprudence in erring (if it were possible) with the universall Church. Secondly, since she is, under paine of eternall damnation, to be believed, and obeyed in some things, wherein confessedly she is endued with infallibilitie; I cannot in wisedome suspect her credit in matters of lesse moment. For who would trust another in matters of highest consequence, and be affraid to rely on him in things of lesse moment? Thirdly, since (as I said) we are undoubtedly obliged not to forsake her in the chiefest, or fundamentall points, and that there is no Rule to know precisely what, and how many those fundamentall points be; I cannot without hazard of my soule, leaue her in any one point, least perhaps that point, or points wherein I forsake her, proue indeed to be fundamentall, and necessary to salvation. Fourthly, that visible Church which cannot erre in points fundamentall, doth without distinction propound all her Definitions concerning matters of faith to be believed under Anathema's or Curses, esteeming all those who resist, to be deservedly cast out of her Communion, and holding it a point necessary to salvation, that we believe she cannot erre: wherein if she speak true, then to deny any one point in *particular*, which she defineth, or to affirm in *generall*, that she may erre, puts a man into state of damnation. Whereas to believe her in such points as are not necessary to salvation, cannot endanger salvation; and likewise to remain in her Communion, can bring no great harme, because she cannot maintain any damnable errour, or practise: but to be divided from her (she being Christs Catholique Church) is most certainly damnable. Fifthly, the true Church, being in lawfull, and certain possession of Superiority and Power, to command and require Obedience, from all Christians in some things; I cannot without grievous sinne withdraw my obedience in any one, unlesse I evidently know, that the thing commanded comes not within the compasse of those things to which her Power extendeth. And who can better inform me, how far God's Church can proceed, then Gods Church her selfe? Or to what Doctour can the Children and Schollers, with greater reason, and more security, fly for direction, then to the *Mother*, and appointed *Teacher* of all Christians? In following her, I shall sooner be excused, then in cleaving to any particular Sect, or Person, teaching, or applying Scriptures against her doctrine, or interpretation. Sixtly, the fearefull examples of innumerable persons who forsaking the Church upon pretence of her errors, haue failed, even in fundamentall points, and suffered shipwrack of their Salvation, ought to deter all Christians, from opposing her in any one doctrine, or practise: as (to omit other, both ancient and modern heresies) we see that divers chiefe Protestants, pretending to reform the corruptions of the Church, are come to affirm, that for many Ages she erred to death, and wholy perished; which D. *Potter*, cannot deny to be a fundamentall Errour against that Article of our Creed, *I believe the Catholique Church*, as he affirmeth it of the *Donatists*, because they confined the universall Church within *Africa*, or some other smal tract of soile. Least therefore I may fall into some fundamentall errour, it is most safe for me to believe all the Decrees of that Church, which cannot erre fundamentally: especially if we adde; That according to the Doctrine of Catholique Divines, one errour in faith, whether it be for the matter it selfe, great or small, destroies faith, as is shewed in *Charity Mistaken*; and consequently to accuse the Church of any one Errour, is to affirm, that she lost all faith, and erred damnably: which very saying is damnable, because it leaues Christ no visible Church on earth.

21 To all these arguments I adde this demonstration: D. *Potter* teacheth, that *there neither was* (c) *nor can be any iust cause to depart from the Church of Christ, no more then from Christ himselfe*

c Pag. 75.

himſelfe. But if the Church of Chriſt can erre in ſome points of faith, men not only may, but muſt forſake her in thoſe, (unleſſe D. *Potter* will haue them to believe one thing, and profeſſe another:) and if ſuch errours, and corruptions ſhould fall out to be about the Churches Liturgy, publique Service, adminiſtration of Sacraments, and the like; they who perceive ſuch errours, muſt of neceſſity leaue her externall Communion. And therefore if once we grant the Church may erre, it followeth that men may, and ought to forſake her (which is againſt D. *Potters* own words,) or elſe they are inexcuſable who left the Communion of the *Roman* Church, under pretence of Errours, which they grant, not to be fundamentall. And if D. *Potter* think good to anſwer this argument, he muſt remember his own doctrine to be, that even the *Catholique* Church may erre in points not fundamentall.

d *Pag.* 97.

22 Another argument for the univerſall Infallibility of the Church, I take out of D. *Potters* own words. *If* (ſaith he) *we* (d) *did not diſſent in ſome opinions from the preſent Roman Church, we could not agree with the Church truly Catholique*. Theſe words cannot be true, unleſſe he preſuppoſe that the *Church truly Catholique*, cannot erre in points not fundamentall. For if ſhe may erre in ſuch points, the *Roman* Church which he affirmeth to erre only in points *not fundamentall*, may agree with the *Church truly Catholique*, if ſhe likewiſe may erre in points *not fundamentall*. Therefore either he muſt acknowledge a plain contradiction in his own words, or elſe muſt grant that the *Church truly Catholique* cannot erre in points *not fundamentall*, which is what we intended to proue.

23 If *Words* cannot perſwade you, that in all Controverſies you muſt rely upon the infallibility of the Church; at leaſt yeeld your aſſent to *Deeds*. Hitherto I haue produced Arguments drawn, as it were, *ex naturâ rei*, from the Wiſdome, and Goodneſſe of God, who cannot faile to haue left ſome infallible meanes to determine Controverſies, which, as we haue proved, can be no other, except a Viſible Church, infallible in all her Definitions. But becauſe both Catholiques and Proteſtants, receive holy Scripture, we may thence alſo proue the infallibility of the Church in all matters which concern Faith and Religion. Our Saviour ſpeaketh clearly: *The gates of Hell* (e) *ſhall not prevail againſt her*. And; *I will aske my* (f) *Father, and he will giue you another Paraclete, that he may abide with you for ever, the Spirit of truth*. And, *But when he, the Spirit of* (g) *truth commeth, he ſhall teach you all truth*. The Apoſtle ſaith, that the Church is *the Pillar, and ground* (h) *of Truth*. And *He gaue ſome Apoſtles, and ſome Prophets, and other ſome Euangeliſts, and other ſome Paſtors and Doctors, to the conſummation of the Saints, unto the work of the Miniſtery, unto the edifying of the body of Chriſt: untill we meet all into the unity of faith, and knowleage of the Sonne of God, into a perfect man, into the meaſure of the age of the fulneſſe of Chriſt: that now we be not children wavering, and carried about with every winde of doctrine in the wickedneſſe of men, in craftineſſe, to the circumvention* (i) *of Errour*. All which words ſeem cleerly enough to proue, that the Church is univerſally infallible, without which, unity of faith could not be conſerved againſt *every winde of Doctrine*: And yet *Doctor Potter* (k) limits theſe promiſes and priviledges to *fundamentall* points, in which he grants the Church cannot erre. I urge the words of Scripture, which are univerſall, and doe not mention any ſuch reſtraint. I alleadge that moſt reaſonable, and receaved Rule, that Scripture is to be underſtood literally, as it ſoundeth, unleſſe ſome manifeſt abſurdity force us to the contrary: But all will not ſerue, to accord our different interpretations. In the mean time divers of *Doctor Potters* Brethren ſtep in, and reject his limitation, as over large, and ſomewhat taſting of Papiſtry: And therefore they reſtrain the mentioned Texts, either to the Infallibility which the Apoſtles, and other ſacred Writers had in penning of Scripture; or elſe to the *inviſible* Church of the Elect; and to them, not abſolutely, but with a double reſtriction, that they ſhall not fall *damnably*, and *finally*; and other men haue as much right as theſe, to interpoſe their opinion, and interpretation. Behold we are three at debate about the ſelfe ſame words of Scripture: We conferre divers places and Text: We conſult the Originalls: We examine Tranſlations: We endeavour to pray heartily: We profeſſe to ſpeak ſincerely; To ſeek nothing but truth and ſalvation of our own ſoules, and that of our Neighbours; and finally we uſe all thoſe meanes, which by Proteſtants themſelues are preſcribed for finding out the true meaning of Scripture: Nevertheleſſe we neither doe, or haue any poſſible meanes to agree, as long as we are left to our ſelues; and when we ſhould chance to be agreed, the doubt would ſtill remain whether the thing it ſelfe be a *fundamentall* point or no: And yet it were great impiety to imagine that God, the Lover of ſoules, hath left no certaine infallible meanes, to decide both this, and all other differences ariſing about the interpretation of Scripture, or upon any other occaſion. Our remedy therefore in theſe contentions muſt be, to conſult, and heare God's Viſible Church, with ſubmiſſiue acknowledgment of her Power, and Infallibility in whatſoever ſhe propoſeth as a revealed truth: according to that divine advice of *S. Auguſtine* in theſe words. *If at length* (l) *thou ſeem to be ſufficiently toſſed, and haſt a deſire to put an end to thy paines, follow the way of the Catholique Diſcipline, which from Chriſt himſelfe by the Apoſtles hath come down even to us, and from us ſhall deſcend to all poſterity*. And though I conceaue that the diſtinction of points *fundamentall*, and *not fundamentall* hath now been ſufficiently confuted; yet that no ſhadow of difficulty may remain, *I* will particularly refell a common ſaying of Proteſtants, that it is ſufficient for ſalvation, to believe the Apoſtles Creed, which they hold to be a Summary of all fundamentall points of Faith.

e Mat. 16.
f Ioan. 14.
g Ioan. 16.
h 1. Tim. c. 3.
i Epheſ. 4.
k *Pag.* 151. 153.
l *De util. cred. cap.* 8.

THE ANSVVER TO THE THIRD CHAPTER.

Wherein it is maintained, That the diſtinction of points Fundamentall *and* not Fundamentall, *is in this preſent Controverſie good and pertinent: And that the Catholique Church may erre in the latter kinde of the ſaid points.*

1 THis diſtinction is imployed by Proteſtants to many purpoſes, and therefore if it be pertinent and good, (as they underſtand and apply it) the whole edifice built thereon, muſt be either firme and ſtable, or if it be not, it cannot be for any default in this diſtinction.

2 *If you obiect to them diſcords in matter of faith without any meanes of agreement*, They will anſwer you, that they want not good and ſolid meanes of agreement in matters neceſſary to ſalvation, *viz.* Their beliefe of all thoſe things which are plainly and undoubtedly delivered in Scripture; which who ſo believes, muſt of neceſſity believe all things neceſſary to ſalvation: and their mutuall ſuffering one another, *to abound in their ſeverall ſenſe*, in matters not plainly and undoubtedly there delivered. And for their agreement in all Controverſies of Religion, either they haue meanes to agree about them, or not: If you ſay they haue, why did you before deny it? If they haue not meanes, why doe you finde fault with them, for not agreeing?

3 You will ſay, that their fault is, that by *remaining Proteſtants they exclude themſelues from the meanes of agreement, which you haue*, and which by ſubmiſſion to your Church they might haue alſo. But if you haue meanes of agreement, the more ſhame for you that you ſtill diſagree. For who, I pray, is more inexcuſably guilty, for the omiſſion of any duty; they that either haue no meanes to doe it, or elſe know of none they haue, which puts them in the ſame caſe as if they had none: or they which profeſſe to haue an eaſie and expedite means to doe it, and yet ſtill leaue it undone? *If you had been blind* (ſaith our *Saviour* to the *Phariſees*) *you had had no ſinne, but now you ſay you ſee, therefore your ſinne remaineth.*

4 If you ſay, you *doe agree in matters of Faith*, I ſay this is ridiculous: for you define matters of faith to be thoſe wherein you agree. So that to ſay, you agree in *matters of faith*, is to ſay, you agree in thoſe things wherein you doe agree. And do not Proteſtants doe ſo likewiſe? Doe not they agree in thoſe things, wherein they doe agree?

5 But *you are all agreed that only thoſe things wherein you doe agree are matters of faith.* And Proteſtants if they were wiſe, would doe ſo too. Sure I am they haue reaſon enough to doe ſo: ſeeing all of them agree with explicite faith in all thoſe things, which are plainly and undoubtedly delivered in Scripture, that is, in all which God hath plain-

ly revealed: and with an implicite faith, in that ſenſe of the whole Scripture which God intended whatſoever it was. Secondly, That which you pretend is falſe; for elſe, why doe ſome of you hold it againſt faith, to take or allow the *Oath of Allegiance*, others as learned and honeſt as they, that it is againſt Faith and unlawfull to refuſe it and allow the refuſing of it? Why doe ſome of you hold, that it is *de Fide*, that the Pope is Head of the Church by divine Law, others the contrary? Some hold it *de Fide*, that the bleſſed Virgin was free from Actuall ſinne, others that it is not ſo. Some, that the Popes Indirect power over Princes in Temporalties is *de Fide*, Others the contrary. Some, that it is Vniverſall Tradition, and conſequently *de Fide*, that the *Virgin Mary* was conceived in originall ſinne, others the contrary.

6 But what ſhall we ſay now, if you be not agreed touching your pretended meanes of agreement, how then can you pretend to Vnity either Actuall or Potentiall more then Proteſtants may? Some of you ſay, the Pope alone without a Councell may determine all Controverſies: But others deny it. Some, that a Generall Councell without a Pope may doe ſo: Others deny this. Some, Both in conjunction are infallible determiners: Others againe deny this. Laſtly, ſome among you, hold the Acceptation of the decrees of Councells by the Vniverſal Church to be the only way to decide Controverſies: which others deny, by denying the Church to be Infallible. And indeed what way of ending Controverſies can this be, when either part may pretend, that they are part of the Church, and they receiue not the decree; therefore the whole Church hath not received it?

7 Againe, Meanes of agreeing differences are either Rationall and well grounded and of Gods appointment, or voluntary and taken up at the pleaſure of men. Meanes of the former nature, we ſay, you haue as little as we. For where hath God appointed, that the Pope, or a Councell, or a Councell confirm'd by the Pope, or that Society of Chriſtians which adhere to him, ſhall be the *Infallible Iudge of Controverſies*. I deſire you to ſhew any one of theſe Aſſertions plainely ſet down in Scripture, (as in all Reaſon a thing of this nature ſhould be) or at leaſt delivered with a full conſent of Fathers, or at leaſt taught in plain tearmes by any one Father for foure hundred yeares after *Chriſt*. And if you cannot doe this (as I am ſure you cannot) and yet will ſtill be obtruding your ſelues upō us for our Iudges, who will not cry out,

--periſſe frontem de rebus?

8 But then for meanes of the other kinde, ſuch as yours are, we haue great abūdance of them. For beſides all the waies which you haue deviſed, which we may make uſē of when wee pleaſe, we haue a great many more, which you yet haue never thought of, for which we haue as good colour out of Scripture as you haue for yours. For firſt, wee could if we would, try it by Lots, whoſe doctrine is true, and whoſe falſe. And you know it is written, [a] *The Lot is caſt into the lap, but the whole diſpoſition of it is from the Lord.* 2. We could referre them to the King, and you know it is written: [b] *A Divine ſentence is in the lips of the King his mouth tranſgreſſeth not in judgement.* [c] *The Heart of the King*

[a] Prov. 16. 33.
[b] Prov. 16. 10.
[c] Prov. 21. 1.

King is in the hand of the Lord. We could referre the matter to any aſſembly of Chriſtians aſſembled in the the name of Chriſt, ſeeing it is written, *where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midſt of them.* We may referre it to any Prieſt, becauſe it is written, [e] *The Prieſts lips ſhall preſerve knowledg.* [f] *The Scribes and Phariſes ſit in Moſes chaire* &c. To any Preacher of the Goſpell, to any Paſtor, or Doctor, for to every one of them Chriſt hath promiſed [g] *he will be with them alwaies even to the end of the world:* & of every one of them it is ſaid, [h] *He that heareth you heareth me: &c.* To any Biſhop or Prelate, for it is written, [i] *Obey your Prelates,* and againe [k] *he hath given Paſtors and Doctors, &c. leaſt we ſhould be carried about with every wind of doctrine.* To any particular Church of Chriſtians, ſeeing it is a particular Church which is called [l] *The houſe of God, a Pillar & ground of Truth*: and ſeeing of any Particular Church it is written [m] *He that heareth not the Church let him be unto thee as a Heathen or a Publicã.* We might referre it to any man that prayes for Gods ſpirit, for it is written, [n] *Every one that asketh receiveth*: and again, [o] *If any man want wiſdome let him aske of God, who giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not.* Laſtly, we might referre it to the Iewes, for without all doubt of them it is written, [p] *my ſpirit that is in thee &c.* All theſe meanes of agreement, whereof not any one but hath as much probability from Scripture, as that which you obtrude upon us, offer themſelves upon a ſuddain to me; happily many more might be thought on, if we had time, but theſe are enough to ſhew, that would we make uſe of voluntary and deviſed meanes to determine differences, we had them in great abundance. And if you ſay theſe would faile us, and contradict themſelves; ſo, as we pretend, have yours. There have been Popes againſt Popes: Councells againſt Councells: Councells confirmed by Popes, againſt Councells confirmed by Popes: Laſtly the Church of ſome Ages againſt the Church of other Ages.

[d] Mat. 18. 20.
[e] Mat. 2. 7.
[f] Mat. 25. 2.
[g] Mat. 28. 20.
[h] Luk. 10. 16.
[i] Heb. 13. 17.
[k] Epheſ. 4. 11.
[l] 1. Tim. 3. 15.
[m] Mat. 18. 17.
[n] Mat. 7. 8.
[o] Ia. 1. 5.
[p] Iſay. 59. 21.

9 Laſtly, whereas you find fault, *That Proteſtants upbraided with their diſcords, anſwer that they differ only in points not Fundamentall,* I deſire you tell me whether they doe ſo, or doe not ſo; If they doe ſo, I hope you will not find fault with the Anſwer: If you ſay they doe not ſo, but in points Fundamentall alſo; then they are not members of the ſame Church one with another, no more then with you: And therefore why ſhould you object to any of them, their differences from each other, any more then to your ſelves, their more and greater differences from you?

10 But *they are convinc'd ſometimes even by their own confeſſions, that the Ancient Fathers taught divers points of Popery: and then they reply, thoſe Fathers may nevertheleſſe be ſaved, becauſe thoſe errors were not Fundamentall.* And may not you alſo be convinc'd by the confeſſions of your own men, that the Fathers taught divers points held by Proteſtants againſt the Church of Rome, and divers againſt Proteſtants and the Church of Rome? Doe not your Purging Indexes, clip the tongues, and ſeal up the lips of a great many for ſuch confeſſi-

ons? And is not the above cited confeſſion of your *Doway* Divines, plain and full to the ſame purpoſe? And doe not you alſo, as freely as we, charge the Fathers with errors, & yet ſay they were ſaved? Now what elſe doe we underſtand by an *unfundamentall* error, but ſuch a one with which a man may poſſibly be ſaved? So that ſtill you proceed in condemning others for your own faults, and urging arguments againſt us, which returne more ſtrongly upon your ſelves.

11 But your will is, *we ſhould remember that Chriſt muſt alwaies have a viſible Church.* Anſ. Your pleaſure ſhall be obeyed, on condition you will not forget, that there is a difference between perpetuall Viſibility, and perpetuall Purity. As for the anſwere, which you make for us, true it is, we believe the *Catholique Church cannot periſh*, yet that ſhe may, and did erre in points not Fundamentall; and that Proteſtants were oblig'd to forſake theſe errors of the Church, as they did, though not the Church for her errors, for that they did not, but continued ſtill members of the Church. For it is not all one (though you perpetually confound them) *to forſake the errors of the Church*, and to *forſake the Church*: or to *forſake the Church in her Errors*, and *ſimply to forſake the Church*: No more then it is for me to renounce my Brothers or my Friends Vices or Errors, and to renounce my Brother or my Friend. The Former then was done by Proteſtants, the latter was not done. Nay not only not from the Catholique, but not ſo much as from the Roman, did they ſeperate *per omnia*, but only in thoſe practiſes which they conceived ſuperſtitious or impious. If you would at this time propoſe a forme of Liturgy, which both Sides hold lawfull, and then they would not joyne with you in this Liturgy, you might have ſome colour then to ſay, they renounce your communion abſolutely. But as things are now ordered, they cannot joyne with you in prayers, but they muſt partake with you in unlawfull practiſes, and for this reaſon, they (*not abſolutely, but thus farre*) ſeparate from your communion. And this, I ſay, they were obliged to doe under pain of damnation. *Not as if it were damnable to hold an error not damnable*, but becauſe it is damnable outwardly to profeſſe & maintaine it, and to joyn with others in the practiſe of it, when inwardly they did not hold it. Now had they continued in your communion, that they muſt have done, *vid.* have profeſſed to believe and externally practiſ'd your Errors, whereof they were convinced that they were Errors: which, though the matters of the Errors had been not neceſſary, but only profitable, whether it had not been damnable diſſimulation and hypocriſy, I leave it to you to judge. You your ſelfe tell us within two pages after this, *that you are obliged never to ſpeak any one leaſt lye againſt your knowledge*, §. 2. now what is this but to live in a perpetuall lye?

12 As for that which in the next place you ſeeme ſo to wonder at, That *both Catholiques and Proteſtants, according to the opinion of Proteſtants, may bee ſaved in their ſeverall profeſſions, becauſe forſooth, we both agree in all Fundamentall points*: I Anſwere, this propoſition ſo crudely ſet down, as you have here ſet it down, I know no Proteſtant will juſtify. For you ſeeme to make

them

them teach, that it is an indifferent thing, for the attainment of ſalvation, whether a man believe the Truth or the Falſhood; and that they care not in whether of theſe Religions a man live or dye, ſo he dye in either of them: whereas all that they ſay is this, That thoſe amongſt you which want meanes to find the Truth and ſo dye in error, or uſe the beſt meanes they can with induſtry, and without partiality to find the truth, and yet dye in error, theſe men, thus qualified, notwithſtanding theſe errors may be ſaved. Secondly for thoſe that have meanes to find the Truth, and will not uſe them, they conceive, though their caſe be dangerous, yet if they dye with a generall repentance for all their ſinnes, knowne and unknowne, their Salvation is not deſperate. The Truths which they hold, of Faith in Chriſt, and Repentance, being as it were an antidote againſt their errors, and their negligence in ſeeking the Truth. Eſpecially ſeeing by confeſſion of both ſides we agree in much more thē is ſimply, & indiſpēſably neceſſary to ſalvatiō.

13 *But ſeeing we make ſuch various uſe of this diſtinction, is it not prodigiouſly ſtrange that we will never be induc'd to give in a particular Catalogue what points be fundamentall?* And why I pray is it ſo *prodigiouſly ſtrange* that we give no anſwer to an unreaſonable demand? God himſelf hath told us, [a] *That where much is given, much ſhall be required; where litle is given, litle ſhall be required.* To Infants, Deafe-men, Mad-men, nothing for ought wee knowe, is given, and if it bee ſo, of them *nothing* ſhall be required. Others perhaps may have meanes only given them to beleive, [b] *That God is, and that he is a rewarder of them that ſeeke him*; and to whom thus much only is given, to them it ſhall not be damnable, that they beleive but only thus much. Which methinks is very manifeſt from the Apoſtle, in the *Epiſt. to the Heb:* where having firſt ſaid, *that without faith it is impoſſible to pleaſe God*, he ſubjoynes as his reaſon, *for whoſoever commeth unto God, muſt beleive that God is, and that he is a rewarder of them that ſeeke him.* Where in my opinion, this is plainly intimated, that this is the *minimum quòd ſic*, the loweſt degree of Faith, wherewith, in men capable of Faith, God will be pleaſed: and that with this loweſt degree he will be pleaſed, where meanes of riſing higher are deficient. Beſides, if without this beliefe, *that God is, and that he is a rewarder of them that ſeeke him*, God will not be pleaſed, then his will is that we ſhould beleive it. Now his will it cannot be, that we ſhould beleive a falſhood, It muſt be therefore true, that he is a rewarder of them that ſeeke him. Now it is poſſible that they which never heard of Chriſt, may ſeek God, therefore it is true that even they ſhall pleaſe him, and be rewarded by him; I ſay rewarded, not with bringing them immediatly to ſalvation without Chriſt, but with bringing them according to his good pleaſure, firſt, to faith in Chriſt, and ſo to ſalvation. To which beleife the ſtory of *Cornelius* in the 10. *chap. of the Acts* of the Apoſtles, and S. *Peter's* words to him, are to me a great inducement. For firſt it is evident he beleeved not in Chriſt, but was a meer Gentile, & one that knew not but men might be worſhipped, and yet we are aſſured *that his prayers and almes* (even while he was in that ſtate) *came up for a memoriall before*

a Luk. 12. 48.

b Heb. 11.

God; That his prayer was heard, and his Almes had in remembrance in the ſight of God. v. 4. that upon his, *Then fearing God and working righteouſneſſe,* (ſuch as it was) *he was accepted with God*. But how accepted? Not to be brought immediatly to ſalvation, but to be promoted to a higher degree of the knowledge of Gods will. For ſo it is in the 4. & 5. v. *Call for Simon whoſe ſirname is Peter, he ſhall tell thee what thou oughteſt todoe,* and at the 33. verſ. *We are all here preſent before God, to heare all things that are cõmanded thee of God.* So that though even in his Gentiliſme, he was accepted for his preſent ſtate, yet if he had continued in it, & refuſed to beleive in Chriſt after the ſufficient revelation of the Goſpell to him, and Gods will to have him beleive it, he that was accepted before, would not have continued accepted ſtill; for then that condemnation had come upon him, *that light was come unto him, and he loved darkneſſe more then light*. So that (to proceed a ſtep farther) to whom faith in Chriſt is ſufficiently propounded, as neceſſary to Salvation, to them it is ſimply neceſſary & Fundamentall to believe in Chriſt, that is, to expect remiſſion of ſinnes and Salvation from him, upon the performance of the conditions he requires; among which conditions one is, that we believe what he has revealed, when it is ſufficiently declared, to have been revealed by him: For by doing ſo, *we ſet to our ſeale, that God is true, and that Chriſt was ſent by him.* Now that may be ſufficiẽtly declared to one (all things conſidered,) which, (all things conſidered) to another is not ſufficiently declared: and conſequently that may be Fundamentall and neceſſary to one, which to another is not ſo. Which variety of circumſtances, makes it impoſſible to ſet down an exact Catalogue of Fundamentalls, and proves your requeſt as reaſonable, as if you ſhould deſire us (according to the Fable) to make a coat to fit the Moon in all her changes; or to giue you a garment that will fit all ſtatures; Or to make you a dyall to ſerve all meridians; or to deſigne particularly, what proviſion will ſerve an army for a year: whereas there may be an army of ten thouſand, there may be of 100000. And therefore without ſeting downe a catalogue of Fundamentalls in particular (becauſe none that can be given, can univerſally ſerve for all men, God requiring more of them to whom he gives more, and leſſe of them to whom he gives leſſe) we muſt content our ſelves by a generall deſcription to tell you what is Fundamentall. And to warrant us in doing ſo, we have your own example §. 19. where being engaged to giue us a catalogue of Fundamentalls, in ſtead thereof you tell us only in generall, *that all is fundamentall, and not to be diſbeleeved under pain of damnation, which the Church hath defin'd.* As you therefore think it enough to ſay in generall, *that all is Fundamentall which the Church has defined,* without ſetting down in particular a compleat Catalogue of all things, which in any age the Church has defined (which I believe you will not undertake to doe, and if you doe, it will be contradicted by your Fellowes:) So in reaſon you might think it enough for us alſo to ſay in generall, *that it is ſufficient for any mans ſalvation, to believe that the Scripture is true, and containes all things neceſſary for ſalvation; and to doe his beſt endeavour to find and*

believe

believe the true ſenſe of it: without delivering any particular catalogue of the Fundamentalls of Faith.

14 Neither *doth the want of ſuch a catalogue* leave us in ſuch a *perplexed uncertainty* as you pretend. For though perhaps we cannot exactly diſtinguiſh in the Scripture, what *is revealed becauſe it is neceſſary*, from what is *neceſſary conſequently and accidentally, meerely becauſe it is revealed*: yet we are ſure enough, that all that is neceſſary any way is there, and therefore in believing all that is there, we are ſure to believe all that is neceſſary. And if we erre from the true and intended ſenſe of ſome, nay of many obſcure or ambiguous texts of Scripture, yet we may be ſure enough, that we erre not damnably: becauſe, if we doe indeed deſire and endeavour to finde the Truth, we may be ſure we doe ſo, and as ſure that it cannot conſiſt with the revealed goodneſſe of God, to damne him for error, that deſires and indeavours to find the Truth.

15 *Ad* §. 2. The effect of this Paragraph (for as much as concernes us) is this, that *for any man to deny belief to any one thing be it great or ſmall known by him, to be revealed by almighty God for a truth, is in effect to charge God with falſhood: for it is to ſay that God affirmes that to be Truth, which he either knowes to be not a Truth, or which he doth not know to be a Truth: and therefore without all controverſy this is a damnable ſinne*. To this I ſubſcribe with hand and heart: adding withall, that not only he which knowes, but he which believes (nay though it be erroneouſly) any thing to be revealed by God, and yet will not believe it, nor aſſent unto it, is in the ſame caſe, and commits the ſame ſinne of derogation from Gods moſt perfect and pure Veracity.

16 *Ad* §. 3. I ſaid purpoſely (*known by himſelfe, and believes himſelfe*) For as, without any diſparagement of a mans honeſty, I may believe ſomething to be falſe, which he affirmes, of his certain knowledge to be true, provided I neither know nor believe that he has ſo affirmed: So without any the leaſt diſhonour to Gods eternall never-failing veracity, I may doubt of, or deny ſome truth revealed by him, if I neither know nor believe it to be revealed by him.

17 Seeing therefore the crime of calling Gods veracity into queſtion, and conſequently (according to your grounds) of erring Fundamentally, is chargeable upon thoſe only, that *believe the contrary* of any one *point known* (*not by others but themſelves*) *to be teſtified by God*: I cannot but fear (though I hope otherwiſe) that your heart condemned you of a great calumny and egregious ſophiſtry, in imputing fundamentall, and damnable error to diſagreeing Proteſtants; Becauſe forſooth, *ſome of them disbelieve, and directly wittingly and willingly oppoſe, what others doe believe to be teſtified by the word of God*. The ſophiſtry of your diſcourſe will be apparent, if it be contrived into a ſyllogiſme: Thus therefore in effect you argue;

> Whoſoever diſbelieves any thing known by himſelfe to be revealed by God, imputes falſhood to God, and therefore errs fundamentally.

But

But Some Proteſtans disbelieve theſe things, which Others believe to be teſtified by God;

Therefore they impute falſhood to God, and erre Fundamentally.

Neither can you with any colour pretend, that in theſe words *known to be teſtified by God*, you meant, *not by himſelfe, but by any other*; Seeing he only in fact affirmes, that God does deceive or is deceived, who denyes ſome things which himſelfe knowes or believes to be revealed by God, as before I have demonſtrated. For otherwiſe if I ſhould deny beleefe to ſome thing which God had revealed ſecretly to ſuch a man as I had never heard of, I ſhould be guilty of calling Gods veracity into Queſtion, which is euidently falſe. Beſides, how can it be avoided, but the Ieſuits and Dominicans, the Dominicans and Franciſcans muſt upon this ground differ Fundamentally, and one of them erre damnably, ſeeing the one of them disbelieves, and willingly oppoſes, what the others believe to be the word of God?

18 Whereas you ſay that *the difference among Proteſtants conſiſts not in this, that ſome believe ſome points of which others are ignorant, or not bound expreſly to know*: I would gladly know, whether you ſpeak of Proteſtants differing *in profeſſion only, or in opinion alſo*. If the firſt, why doe you ſay preſently after, *that ſome disbelieve, what others of them believe?* If they differ in opinion, then ſure they are ignorant of the truth of each other's opinions: it being impoſſible and contradictious, that a man ſhould know one thing to be true, and believe the contrary, or know it and not believe it. And if they doe not know the truth of each others opinions, then, I hope, you will grant they are ignorant of it. If your meaning were, they *were not ignorant, that each other held theſe Opinions, or of the ſenſe of the opinions which they held*: I Anſwere, this is nothing to the convincing of their underſtandings of the truth of them, and theſe remaining unconvinced of the truth of them, they are excuſable if they doe not believe.

9 But *ignorance of what we are expreſly bound to know, is it ſelfe a fault, and therefore cannot be an excuſe:* and therefore if you could ſhew the Proteſtants differ in thoſe points, the truth whereof (which can be but one) they were bound expreſly to know, I ſhould eaſily yeeld that one ſide muſt of neceſſity be in a mortall crime. But for want of proofe of this, you content your ſelfe only to ſay it; and therefore I alſo might be contented only to deny it, yet I will not, but give a reaſon for my deniall. And my reaſon is, becauſe our obligation expreſly to know any divine Truth, muſt ariſe from Gods manifeſt revealing of it, and his revealing unto us that he has revealed it, and that his will is, we ſhould believe it: Now in the points controverted among Proteſtants, he hath not ſo dealt with us, therefore he hath not laid any ſuch obligation upon us. The major of this ſyllogiſme is evident, and therefore I will not ſtand to prove it. The minor alſo will be evident to him that conſiders, that in all the Controverſies of Proteſtants, there is a ſeeming conflict of Scripture with Scripture, Reaſon with Reaſon, Authority with Authority: which how it can conſiſt with the manifeſt revealing of the truth of either Side, I cannot well

well understand. Besides, though we grant that Scripture, Reason, and Authority, were all on one side, and the apparences of the other side all answerable: yet if we consider the strange power that education and prejudices instilled by it, haue over even excellent understandings, wee may well imagine, that many truths which in themselues are revealed plainly enough, are yet to such or such a man, prepossest with contrary opinions, not revealed plainly. Neither doubt I but God, who knows whereof we are made, and what passions we are subject unto, will compassionate such infirmities, and not enter into judgement with us for those things, which, all things considered, were unavoidable.

20 *But till Fundamentalls* (say you) *be sufficiently proposed* (*as revealed by God*) *it is not against Faith to reject them; or rather it is not possible prudently to believe them: And points unfundamentall being thus sufficiently proposed as divine Truths, may not be denied; Therefore you conclude there is no difference between them*: Ans. A Circumstantiall point, may by accident become Fundamentall, because it may bee so proposed that the deniall of it, will draw after it the deniall of this Fundamentall truth, *that all which God saies is true*. Notwithstanding in themselues there is a main difference between them: *Points fundamentall being those onely which are revealed by God, and commanded to bee preacht to all, and believed by all. Points circumstantiall being such, as though God hath revealed them, yet the Pastors of the Church are not bound under paine of damnation particularly to teach them unto all men every where, and the people may be securely ignorant of them.*

21 You say, *Not erring in points Fundamentall, is not sufficient for the preservation of the Church; because any Errour maintained by it against Gods revelation is destructive.* I answer. If you mean against Gods Revelation known by the Church to be so, it is true; but impossible that the Church should doe so, for *ipso Facto* in doing it, it were a Church no longer. But if you mean against some Revelation, which the Church by errour thinks to bee no Revelation, it is false. The Church may ignorantly disbelieue such a Revelation, and yet continue a Church; which thus I proue. That the Gospell was to be preached to all Nations, was a Truth revealed before our Saviours Ascention, in these words, *Goe and teach all Nations. Mat. 29. 19.* Yet through prejudice or inadvertence, or some other cause, the Church disbelieved it, as it is apparent out of the 11. and 12. Chap. of the *Acts*, untill the conversion of *Cornelius*, and yet was still a Church. Therefore to disbelieue some divine Revelation, not knowing it to be so, is not destructive of salvation, or of the being of the Church. Again, It is a plaine Revelation of God, that [a] the Sacrament of the Eucharist *should be administred in both kindes*: and [b] that the publique Hymnes and *Prayers of the Church should be in such a language as is most for edification*; yet these Revelations the Church of *Rome* not seeing, by reason of the veile before their eyes, their Churches supposed infallibility, I hope the deniall of them shall not be laid to their charge, no otherwise then as *building hay and stubble on the Foundations, not overthrowing the Foundation it selfe.*

[a] 1. Cor. 11. 28.
[b] 1. Cor. 14. 15. 16. 26.

22 *Ad* §. 2. In the beginning of this Paragraph, wee haue this Argument againſt this Diſtinction; *It is enough* (*by D. Potters confeſſion*) *to belieue ſome things negatiuely, i.e. not to deny them*; Therefore all deniall of any divine truth excludes Salvation. As if you ſhould ſay: One Horſe is enough for a man to goe a journey: Therefore without a horſe no man can goe a journey. As if ſome Divine Truthes, *viz.* Thoſe which are plainly revealed, might not be ſuch, as of neceſſity were not to be denied: and others for want of ſufficient declaration, deniable without danger. Indeed if D. *Potter* had ſaid there had been no divine Truth, declared ſufficiently or not declared, but muſt upon pain of damnation be believed, or at leaſt not denied, then might you juſtly haue concluded as you doe: but now, that ſome may not be denied, and that ſome may be denied without damnation, why they may not both ſtand together I doe not yet underſtand.

23 In the Remainder you inferre out of D. *Potters* words, *That all errours are alike damnable, if the manner of propounding the contrary Truths be not different*: which for ought I know, all Proteſtants, and all that haue ſenſe muſt grant. Yet I deny your illation from hence, That *the diſtinction of points into fundamentall and unfundamentall is vaine and uneffectuall for the purpoſe of Proteſtants*. For though being alike propos'd as divine truths, they are by accident alike neceſſary, yet the reall difference ſtill remaines between them, that they are not alike neceſſary to be propoſed.

24 *Ad* §. 5. The next Paragraph, if it be brought out of the clouds, will I belieue haue in it theſe Propoſitions. 1. *Things are diſtinguiſhed by their different natures.* 2. *The Nature of Faith is taken, not from the matter believed, for then they that believed different matters ſhould haue different Faiths, but from the Motive to it.* 3. *This Motiue is Gods Revelation.* 4. *This Revelation is alike for all obiects.* 5. *Proteſtants diſagree in things equally revealed by God: Therefore they forſake the formall motiue of faith: and therefore haue no faith nor unity therein.* Which is truly a very proper and convenient argument to cloſe up a weak diſcourſe, wherein both the Propoſitions are falſe for matter, confuſed and diſorderd for the forme, and the concluſion utterly inconſequent. Firſt for the ſecond Propoſition, who knowes not that the Eſſence of all Habits (& therefore of Faith among the reſt) is taken from their Act, and their Object? If the Habit be generall, from the Act and Object in generall, if the Habit be ſpeciall, from the Act and Object in ſpeciall. Then for the motiue to a thing, that it cannot be of the Eſſence of the thing to which it moues, who can doubt, that knows that a motiue is an efficient cauſe: and that the efficient is alwaies extrinſecall to the effect? For the fourth, that *Gods Revelation is alike for all obiects*, It is ambiguous: and if the ſenſe of it be, that his Revelation is an equall Motive to induce us to belieue all obiects revealed by him, it is true, but impertinent: If the ſenſe of it be, that all obiects revealed by God are alike (that is, alike plainly and undoubtedly) revealed by him, it is pertinent, but moſt untrue. Witneſſe the great diverſity of Texts of Scripture, whereof ſome are ſo plain and evident

evident, that no man of ordinary ſenſe can miſtake the ſenſe of them: Some are ſo obſcure and ambiguous, that to ſay this or this is the certain ſenſe of them, were high preſumption. For the 5. *Proteſtants diſagree in things equally revealed by God!* In themſelues perhaps, but not equally to them: whoſe underſtandings by reaſon of their different Educations are faſhioned, and ſhaped for the entertainment of various opinions, and conſequently ſome of them, more enclined to belieue ſuch a ſenſe of Scripture, others to belieue another; which to ſay that God will not take into his conſideration in judging mens opinions, is to diſparage his goodneſſe. But to what purpoſe is it, that theſe things are equally revealed to both, (as the light is equally revealed to all blind men,) if they be not fully reuealed to either? The ſenſe of this Scripture, *Why are they then bapti∠'d for the dead?* and this, *He ſhall bee ſaued, yet ſo as by fire*, and a thouſand others, is equally revealed to you and to another interpreter, that is certainly to neither. Hee now conceiues one ſenſe of them, and you another; and would it not be an excellent inference, if I ſhould conclude now as you doe; That you forſake the formall motiue of faith, which is Gods revelation, and conſequently looſe all faith and unity therein? So likewiſe the Ieſuites and Dominicans, the Franciſcans and Dominicans diſagree about things equally revealed by Almighty God: and ſeeing they doe ſo, I beſeech you let me underſtand, why this reaſon will not exclude them as well as Proteſtants *from all faith and unity therein?* Thus you haue fayl'd of your undertaking in your firſt part of your Title, and that is a very ill *omen*, eſpecially in points of ſo ſtreight mutuall dependance, that we ſhall haue but ſlender performance in your ſecond aſſumpt. Which is, *That the Church is infallible in all her Definitions, whether concerning points Fundamentall, or not Fundamentall.*

25 *Ad* §. 7. *&* 8. The Reaſons in theſe two paragraphs, as they were alleaged before, ſo they were before anſwered, *Cap.* 2. and thither I remit the Reader.

26 *Ad* §. 9.10.11. I grant that the Church *cannot without damnable ſinne, either deny any thing to be true, which ſhe knowes to be Gods truth*: or propoſe *any thing as his truth, which ſhe knowes not to be ſo.* But that ſhe may not doe this by ignorance or miſtake, and ſo without damnable ſinne, that you ſhould haue proved, but haue not. But, ſay you *this excuſe cannot ſerue: for if the Church bee aſſiſted onely for points fundamentall, ſhe cannot but know that ſhe may erre in points not fundamentall.* Anſ. It does not follow, unleſſe you ſuppoſe, that the Church knowes that ſhe is aſſiſted no farther. But if, being aſſiſted only ſo farre, ſhe yet did conceaue by errour her aſſiſtance abſolute and unlimited, or if knowing her aſſiſtance reſtrained to fundamentalls, ſhe yet conceived by errour, that ſhe ſhould bee guarded, from propoſing any thing but what was fundamentall, then the conſequence is apparently falſe. *But at leaſt ſhe cannot be certain that ſhe cannot erre, and therefore cannot be excus'd from headlong and pernicious temerity in propoſing points not fundamentall, to be believed by Chriſtians as matters of faith.* Anſ. Neither is this deduction worth any thing; unleſſe it bee

underſtood of ſuch unfundamentall points, as ſhee is not warranted to propoſe by evident Text of Scripture. Indeed if ſhe propoſe ſuch, as *matters of faith certainly true*, ſhe may well be queſtioned, *Quo Warranto?* Shee builds without a foundation, and *ſaies thus ſaith the Lord, when the Lord doth not ſay ſo:* which cannot be excus'd from raſhneſſe and high preſumption; ſuch a preſumption, as an Embaſſadour ſhould commit, who ſhould ſay in his Maſters name that for which hee hath no commiſſion. Of the ſame nature, I ſay, but of a higher ſtraine: as much as the King of Heaven, is greater then any earthly King. But though ſhe may erre in ſome points not fundamentall, yet may ſhee haue certainty enough in propoſing others; as for example, theſe, *That Abraham begat Iſaac*, that S. *Paul had a Cloak*, that *Timothy was ſick*; becauſe theſe, though not Fundamentall .i.e. no eſſentiall parts of Chriſtianity, yet are evidently, and undeniably ſet down in Scripture, and conſequently, may be without all raſhnes propos'd by the Church as certaine divine Revelations. Neither is your Argument concluding when you ſay, *If in ſuch things ſhe may be deceived, ſhe muſt be alwaies uncertain of all ſuch things.* For my ſenſe may ſometimes poſſibly deceiue me, yet I am certain enough that I ſee what I ſee, and feel what I feel. Our Iudges are not infallible in their judgements, yet are they certain enough, that they judge aright, and that they proceed according to the evidence that is given, when they condemne a theef, or a murtherer to the gallows. A Traveller is not alwaies certain of his way, but often miſtaken: and does it therefore follow that hee can haue no aſſurance that Charing croſſe is his right way from the Temple to White-Hall? The ground of your errour here, is your not diſtinguiſhing, between Actuall certainty and Abſolute infallibility. Geometricians are not infallible in their own ſcience: yet they are very certain of thoſe things, which they ſee demonſtrated. And Carpenters are not infallible, yet certain of the ſtraightneſſe of thoſe things which agree with their rule and ſquare. So though the Church be not infallibly certain, that in all her Definitions, whereof ſome are about diſputable and ambiguous matters, ſhe ſhall proceed according to her Rule, yet being certain of the infallibility of her rule, and that in this or that thing ſhe doth manifeſtly proceed according to it, ſhe may be certaine of the Truth of ſome particular decrees, and yet not certain that ſhee ſhall never decree but what is true.

27 *Ad § 12. But if the Church may erre in points not fundamentall, ſhe may erre in propoſing Scripture, and ſo we cannot bee aſſur'd whether ſhe haue not been deceived already.* The Church may erre in her Propoſition or cuſtody of the Canon of Scripture, if you underſtand by the Church, any preſent Church of one denomination, for example, the *Roman*, the *Greek*, or ſo. Yet haue we ſufficient certainty of Scripture, not from the bare teſtimony of any preſent Church, but from Vniverſall Tradition, of which the teſtimony of any preſent Church is but a little part. So that here you fall into the Fallacy, *à dicto ſecundum quid ad dictum ſimpliciter*. For in effect this is the ſenſe of your Argument: Vnleſſe the Church be infallible, we can haue no certainty of Scripture

Scripture from the authority of the Church: Therefore unleſſe the Church be infallible, we can have no certainty hereof at all. As if a man ſhould ſay; If the vintage of France miſcarry, we can have no wine from France: Therefore if that Vintage miſcarry we can have no Wine at all. And for the incorruption of Scripture, I know no other rationall aſſurance we can have of it, then ſuch as we have of the incorruption of other ancient Bookes, that is, the conſent of ancient Copies: ſuch I mean *for the kind*, though it be farre *greater for the degree of it*. And if the ſpirit of God give any man any other aſſurance hereof, this is not rationall and diſcurſive, but ſupernaturall and infuſed. An aſſurance it may be to himſelfe, but no argument to another. As for the infallibility of the Church, it is ſo farre from being a proofe of the Scriptures incorruption, that no proofe can be pretended for it, but incorrupted places of Scripture: which yet are as ſubject to corruption as any other, and more likely to have been corrupted (if it had been poſſible) then any other, and made to ſpeak as they doe, for the advantage of thoſe men, whoſe ambition it hath been a long time, to bring all under their authority. Now then, if any man ſhould prove the Scriptures uncorrupted, becauſe the Church ſaies ſo which is infallible: I would demand again touching this very thing, that there is an infallible Church, ſeeing it is not of it ſelfe evident, how ſhall I be aſſured of it? And what can he anſwer, but that the Scripture ſaies ſo in theſe and theſe places? Hereupon I would aske him, how ſhall I be aſſured, that the Scriptures are incorrupted in theſe places? ſeeing it is poſſible, and not altogether improbable, that theſe men, which deſire to be thought infallible, when they had the government of all things in their own hands, may have altered them for their purpoſe. If to this he anſwer again, that the Church is infallible, and therefore cannot doe ſo, I hope it would be apparent, that he runs round in a circle, and proves the Scriptures incorruption, by the Churches infallibility, and the Churches infallibility by the Scriptures incorruption, and that is in effect the Churches infallibility, by the Churches infallibility, and the Scriptures incorruption by the Scriptures incorruption.

28 Now for your obſervation, that *ſome Bookes, which were not alwaies known to be Canonicall, have been afterwards received for ſuch. But never any book or ſyllable defined for Canonicall, was afterwards queſtioned or rejected for Apocryphall*: I demand, touching the firſt ſort, whether they were commended to the Church by the Apoſtles as Canonicall or not? If not, ſeeing the whole faith was preached by the Apoſtles to the Church, and ſeeing after the Apoſtles, the Church pretends to no new Revelations, how can it be an Article of faith to believe them Canonicall? And how can you pretend, that your Church which makes this an article of faith, is ſo aſſiſted as not to propoſe any thing as a divine truth which is not revealed by God? If they were, how then is the Church an infallible keeper of the Canō of Scripture, which hath ſuffered ſome Bookes of Canonicall Scripture, to be loſt? & others to looſe for a long time their being Canonicall, at

leaſt, the neceſſity of being ſo eſteemed, and afterwards, as it were by the law of *Poſtliminium* hath reſtored their Authority and Canonicalneſſe unto them? If this was delivered by the Apoſtles to the Church, the point was ſufficiently diſcuſſed, and therefore your Churches omiſſion to teach it for ſome ages, as an article of faith, nay degrading it from the number of articles of faith, and putting it among diſputable problems, was ſurely not very laudable. If it were not revealed by God to the Apoſtles, and by the Apoſtles to the Church, then can it be no Revelation, and therefore her preſumption in propoſing it as ſuch, is inexcuſable.

29 And then for the other part of it, *that never any book or ſyllable defined for Canonicall, was afterwards queſtion'd or rejected for Apocryphall*: Certainly it is a bold aſſeveration, but extreamly falſe. For I demand; The Book of *Eccleſiaſticus* and *Wiſdome*, the *Epiſtle of Saint Iames*, and *to the Heb.* were they by the Apoſtles approved for Canonicall, or no? If not, with what face dare you approve them, and yet pretend that all your doctrine is Apoſtolicall? Eſpecially ſeeing it is evident that this point is not deducible by rationall diſcourſe from any other defined by them. If they were approved by them, this I hope was a ſufficient definition: and therefore you were beſt rub your forehead hard, and ſay, that theſe Books were never queſtioned. But if you doe ſo, then I ſhall be bold to aske you, what bookes you meant in ſaying before, *Some bookes which were not alwaies known to be Canonicall, have been afterwards received*? Then for the book of *Maccabes*, I hope you will ſay, it was defin'd for Canonicall before S. *Gregories* time: and yet he, lib. 19. Moral, c. 13. citing a teſtimony out of it, prefaceth to it after this manner, *Concerning which matter we doe not amiſſe if we produce a teſtimony out of Bookes although not Canonicall, yet ſet forth, for the edification of the Church. For Eleazar in the Book of Machabees.* &c. Which if it be not to reject it from being Canonicall, is without queſtion, at leaſt to queſtion it. Moreover, becauſe you are ſo punctuall, as to talk of words and ſyllables, I would know whether before *Sixtus Quintus* his time, your Church had a defined Canon of Scripture, or not? If not, then was your Church ſurely a moſt Vigilant keeper of Scripture, that for 1500 yeares had not defined what was Scripture, and what was not. If it had, then I demand, was it *that*, ſet forth by *Sixtus*, or *that*, ſet forth by *Clement*, or a *third* different from both? If it were that ſet forth by *Sixtus*, then is it now condemned by *Clement*: if that of *Clement*, it was condemned I ſay, but ſure you will ſay contradicted and queſtion'd by *Sixtus*; If different from both, then was it queſtion'd and condemned by both, and ſtill lies under the condemnation. But then laſtly, ſuppoſe it had been true, *That both ſome Book not known to be Canonicall had been received*, and that *never any after receiving had been queſtioned*: How had this been a ſigne that the Church is infallibly aſſiſted by the Holy Ghoſt? In what mood or figure, would this concluſion follow out of theſe Premiſes? Certainly your flying to ſuch poor ſignes, as theſe are, is to me a great ſigne, that you labour with penury of better arguments:

ments: and that, thus to catch at ſhadowes and bulruſhes, is a ſhrewd ſigne of a ſinking cauſe.

30 *Ad* §. 13. We are told here, *That the generall promiſes of Infallibility to the Church, muſt not be reſtrained only to points fundamentall: Becauſe then the Apoſtles words and writings may alſo be ſo reſtrained.* The Argument put in forme, and made compleat by ſupply of the concealed Propoſition runs thus;

The Infallibility promiſed to the preſent Church of any age, is as abſolute and unlimited, as that promiſed to the Apoſtles in their Preaching and Writings:

But the Apoſtles Infallibility is not to be limited to Fundamentalls:

Therefore neither is the Churches Infallibility thus to be limited.

Or thus;

The Apoſtles Infallibility in their Preaching and writing may be limited to Fundamentalls as well as the Infallibility of the preſent Church: But that is not to be done: Therefore this alſo is not to be done.

Now to this Argument, I anſwere, that if by *may be as well*, in the major Propoſition, be underſtood, *may be as poſſibly:* it is true, but impertinent. If by it we underſtand, *may be as iuſtly and rightly*, It is very pertinent but very falſe. So that as D. *Potter limits the infallibility of the Preſent Church unto Fundamentalls, ſo another may limit the Apoſtles unto them alſo.* He may doe it *de facto*, but *de iure* he cannot; that may be done and done lawfully: this alſo may be done, but not lawfully. That may be done, and if it be done cannot be confuted: This alſo may be done, but if it be done, may eaſily be confuted. It is done to our hand in this very Paragraph, by five words taken out of Scripture, *All Scripture is divinely inſpired.* Shew but as much for the Church: Shew where it is written, *That all the decrees of the Church are divinely inſpired*; and the Controverſy will be at an end. Beſides, there is not the ſame reaſon for the Churches abſolute infallibility, as for the Apoſtles and Scriptures. For if the Church fall into error, it may be reformed by comparing it with the rule of the Apoſtles doctrine and Scripture. But if the Apoſtles have erred in delivering the doctrine of Chriſtianity, to whom ſhall we have recourſe, for the diſcovering and correcting their error? Again, there is not ſo much ſtrength required in the Edifice as in the Foundation: and if but wiſemen have the ordering of the building, they will make it much a ſurer thing, that the foundation ſhall not fail the building, then that the building ſhall not fall from the foundation. And though the building be to be of Brick or Stone, and perhaps of wood, yet if it may be poſſibly, they will have a rock for their foundation, whoſe ſtability is a much more indubitable thing, then the adherence of the ſtructure to it. Now the Apoſtles & Prophets, and Canonicall Writers, are the foundation of the Church, according to that of S. *Paul, built upon the foundation of Apoſtles and Prophets*; therefore their ſtability, in reaſon ought

ought to be greater then the Churches, which is built upon them. Again, a dependent Infallibility (eſpecially if the dependance be voluntary) cannot be ſo certain, as that on which it depends: But the Infallibility of the Church, depends upon the Infallibility of the Apoſtles, as the ſtreightneſſe of the thing regulated, upon the ſtreightneſſe of the Rule: and beſides this dependance is voluntary, for it is in the power of the Church to deviate from this Rule; being nothing elſe but an aggregation of men, of which every one has free will, and is ſubject to paſſions and errour: Therefore the Churches infallibility, is not ſo certain as that of the Apoſtles.

31 Laſtly, *Quid verba audiam, cum facta videam?* If you be ſo Infallible as the Apoſtles were, ſhew it as the Apoſtles did; *They went forth* (ſaith *S. Marke*) *and Preached every where, the Lord working with them, and confirming their words with Signes following.* It is impoſſible that God ſhould lye, and that the eternall Truth ſhould ſet his hand and ſeale to the confirmation of a falſhood, or of ſuch Doctrine as is partly true and partly falſe. The Apoſtles Doctrine was thus confirmed, therefore it was intirely true, and in no part either falſe or uncertain. I ſay in no part of that which they delivered conſtantly, as a certain divine Truth, and which had the Atteſtation of Divine Miracles. For that the Apoſtles themſelves, even after the ſending of the holy Ghoſt, were, and through inadvertence or prejudice, continued for a time in an errour, repugnant to a revealed Truth, it is as I have already noted unanſwerably evident, from the *ſtory of the Acts of the Apoſtles*. For notwithſtanding our Saviours expreſſe warrant & injunction, *to goe and Preach to all Nations*, yet untill S. *Peter* was better informed by a viſion from Heaven, and by the converſion of *Cornelius*, both he and the reſt of the Church, held it unlawfull for them, to goe or preach the Goſpell to any but the Iewes.

32 And for thoſe things which they profeſſe to deliver as the dictates of humane reaſon and prudence, and not as divine Revelations, why we ſhould take them to be divine revelations, I ſee no reaſon; nor how we can doe ſo, and not contradict the Apoſtles, and God himſelfe. Therefore when S. Paul ſaies, in the 1. Epiſt. to the *Cor.* 7. 12. *To the reſt ſpeak I, not the Lord*; And again, *concerning Virgins I have no commandement of the Lord, but I deliver my Iudgement:* If we will pretend, that the Lord did certainly ſpeak, what S. *Paul* ſpake, and that his judgement was Gods commandement, ſhall we not plainly contradict S. *Paul*, and that ſpirit by which he wrote? which moved him to write, as in other places divine Revelations, which he certainly knew to be ſuch, ſo in this place, his own judgement, touching ſome things which God had not particularly revealed unto him. And if *D. Potter* did ſpeak to this purpoſe (*that the Apoſtles were Infallible only in thoſe things which they ſpake of certain knowledge*) I cannot ſee what danger there were in ſaying ſo. Yet the truth is, you wrong *D. Potter*. It is not he, but *D. Stapleton* in him, that ſpeakes the words you cavill at. D. *Stapleton*, ſaith he, p. 140. is full and punctuall to this purpoſe: then ſets down the effect of his diſcourſe l. 8. *Princ. Doct.* 4. *c.* 15.

15. and in that, the words you cavill at, and then, p. 150. he ſhuts up this paragraph with theſe words, *thus D. Stapleton.* So that if either the Doctrine, or the reaſon be not good, *D. Stapleton*, not *D. Potter* is to anſwer for it.

33 Neither doe D. *Potter's* enſuing words *limit the Apoſtles infallibilitie to truths abſolutely neceſſary to ſalvation*, if you read them with any candor: for it is evident, he grants the *Church infallible in Truths abſolutely neceſſary*; and as evident, that he *aſcribes to the Apoſtles, the ſpirits guidance, and conſequently infallibility in a more high and abſolute manner then any ſince them.* From whence, thus I argue: Hee that grants the Church infallible in Fundamentals, and aſcribes to the Apoſtles the infallible guidance of the Spirit, in a more high and abſolute manner then to any ſince them, limits not the Apoſtles infallibility to Fundamentals; But D. *Potter* grants to the Church ſuch a limited infallibility, and aſcribes to the Apoſtles, *The Spirits infallible guidance in a more high and abſolute manner*; therefore hee limits not the Apoſtles infallibility to Fundamentals. I once knew a man out of curteſie, help a lame dog over a ſtile, and he for requitall bit him by the fingers: Iuſt ſo you ſerue D. *Potter.* He out of curteſie grants you, that thoſe words, *The Spirit ſhall lead you into all Truth, and ſhall abide with you ever*, though in their high and moſt abſolute ſenſe, they agree only to the Apoſtles, yet in a conditionall, limited, moderate, ſecundary ſenſe, they may be underſtood of the Church. But ſaies, that if they be underſtood of the Church, *All, muſt not be ſimply all*, No, nor ſo large an All, as the Apoſtles All, *but all neceſſary to ſalvation.* And you to requite his curteſie, in granting you thus much cavill at him, as if hee had preſcribed theſe bounds to the Apoſtles alſo, as well as the preſent Church. Whereas, he hath explained himſelfe to the contrary, both in the clauſe fore-mentioned, *The Apoſtles, who had the ſpirits guidance in a more high and abſolute manner then any ſince them*, and in theſe words enſuing, *whereof the Church is ſimply ignorant*, and againe, *wherewith the Church is not acquainted.* But moſt clearly in thoſe which being moſt incompatible to the Apoſtles, you with an &c, I cannot but feare craftily, haue conceal'd: *How many obſcure Texts of Scripture which ſhe underſtands not? How many Schoole Queſtions which ſhe hath not, happily cannot determine? And for matters of fact it is apparent that the Church may erre*; and then concludes, *That we muſt underſtand by, All truths, not ſimply All, But* (if you conceiue the words as ſpoken of the Church) *All Truth abſolutely neceſſary to ſalvation.* And yet beyond all this, the negative part of his anſwer, agrees very well to the Apoſtles themſelues, for that *All which they were led into*, was not ſimply All, otherwiſe S. *Paul* erred in ſaying, *we know in part*; but ſuch an All, as was requiſite to make them the Churches Foundations. Now ſuch they could not be without freedome from errour in all thoſe things which they delivered conſtantly, as certaine revealed Truths. For if we once ſuppoſe they may haue erred in ſome things of this nature, it will be utterly undiſcernable what they haue erred in, & what they haue not. Whereas though wee ſuppoſe the Church hath

err'd in ſomethings, yet we haue meanes to know, what ſhe hath err'd in, and what ſhe hath not. I mean by comparing the Doctrine of the preſent Church, with the doctrine of the Primitiue Church delivered in Scripture. But then laſt of all, ſuppoſe the *Doctor* had ſaid (which I know he never intended) that this promiſe in this place made to the Apoſtles, was to bee underſtood only of all Truths abſolutely neceſſary to ſalvation; Is it conſequent that he makes their Preaching and Writing not Infallible in points not fundamentall? Doe you not bluſh for ſhame at this Sophiſtry? The Dr ſaies, no more was promiſed in this place; Therefore he ſaies no more was promiſed! Are there not other places beſides this? And may not that be promiſed in other places, which is not promiſed in this?

34 *But if the Apoſtles were Infallible, in all things propos'd by them as Divine Truths, the like muſt be affirm'd of the Church, becauſe Doctor Potter teacheth the ſaid promiſe to be verified in the Church.* True, hee does ſo, but not in ſo abſolute a manner. Now what is oppos'd to Abſolute, but limited, or reſtrained? To the Apoſtles then it was made, & to them only, yet the words are true of the Church. And this very promiſe might haue been made to it, though here it is not. They agree to the Apoſtles *in a higher*, to the Church *in a lower* ſenſe: to the Apoſtles *in a more abſolute*, to the Church in *a more limited* ſenſe. To the Apoſtles *abſolutely*, for the *Churches direction:* to the Church *Conditionally by adherence to that direction, and ſo farre as ſhe doth adhere to it.* In a word, the Apoſtles were led into all Truths by the Spirit, *efficaciter*: The Church is led alſo into all truth by the Apoſtles *writings, ſufficienter.* So that the Apoſtles and the Church, may be fitly compared to the Starre and the Wiſemen. The Starre was directed by the finger of God, and could not but goe right to the place where Chriſt was: But the Wiſe men were led by the Starre to Chriſt; led by it, I ſay, not *efficaciter*, or *irreſiſtibiliter*, but *ſufficienter*, ſo that if they would they might follow it, if they would not, they might chooſe. So was it between the Apoſtles writing Scriptures, & the Church. They in their writing were Infallibly aſſiſted to propoſe nothing as a divine Truth, but what was ſo. The Church is alſo led into all Truth, but it is by the intervening of the Apoſtles writings: But it is, as the Wiſemen were led by the Starre, or as a Traveller is directed by a Mercuriall ſtatue, or as a Pilot by his Card and Compaſſe: led ſufficiently, but not irreſiſtibly: led ſo that ſhe may follow, not ſo that ſhe muſt. For ſeeing the Church is a ſociety of men, whereof every one (according to the Doctrine of the Romiſh Church) hath freewill in believing; it follows, that the whole aggregate has freewill in believing. And if any man ſay that at leaſt *it is morally impoſſible, that of ſo many whereof all may believe aright, not any ſhould doe ſo:* I anſwer, It is true, if they did all giue themſelues any liberty of judgement. But if all (as the caſe is here) captivate their underſtandings to one of them, all are as likely to erre as that one. And he more likely to erre then any other, becauſe hee may erre and thinks he cannot, & becauſe he conceiues the Spirit abſolutly promis'd to the ſucceſſion of Biſhops, of which many haue been notoriouſly

toriouſly and confeſſedly wicked men, *Men of the World*: whereas this Spirit is the *Spirit of Truth, whom the world cannot receiue, becauſe he ſeeth him not, neither knoweth him*. Beſides, let us ſuppoſe, that neither in this nor in any other place, God had promiſed any more unto them, but to lead them into all Truth, neceſſary for their own & other mens ſalvation: Does it therefore follow that they were *de facto*, led no farther? God indeed is oblig'd by his Veracity to doe all that hee has promiſed, but is there any thing that binds him to doe no more? May not he be better then his word, but you will quarrell at him? May not his Bounty exceed his Promiſe? And may not we haue certainty enough that oftimes it does ſo? God did not promiſe to *Solomon*, in his viſion at *Gibeon*, any more then what he askt, which was *wiſdome to govern his people*, and that he gaue him. But yet I hope you will not deny that we haue certainty enough that he gaue him ſomething which neither God had promiſed, nor he had asked. If you doe, you contradict God himſelfe; For *Behold* (ſaith God) *becauſe thou haſt asked this thing, I haue done according to thy word. Loe, I haue given thee a Wiſe and an Vnderſtanding heart, ſo that there was none like thee before thee, neither after thee ſhall any ariſe like unto thee. And I haue alſo given thee that which thou haſt not asked, both riches and honour, ſo that there ſhall not be any among the Kings like unto thee in all thy dayes*. God, for ought appeares, never oblig'd himſelfe by promiſe, to ſhew S. *Paul* thoſe *Vnſpeakable myſteries*, which in the third Heaven he ſhewed unto him: and yet I hope we haue certainty enough, that he did ſo. God promiſes to thoſe that *ſeek his Kingdome and the righteouſneſſe thereof, that all things neceſſary ſhall be added unto them*, and in rigour by his promiſe he is obliged to doe no more, and if hee giue them neceſſaries he hath diſcharged his obligation: Shall we therefore be ſo injurious to his bounty towards us, as to ſay it is determined by the narrow bounds of meere neceſſity? So though God had obliged himſelfe by promiſe, to giue his Apoſtles infallibility onely in things neceſſary to ſalvation; nevertheleſſe it is utterly inconſequent, that he gaue them no more, then by the rigour of his promiſe he was engaged to doe; or that we can haue no aſſurance of any farther aſſiſtance that he gaue them: eſpecially when he himſelfe, both by his word, and by his works hath aſſured us, that he did aſſiſt them farther. You ſee by this time that your chaine of *feareful conſequences* (as you call them) is turned to a rope of ſand, and may eaſily bee avoided without any flying to your imaginary infallibility of the Church in all her propoſalls.

35 *Ad* § 14. *&* 15. *Doubting of a Book receaved for Canonicall*, may ſignifie, either doubting whether it be Canonicall; or ſuppoſing it to be Canonicall, whether it be True. If the former ſenſe were yours, I muſt then againe diſtinguiſh of the terme, *received*; For it may ſignify, *either received by ſome particular Church*, or by the *preſent Church Vniverſall*, or *the Church of all Ages*. If you meant the word in either of the former ſenſes, that which you ſay is not true. A man may juſtly and reaſonably doubt of ſome Texts, or ſome Book received by ſome

particular Church, or by the Vniverſall Church of this preſent time, whether it be Canonicall or no: and yet haue juſt reaſon to belieue, & no reaſon to doubt, but that other Books are Canonicall. As *Euſebius* perhaps, had reaſon to doubt of the Epiſtle of S. *Iames*; the Church of Rome in *Hierom's* time of the Epiſtle to the *Hebr.* And yet they did not doubt of all the Books of the Canon, nor had reaſon to doe ſo. If by *Received*, you meant, *Received by the Church of all Ages*, I grant he that doubts of any one ſuch Book, has as much reaſon to doubt of all. But yet here again I tell you, that it is poſſible a man may doubt of one ſuch book, and yet not of all: becauſe it is poſſible men may doe not accordiug to reaſon. If you meant your words in the latter ſenſe, then I confeſſe he that belieues ſuch a Book to be Canonicall, i.e. the word of God, and yet (to make an impoſſible ſuppoſition) believes it not to be true, if he will doe according to reaſon, muſt doubt of all the reſt, and belieue none. For there being no greater reaſon to believe any thing true, then becauſe God hath ſaid it, nor no other reaſon to belieue the Scripture to be true, but only becauſe it is Gods word; hee that doubts of the Truth of any thing ſaid by God, hath as much reaſon to belieue nothing that he ſaies: and therefore if he will doe according to reaſon, neither muſt nor can believe any thing he ſaies. And upon this ground you conclude rightly, that *the infallibility of true Scripture muſt be Vniverſall, and not confin'd to points fundamentall.*

36 *And this Reaſon why we ſhould not refuſe to beleiue any part of Scripture, upon pretence that the matter of it is not Fundamentall, you confeſſe to be convincing. But the ſame reaſon you ſay is as convincing for the Vniverſall infallibility of the Church. For* (ſay you) *unleſſe ſhee be Infallible in all things, we cannot belieue her in any one.* But by this reaſon your Proſelytes, knowing you are not Infallible in all things, muſt not, nor cannot belieue you in any thing. Nay you your ſelfe muſt not belieue your ſelfe in any thing, becauſe you know that you are not Infallible in all things. Indeed if you had ſaid *wee could not rationally belieue her for her own ſake, and upon her own word and authority in any thing*, I ſhould willingly grant the conſequence. For an authority ſubject to errour can be no firm or ſtable foundation of my beliefe in any thing: and if it were in any thing, then this authority being one & the ſame in all propoſalls, I ſhould haue the ſame reaſon to belieue all, that I haue to belieue one, and therefore muſt either doe unreaſonably, in believing any one thing, upon the ſole warrant of this authority, or unreaſonably in not believing all things equally warranted by it. Let this therefore be granted; and what will come of it? *Why then*, you ſay, *we cannot belieue her in propounding Canonicall Books.* If you mean ſtill (as you muſt doe unleſſe you play the Sophiſter) *not upon her own Authority*, I grant it: For we belieue Canonicall Books not upon the *Authority of the preſent Church*, but upon *Vniverſall Tradition.* If you mean, *Not at all*, and that with reaſon we cannot believe theſe Books to be Canonicall, which the Church propoſes, I deny it. There is no more conſequence in the Argument then in this, The Divell is not infallible, therefore if he ſaies there is one God, I cannot believe him.

No

No Geometritian is Infallible in all things, therefore not in theſe things which he domonſtrates. M. *Knot* is not Infallible in all things, therefore he may not believe that he wrote a Book, entituled *Charity Maintained.*

37 But *though the reply be good, Proteſtants cannot make uſe of it, with any good coherence to this diſtinction, and ſome other Doctrine of theirs; becauſe they pretend to be able to tell, what points are Fundamentall and what not; and therefore though they ſhould believe Scripture erroneous in others, yet they might be ſure it err'd not in theſe.* To this I anſwer. That if without dependance on Scripture, they did know what were Fundamentall, and what not, they might poſſibly believe the Scripture true in Fundamentalls, and erroneous in other things. But ſeeing they ground their beliefe, that *ſuch and ſuch things only are Fundamentalls*, only upon *Scripture*, and goe about to prove their aſſertion true, only by Scripture, then muſt they ſuppoſe the Scripture true abſolutely and in all things, or elſe the Scripture could not be a ſufficient warrant to them, to believe this thing, that theſe only points are Fundamentall. For who would not laugh at them if they ſhould argue thus, The Scripture is true in ſomething; the Scripture ſaies that theſe points only are Fundamentall, therefore this is true, that theſe only are ſo! For every Freſh-man in Logick knowes that from meer particulars nothing can be certainly concluded. But on the other ſide, this reaſon is firme, and demonſtrative, The Scripture is true in all things; But the Scripture ſaies, that theſe only points are the Fundamentalls of Chriſtian Religion, therefore it is true, that theſe only are ſo. So that the knowledge of Fundamentalls being it ſelfe drawen from Scripture, is ſo farre from warranting us to believe the Scripture is, or may be in part True, and in part Falſe; that it ſelfe can have no foundation, but the Vniverſall truth of Scripture. For to be a Fundamentall truth, preſuppoſes to be a truth; now I cannot know any Doctrine to be a divine and ſupernaturall Truth, or a true part of Chriſtianity, but only becauſe the Scripture ſaies ſo, which is all true: Therefore, much more can I not know it, to be a Fundamentall truth.

33 *Ad §. 16.* To this Parag. I anſwer. Though the Church being not Infallible, I cannot believe her in every thing ſhe ſaies, yet I can and muſt believe her in every thing ſhe proves, either by Scripture, Reaſon, or univerſall Tradition, be it Fundamentall, or be it not Fundamentall. This you ſay, we *cannot, in points not Fundamentall, becauſe in ſuch we believe ſhe may erre.* But this I know, we can: becauſe though ſhe may erre in ſome things, yet ſhe does not erre in what ſhe proves, though it be not Fundamentall. Again you ſay, *we cannot doe it in Fundamentalls, becauſe we muſt know what points be Fundamentall, before we goe to learn of her.* Not ſo, but I muſt learn of the Church, or of ſome part of the Church, or I cannot know any thing Fundamentall or not Fundamentall. For how can I come to know, that there was ſuch a man as Chriſt, that he taught ſuch Doctrine, that he and his Apoſtles did ſuch miracles in confirmation of it, that

the Scripture is Gods word, unleſſe I be taught it. So then the Church is, though *not a certain Foundation and proof of my Faith, yet a neceſſary introduction to it.*

39 But the *Churches infallible direction, extending only to Fundamentalls, unleſſe I know them before I goe to learn of her, I may be rather deluded then inſtructed by her.* The reaſon and connexion of this conſequence, I fear neither I nor you doe well underſtand. And beſides I muſt tell you, you are too bold in taking that which no man grants you, *that the Church is an infallible director in Fundamentalls.* For if ſhe were ſo, then muſt we not only learn Fundamentalls of her, but alſo *learn of her what is fundamentall, and take all for fundamentall which ſhe delivers to be ſuch.* In the performance whereof, if I knew any one Church to be infallible, I would quickly be of that Church. But good Sir, you muſt needs doe us this favour, to be ſo acute, as to diſtinguiſh between, being *infallible in fundamentalls*, and being an *infallible guide in fundamentalls.* That ſhe ſhall be alwaies *a Church infallible in fundamentalls*, we eaſily grant; for it comes to no more but this, *that there ſhall be alwaies a Church.* But that there ſhall be alwaies ſuch a Church, which is an infallible Guide in fundamentalls, this we deny. For this cannot be without ſetling a known infallibility in ſome one known ſociety of Chriſtians, (as the Greek or the Roman, or ſome other Church) by adhering to which Guide, men might be guided to believe aright in all Fundamentalls. A man that were deſtitute of all meanes of communicating his thoughts to others, might yet in himſelfe, and to himſelfe be infallible, but he could not be a Guide to others. A man or a Church that were inviſible, ſo that none could know how to repaire to it for direction, could not be an infallible guide, and yet he might be in himſelfe infallible. You ſee then there is a wide difference between theſe two, and therefore I muſt beſeech you not to confound them, nor to take the one for the other.

40 But they that *know what points are Fundamentall, otherwiſe then by the Churches authority, learn not of the Church:* Yes, they may learn of the Church, that the Scripture is the word of God, and from the Scripture, that ſuch points are fundamentall, others are not ſo, and conſequently learn, even of the Church, even of your Church, that all is not fundamentall, nay all is not true, which the Church teacheth to be ſo. Neither doe I ſee what hinders, but a man may learn of a Church, how to confute the errors of that Church which taught him: as well as of my Maſter in Phyſick, or the Mathematicks, I may learn thoſe rules and principles, by which I may confute my Maſters erroneous concluſions.

41 But you aske, *If the Church be not an infallible teacher, why are we commanded to hear, to ſeek, to obey the Church?* I Anſwer. For commands *to ſeek the Church*, I have not yet met with any, and I believe you, if you were to ſhew them, would be your ſelfe to ſeek. But yet if you could produce ſome ſuch, we might ſeek the Church to many good purpoſes, without ſuppoſing her *a Guide infallible.* And then for *hearing and obeying the Church*, I would fain know, whether none may

be

be heard and obeyed, but thoſe that are infallible? Whether particular Churches, Governors, Paſtors, Parents, be not to be heard and obeyed? Or whether all theſe be Infallible? I wonder you will thruſt upon us ſo often, theſe worne out-objections, without taking notice of their Anſwers.

42 Your Argument from S. *Auſtine's* firſt place, is a fallacy, *A dicto ſecundum quid ad dictum ſimpliciter.* If the *whole Church practiſe any of theſe things (matters of order and decency*, for ſuch only there he ſpeaks of,) *to diſpute whether that ought to be done, is inſolent madneſſe.* And from hence you inferre, *If the whole Church practiſe any thing, to diſpute whether it ought to be done, is inſolent madneſſe.* As if there were no difference between *any thing, and any of theſe things?* Or as if I might not eſteem it pride and folly, to contradict and diſturbe the Church for matter of order, pertaining to the time and place, and other circumſtances of Gods worſhip; and yet account it neither pride nor folly, to goe about to reforme ſome errors, which the Church hath ſuffered to come in, and to vitiate the very ſubſtance of Gods worſhip. It was a practiſe of the whole Church in S. *Auſtines* time, and eſteem'd an Apoſtolique Tradition, even by Saint *Auſtine* himſelf, *That the Euchariſt ſhould be adminiſtred to infants*: Tell me Sir, I beſeech you; Had it been inſolent madneſſe to diſpute againſt this practiſe, or had it not? If it had, how inſolent and mad are you, that have not only diſputed againſt it, but utterly aboliſhed it? If it had not, then as I ſay, you muſt underſtand S. *Auſtines* words, not ſimply of all things, but (as indeed he himſelfe reſtrained them) *of theſe things, of matter of Order, Decency, and Vniformity.*

43 In the next place, you tell us out of him, *That that which has been alwaies kept, is moſt rightly eſteem'd to come from the Apoſtles*: Very right, and what then? Therefore the Church cannot erre in defining of Controverſies. Sir I beſeech you, when you write again, doe us the favour to write nothing but ſyllogiſmes, for I find it ſtill an extream trouble, to find out the concealed propoſitions, which are to connect the parts of your enthymemes. As now for example, I profeſſe unto you, I am at my wits end, and have done my beſt endeavour, to find ſome glue, or ſodder, or cement, or chaine, or thred, or any thing to tye this antecedent and this conſequent together, and at length am inforced to give it over, and cannot doe it.

44 But the Doctrines, that *Infants are to be baptized, and thoſe that are baptized by Heretiques, are not to be re-baptized, are neither of them to be proved by Scripture: And yet according to* S. *Auſtine they are true Doctrines, and we may be certain of them upon the Authority of the Church, which we could not be, unleſſe the Church were Infallible; therefore the Church is infallible.* I anſwer, that there is no repugnance but we may be certain enough, of the Vniverſall Traditions of the ancient Church, ſuch as in S. *Auſtin's* account, theſe were which here are ſpoken of, and yet not be certain enough, of the definitions of the preſent Church. Vnleſſe you can ſhew (which I am ſure you can never doe) that the Infallibility of the preſent Church, was alwaies a Tra-

dition

dition of the ancient Church. Now your main buſineſſe is to prove the preſent Church infallible, not ſo much in conſigning ancient Traditions, as in defining emergent controverſies. Again, it followes not, becauſe the Churches Authority, is warrant enough for us to believe ſome doctrine, touching which the Scripture is ſilent, therefore it is Warrant enough to believe theſe, to which the Scripture ſeemes repugnant. Now the Doctrines which S. *Auſtine* received upon the Churches Authority, were of the firſt ſort; the Doctrines for which we deny your Churches infallibility are of the ſecond. And therefore though the Churches authority, might be ſtrong enough, to bear the weight which S. *Auſtine* laid upon it, yet happily it may not be ſtrong enough, to bear that which you lay upon it. Though it may ſupport ſome Doctrines without Scripture, yet ſurely not againſt it. And laſt of all, to deal ingeniouſly with you and the World, I am not ſuch an Idolater of S. *Auſtine*, as to think a thing proved ſufficiently becauſe he ſaies it, nor that all his ſentences are oracles; and particularly in this thing, that whatſoever was practiſed or held by the Vniverſall Church of his time, muſt needs have come from the Apoſtles. Though conſidering the neereneſſe of his time to the Apoſtles, I think it a good probable way, and therefore am apt enough to follow it, when I ſee no reaſon to the contrary. Yet I profeſſe I muſt have better ſatisfaction, before I can induce my ſelfe to hold it certain and infallible. And this, not becauſe Popery would come in at this dore, as ſome have vainly feared, but becauſe by the Church Vniverſall of ſome time, and the Church Vniverſall of other times, I ſee plain contradictions held and practiſed. Both which could not come from the Apoſtles, for then the Apoſtles had been teachers of falſhood. And therefore the belief or practiſe of the preſent Vniverſall Church, can be no infallible proof, that the Doctrine ſo beleived, or the cuſtome ſo practiſed came from the Apoſtles. I inſtance in the doctrine of the *Millenaries*, and the *Euchariſts neceſſity for infants*: both which Doctrines have been taught by the conſent of the eminent Fathers of ſome ages, without any oppoſition from any of their Contemporaries: and were delivered by them, not as Doctors, but as Witneſſes, not as their own opinions, but as Apoſtolike Traditions. And therefore meaſuring the doctrine of the Church by all the Rules which Cardinall *Perron* gives us for that purpoſe, both theſe Doctrines muſt be acknowledged to have been the doctrines of the Ancient Church of ſome age, or ages; And that the contrary Doctrines were Catholique at ſome other time, I believe you will not think it needfull for me to prove. So that either I muſt ſay, the Apoſtles were fountaines of contradictious doctrines, or that being the Vniverſall Doctrine of the preſent Church, is no ſufficient proof that it came originally from the Apoſtles. Beſides, who can warrant us, that the Vniverſall Traditions of the Church were all Apoſtolicall? ſeeing in that famous place for Traditions, in *Tertullian*, [a] *Quicunq; traditor, any author whatſoe-*

[a] *De Corona Militis c. 3. & 4.* Where having recounted ſundry unwritten Traditions then obſerved by Chriſtians, many whereof, by the way, (notwithſtanding the Councell of *Trents* profeſſion, *to receive them and the written word with like affection of Piety*) are now rejected and

ver is founder good enough for them. And who can ſecure us, that Humane inventions, and ſuch as came *à quocunq; Traditore*, might not in a ſhort time, gain the reputation of Apoſtolique! Seeing the direction then was, [b] *Precepta maiorum Apoſtolicas Traditiones quiſq; exiſtimat.*

45 No leſſe you ſay is S. *Chryſoſt. for the infallible Traditions of the Church.* But you were to prove the Church infallible, not in her Traditions (which we willingly grant, if they be as univerſall as the Tradition of the undoubted books of Scripture is, to be as infallible as the Scripture is; for neither does being written make the word of God the more infallible, nor being unwritten make it the leſſe infallible:) Not therefore in her univerſall Traditions, were you to prove the Church infallible, but in all her Decrees and definitions of Controverſies. To this point when you ſpeak you ſhall have an anſwer, but hitherto you doe but wander.

46 But let us ſee what S. *Chryſoſtome* ſaies, *They (the Apoſtles) de livered not all things in writing* (who denies it?) *but many things alſo without writing*, (who doubts of it?) *and theſe alſo are worthy of belief.* Yes, if we knew what they were. But many things are worthy of belief, which are not neceſſary to be believed: As that *Iulius Cæſar* was Emperour of Rome is a thing worthy of belief, being ſo well teſtified as it is, but yet it is not neceſſary to be believed; a man may be ſaved without it. Thoſe many workes which *our Saviour did (which S. Iohn ſuppoſes, would not have been contained in a world of bookes)* if they had been written, or if God by ſome other meanes had preſerv'd the knowledge of them, had been as worthy to be believed, and as neceſſary as thoſe that are written. But to ſhew you how much a more faith full keeper Records are then report, thoſe few that were written are preſerved & believed, thoſe infinitly more that were not written, are all loſt and vaniſhed out of the memory of men. And ſeeing God in his providence, hath not thought fit to preſerve the memory of them, he hath freed us from the obligation of believing them: for every obligation ceaſes, when it becomes impoſſible. Who can doubt but the Primitive Chriſtians, to whom the Epiſtles of the Apoſtles were written, either of themſelves underſtood, or were inſtructed by the Apoſtles, touching the ſenſe of the obſcure places of them? Theſe Traditive interpretations, had they been written and diſperſed, as the Scriptures were, had without queſtion been preſerved, as the Scriptures are. But to ſhew how excellent a keeper of the Tradition, the Church of Rome hath been, or even the Catholique Church, for

and neglected by the Church of Rome: For example *Immerſion in Baptiſm; Taſting a mixture of milke and honey preſently after; Abſtaining from Bathes for a weeke after; Accounting it an impiety to pray kneeling on the Lords day, or betweenEaſter and Pentecoſt*: I ſay, having reckoned up theſe and other Traditions in the 3. *chapt.* He addes another in the fourth, of *the Veiling of Women;* And then addes, *Since I find no law for this, it followes that Tradition muſt have given this obſervation to cuſtome, which ſhall gaine in time, Apoſtolique authority by the interpretation of the reaſon it. By theſe examples therefore it is declared, that the obſerving of unwritten Tradition, being confirmed by cuſtome, may bee defended. The perſeverance of the obſervation being a good teſtimony of the goodneſſe of the Tradition. Now cuſtome even in civill affaires where a Law is wanting, paſſes for a law. Neither is it materiall whether it be grounded on Scripture, or reaſon; ſeeing reaſon is commendation enough for a law. Moreover if law be grounded on reaſon, all that muſt be law, which is ſo grounded.--A quocunq; productum--Whoſoever is the producer of it. Doe ye thinke it is not lawfull, Omni fideli, for every faithfull man to conceive and conſtitute? Provided he conſtitute only what is not repugnant to Gods will, what is conducible for diſcipline and available to ſalvation? ſeeing the Lord ſayes, why even of our ſelves, judge yee not what is right? And a little after, This reaſon now demand, ſaving the reſpect of the Tradition, --A quocunq; Traditore cenſetur, nec auctorem reſpiciens ſed Auctoritatem: From whatſoever Traditor it comes; neither regard the Author but the Authority.*

[b] Hier.

want of writing they are all loſt, nay were all loſt, within a few ages after Chriſt. So that if we conſult the ancient Interpreters, we ſhall hardly find any two of them agree about the ſenſe of any one of them. *Cardinall Perron*, in his diſcourſe of Traditions, having alleaged this place for them, *Hold the Traditions &c.* tells us we *muſt not anſwer that S. Paul ſpeaks here, only of ſuch Traditions, which (though not in this Epiſt. to the Theſſ.) yet were afterwards written, and in other bookes of Scripture: becauſe it is upon occaſion of Tradition* (touching the *cauſe* of the *hinderance of the comming of Antichriſt*,) *which was never written, that he laies this iniunction upon them, to hold the Traditions.* Well, let us grant this Argument good, and concluding; and that the Church of the *Theſſalonians*, or the Catholique Church (for what S. *Paul* writ to one Church he writ to all,) were to hold ſome unwritten Traditions, and among the reſt, what was the cauſe of the hinderance of the comming of Antichriſt. But what if they did not performe their duty in this point, but ſuffered this Tradition to be loſt out of the memory of the Church? Shall we not conclude, that ſeeing God would not ſuffer any thing neceſſary to ſalvation to be loſt, and he has ſuffered this Tradition to be loſt, therefore the knowledge or belief of it, though it were a profitable thing, yet it was not neceſſary? I hope you will not challenge ſuch authority over us, as to oblige us to impoſſibilities, to doe that which you cannot doe your ſelves. It is therefore requiſite that you make this command poſſible to be obeyed, before you require obedience unto it. Are you able then to inſtruct us ſo well, as to be fit to ſay unto us, *Now ye know what withholdeth*? Or doe you your ſelves know that ye may inſtruct us? Can yee, or dare you ſay, this or this was this hindrance which S. *Paul* here meant, and all men under pain of damnatiõ are to believe it? Or if you cannot, (as I am certain you cannot) goe then, & vaunt your Church, for the only Watchfull, Faithfull, Infallible keeper of the Apoſtles Traditions; when here this very Tradition, which here in particular was depoſited with the Theſſalonians and the Primitive Church, you have utterly loſt it, ſo that there is no footſtep or print of it remaining, which with Divine faith we may rely upon. Bleſſed therefore be the goodneſſe of God, who ſeeing that what was not written, was in ſuch danger to be loſt, took order, that what was neceſſary ſhould be written! Saint *Chryſoſtomes* counſell therefore, of *accounting the Churches Traditions worthy of belief*, we are willing to obey: And if you can of any thing make it appear, that *it is Tradition*, we will ſeek no farther. But this we ſay withall, that we are perſwaded you cannot make this appear in any thing, but *only the Canon of Scripture*, and that there is nothing now extant, and to be known by us, which can put in ſo good plea, to be the unwritten word of God, as the unqueſtiond Books of Canonicall Scripture, to be the written word of God.

47 You conclude this Parag. with a ſentence of S. *Auſtin's* who ſaies, *The Church doth not approve, nor diſſemble, nor doe theſe things which are againſt Faith or good life*: and from hence you conclude, *that it never hath done ſo, nor ever can doe ſo.* But though the argument hold

hold in Logick *à non poſſe, ad non eſſe*, yet I never heard, that it would hold back again, *à non eſſe, ad non poſſe*. The Church cannot doe this, therefore it does it not, followes with good conſequence: but the Church does not this, therefore it ſhall never doe it, nor can never doe it, this I believe will hardly follow. In the Epiſtle next before to the ſame *Ianuarius*, writing of the ſame matter, he hath theſe words, *It remaines that the thing you enquire of, muſt be of that third kind of things, which are different in divers places. Let every one therefore doe, that which he findes done in the Church to which he comes, for none of them is againſt Faith or good manners.* And why doe you not inferre from hence, that *no particular Church can bring up any Cuſtome that is againſt faith or good manners?* Certainly this conſequence has as good reaſon for it as the former. If a man ſay of the Church of England, (what S. *Auſtine* of the Church) that ſhe neither approves, nor diſſembles, nor does any thing againſt faith or good manners, would you collect preſently, that this man did either make or think the Church of England infallible? Furthermore, it is obſervable out of this, and the former Epiſtle, that this Church *which did not* (as S. *Auſtine* according to you, thought) *approve or diſſemble, or doe any thing againſt faith or good life*, did yet tolerate and diſſemble vain ſuperſtitions, and humane preſumptions, and ſuffer all places to be full of them, and to be exacted, as, nay more ſeverely then the commandements of God himſelfe. This S. *Auſtine* himſelfe profeſſeth in this very Epiſtle. *This* (ſaith he) *I doe infinitely grieve at, that many moſt wholſome precepts of the divine Scripture, are little regarded; and in the mean time, all is ſo full of ſo many preſumptions, that he is more grievouſly found fault with, who during his octaves, toucheth the earth with his naked foot, then he that ſhall bury his ſoul in drunkenneſſe.* Of theſe he ſaies, *that they were neither contained in Scripture, decreed by Councells, nor corroborated by the Cuſtome of the Vniverſall Church. And though not againſt faith, yet unprofitable burdens of Chriſtian liberty, which made the condition of the Iewes more tolerable then that of Chriſtians.* And therefore he profeſſes of them, *Approbare non poſſum, I cannot approve them.* And *ubi facultas tribuitur, reſecanda exiſtimo, I think they are to be cut off, where ſoever we have power.* Yet ſo deeply were they rooted, and ſpread ſo farre, through the indiſcreet devotion of the people, alwaies more prone to ſuperſtition then true piety, and through the connivence of the Governors, who ſhould have ſtrangled them at their birth, that himſelfe, though he grieved at them, and could not allow them, yet for fear of offence he durſt not ſpeak againſt them, *multa hujuſmodi propter nonnullarũ vel ſanctarũ vel turbulentarum perſonarum ſcandala devitanda liberius improbare non audeo. Many of theſe things for fear of ſcandalizing many holy perſons, or provoking thoſe that are turbulent, I dare not freely diſallow.* Nay, the Catholique Church it ſelfe, did ſee and diſſemble, and tolerate them; for theſe are the things of which he preſently ſaies after, *the Church of God* (and you will have him ſpeak of the true Catholique Church) *placed between Chaffe & Tares, tolerates many things.* Which

was directly againſt the command of the holy ſpirit, given the Church by S. *Paul*; *To ſtand faſt in that liberty wherewith Chriſt hath made her free, and not to ſuffer her ſelfe to be brought in bondage to theſe ſervile burdens.* Our Saviour tels the Scribes and Phariſes, *that in vain they worſhipped God, teaching for Doctrines mens Commandements: For that laying aſide the Commandements of God, they held the Traditions of men, as the waſhing of pots, and cups, and many other ſuch like things.* Certainly that which S. *Auſtine* complaines of, as the generall fault of Chriſtians of his time, was paralell to this: *Multa* (ſaith he) *quæ in divinis libris ſaluberrima præcepta ſunt, minus curantur*; This I ſuppoſe I may very well render in our Saviours words, *The commandements of God are laid aſide*; and then; *tam multis preſumptionibus ſic plena ſunt omnia, all things, or all places, are ſo full of ſo many preſumptions, and thoſe exacted with ſuch ſeverity, nay with Tyranny, that he was more ſeverely cenſur'd, who in the time of his Octaves touched the earth with his naked feet, then hee which drowned and buried his ſoul in drink.* Certainly, if this be not *to teach for Doctrines mens Commandements*, I know not what is. And therefore theſe ſuperſtitious Chriſtians might be ſaid, *to worſhip God in vain*, as well as Scribes and Phariſes. And yet great variety of ſuperſtitions of this kind, were then already ſpread over the Church, being different in divers places. This is plain from theſe words of S. *Auſtin* of them, *diverſorum locorum diverſis moribus innumerabiliter variantur*; and apparent, becauſe the ſtream of them was grown ſo violent, that he durſt not oppoſe it, *liberiùs improbare non audeo, I dare not freely ſpeak againſt them.* So that to ſay, the Catholique Church tolerated all this, and for fear of offence, durſt not abrogate or condemne it, is to ſay (if we judge rightly of it) that the Church with ſilence and connivence generally tolerated Chriſtians to *worſhip God in vain.* Now how this tolerating of Vniverſall ſuperſtition in the Church, can conſiſt with the aſſiſtance and direction of Gods omnipotent ſpirit to guard it from ſuperſtition, & with the accompliſhment of that pretended prophecy of the Church, I *have ſet watchmen upon thy walls, O Ieruſalem, which ſhall never hold their peace day nor night*; beſides how theſe ſuperſtitions being thus nouriſhed, cheriſhed, and ſtrengthened by the practiſe of the moſt, and urged with great violence upon others as the commandements of God, and but fearfully oppoſed or contradicted by any, might in time take ſuch deepe roote, and ſpread their branches ſo farre, as to paſſe for univerſall Cuſtomes of the Church, he that does not ſee, ſees nothing. Eſpecially, conſidering the catching and contagious nature of this ſinne, and how faſt ill weeds ſpread, and how true and experimented that rule is of the Hiſtorian, *Exempla non conſiſtunt ubi incipiunt, ſed quamlibet in tenuem recepta tramitem latiſſimè evagandi ſibi faciunt poteſtatem.* Nay that ſome ſuch ſuperſtition had not already even in S. *Auſtins* time, prevailed ſo farre, as to be *Conſuetudine univerſæ Eccleſiæ roboratum*, who can doubt that conſiders, that the practiſe of *Communicating Infants*, had even then got the credit, and authority, not only of an uni-

uerſall

ſall Cuſtome, but alſo of an Apoſtolique Tradition.

48 But (you will ſay) notwithſtanding all this, S. *Auſtin here warrants us, that the Church can never either approue or diſſemble or practiſe any thing againſt faith or good life, and ſo long you may reſt ſecurely upon it.* Yea, but the ſame S. *Auſtine* tels us in the ſame place, *that the Church may tolerate humane preſumptions, and vain ſuperſtitions, and thoſe urg'd more ſeverely then the Commandements of God*: And whether ſuperſtition be a ſinne or no, I appeal to our Saviours words before-cited, and to the conſent of your Schoolmen. Beſides if we conſider it rightly, we ſhall finde, that the Church is not truly ſaid only to tolerate theſe things, but rather, that a part and farre the leſſer, tolerated and diſſembled them in ſilence, and a part, & a farre greater publiquely avowed and practis'd them, and urg'd them upon others with great violence, and that continued ſtill a part of the Church. Now why the whole Church might not continue the Church, and yet doe ſo, as well as a part of the Church might continue a part of it, and yet doe ſo, I deſire you to inform me.

49 But now after all this adoe, what if S. *Auſtine* ſaies not this which is pretended of the Church, *viz. That ſhe neither approues, nor diſſembles, nor practiſes any thing againſt Faith or good life*, but onely of good men in the Church? Certainly, though ſome Copies read as you would haue it, yet you ſhould not haue diſſembled, that others read the place otherwiſe. *viz. Eccleſia multa tolerat, & tamen quæ ſunt contra Fidem & bonam vitam, nec bonus approbat, &c. The Church tolerates many things; and yet what is againſt faith or good life, a good man will neither approue, nor diſſemble, nor practiſe.*

50 *Ad* § 17. *That Abraham begat Iſaac*, is a point very far from being Fundamentall; and yet I hope you will grant, that Proteſtants believing Scripture to be the word of God, may bee certain enough of the truth and certainty of it. For what if they ſay that the Catholique Church, and much more themſelues may poſſibly erre in ſome unfundamentall points, is it therefore conſequent, they can be certaine of none ſuch? What if a wiſer man then I may miſtake the ſenſe of ſome obſcure place of *Ariſtotle*, may I not therefore without any arrogance or inconſequence, conceiue my ſelfe certain that I underſtand him in ſome plain places, which carry their ſenſe before them? And then for points Fundamentall, to what purpoſe doe you ſay, *That we muſt firſt know what they be, before we can be aſſured that wee cannot erre in underſtanding the Scripture*; when we pretend not at all to any aſſurance that we cannot erre, but only to a ſufficient certainty, that we doe not erre, but rightly underſtand thoſe things that are plain, whether Fundamentall or not Fundamentall? That *God is, and is a rewarder of them that ſeek him*: That *there is no ſalvation but by faith in Chriſt*: That by *repentance and faith in Chriſt Remiſſion of ſinnes may be obtained*: That *there ſhall be a Reſurrection of the Body*: Theſe wee conceive both true, becauſe the Scripture ſaies ſo, and Truths Fundamentall, becauſe they are neceſſary parts of the Goſpell, whereof our Saviour ſaies, *Qui non*

crediderit, damnabitur. All which we either learne from Scripture immediatly, or learne of thoſe that learne it of Scripture, ſo that neither Learned nor Vnlearned pretend to know theſe things independently of Scripture. And therefore in imputing this to us, you cannot excuſe your ſelfe from having done us a palpable injury.

51 *Ad* § 18. And I urge you as mainly as you urge D. *Potter* & other Proteſtants, that you tell us that all the Traditions, and all the Definitions of the Church are Fundamẽtal points, & we cannot wreſt from you *a liſt in particular of all ſuch Traditions and Definitions*, without which, no man can tell whether or no he erre in points fundamentall, and be capable of ſalvation; (For I hope erring in our fundamentals is no more excluſiue of ſalvation thẽ erring in yours.) And which is moſt lamentable, inſteed of giving us ſuch a Catalogue, you alſo fall to wrangle among your ſelues about the making of it; Some of you, as I haue ſaid aboue, holding ſomethings to be *matters of Faith*, which others deny to be ſo.

52 *Ad* § 19. I anſw. That theſe differences between Proteſtants, concerning Errours damnable and not damnable, Truths fundamentall and not fundamentall, may be eaſily reconcil'd. For either the Error they ſpeak of *may be purely and ſimply involuntary*, or it may be in reſpect of the *cauſe of it voluntary*. If the cauſe of it be ſome voluntary and avoidable fault, the Errour is it ſelfe ſinfull, and conſequently in its own nature damnable; As if by negligence in ſeeking the Truth, by unwillingneſſe to finde it, by pride, by obſtinacy, by deſiring that Religion ſhould be true which ſutes beſt with my ends, by feare of mens ill opinion, or any other worldly feare, or any other worldly hope, I betray my ſelfe to any error contrary to any divine revealed Truth, that Errour may be juſtly ſtiled a ſinne, and conſequently of it ſelfe to ſuch a one damnable. But if I be guilty of none of theſe faults, but be deſirous to know the Truth, and diligent in ſeeking it, and adviſe not at all with fleſh & bloud about the choice of my opinions, but only with God, & that Reaſon that he hath given me, if I be thus qualifi'd, and yet through humane infirmity fall into errour, that errour cannot be damnable. Again, the party erring may be conceived either to dye with contrition for all his ſins known and unknown, or without it; If he dye without it, this errour in it ſelfe damnable, will bee likewiſe ſo unto him: If he dye with contrition (as his errour can bee no impediment but he may) his errour though in it ſelfe damnable, to him according to your doctrine, will not proue ſo. And therefore ſome of thoſe Authors whom you quote, ſpeaking of Errours whereunto men were betrayed, or wherein they were kept by their Fault, or Vice, or Paſſion (as for the moſt part men are:) Others ſpeaking of them, as errours ſimply and purely involuntary, and the effects of humane infirmity; ſome as they were *retracted by Contrition* (to uſe your own phraſe) others, as they were not; no marvell though they haue paſt upon them, ſome a heavier, & ſome a milder, ſome an abſolving, & ſome a condemning ſentence. The laſt of all theſe errours, which here you mention, having malice enough too frequently mixed with it, to ſink a

man

man deep enough into hell: and the greateſt of them all, being according to your Principles, either no fault at all, or very Veniall, where there is no malice of the will conjoyn'd with it. And if it be, yet as the moſt malignant poyſon, will not poiſon him that receives with it a more powerfull Antidote: ſo I am confident your own Doctrine will force you to confeſſe, that whoſoever dies with Faith in Chriſt, and Contrition for all ſinnes known and unknown (in which heap all his ſinfull errours muſt be compriz'd,) can no more be hurt by any the moſt malignant and peſtilent errour, then S. *Paul* by the viper which he ſhook of into the fire. Now touching the *neceſſity of Repentance from dead works, and Faith in Chriſt Ieſus the Sonne of God, and Saviour of the World*, they all agree; and therefore you cannot deny, but they agree about all that is ſimply neceſſary. Moreover, though, if they ſhould goe about to chooſe out of Scripture all theſe Propoſitions & Doctrines which integrate and make up the body of Chriſtian Religion, peradventure there would not be ſo exact agreement amongſt them, as ſome ſay there was between the 70. Interpreters, in tranſlating the Old Teſtament; yet thus far without controverſie they doe all agree, that in the Bible all theſe things are contained, and therefore, that whoſoever does truly and ſincerely believe the Scripture, muſt of neceſſity either in *hypotheſi*, or at leaſt *in theſi*, either *formally*, or at leaſt *virtually*, either *explicitely*, or at leaſt *implicitely*, either in *Act* or at leaſt in *preparation of minde*, believe all things Fundamentall: It being not Fundamentall, nor required of Almighty God, to believe the true ſenſe of Scripture in all places, but only that we ſhould endeavour to doe ſo, & be prepar'd in minde to doe ſo, whenſoever it ſhall be ſufficiently propounded to us. Suppoſe a man in ſome diſeaſe were preſcribed a medicine conſiſting of twenty ingredients, and he adviſing with Phyſitians ſhould finde them differing in opinion about it, ſome of them telling him, that all the ingredients were abſolutely neceſſary; ſome, that only ſome of them were neceſſary, the reſt only profitable, and requiſite *ad melius eſſe*, laſtly ſome, that ſome only were neceſſary, ſome profitable, and the reſt ſuperfluous, yet not hurtfull; Yet all with one accord agreeing in this, That the *whole receipt had in it all things neceſſary* for the recovery of his health, and that if hee made uſe of it, hee ſhould infallibly finde it ſucceſſefull: what wiſe man would not think they agreed ſufficiently for his direction to the recovery of his health? Iuſt ſo, theſe Proteſtant Doctors, with whoſe diſcords you make ſuch Tragedies, agreeing in *Theſi* thus far, that the *Scripture evidently containes all things neceſſary to Salvation*, both for matter of Faith and of practiſe, and that whoſoever believes it, and endeavours to finde the true ſenſe of it, and to conform his life unto it, ſhall certainly performe all things neceſſary to ſalvation, and undoubtedly be ſaved; agreeing I ſay thus farre, what matters it for the direction of men to ſalvation, though they differ in opinion, touching what points are abſolutely neceſſary, and what not? What Errours abſolutely repugnant to Salvation, and what not? Eſpecially conſidering that although they differ about the Queſtion of the neceſſity of theſe Truths, yet for the moſt

part

part they agree in this that Truths they are, and profitable at leaſt, though not ſimply neceſſary. And though they differ in the Queſtion, whether the contrary Errours be deſtructive of ſalvation, or no, yet in this they conſent, that Errours they are, & hurtful to Religion, though not deſtructive of Salvation. Now that which God requires of us is this; That we ſhould beleiue the Doctrines of the Goſpell to bee Truths, not all, neceſſary Truths, for all are not ſo, and conſequently, the repugnant Errours to be falſhoods; yet not all ſuch falſhoods, as unavoidably draw with them damnation upon all that hold them, for all doe not ſo.

53 Yea but *you ſay, it is very requiſite we ſhould agree upon a particular Catalogue of Fundamentall points, for without ſuch a Catalogue, no man can be aſſured whether or no, he hath faith ſufficient to ſalvation.* This I utterly deny as a thing evidently falſe, and I wonder you ſhould content your ſelfe magiſterially to ſay ſo, without offering any proof of it. I might much more juſtly, think it enough barely to deny it, without refutation, but I will not. Thus therefore I argue againſt it.

> Without being able to make a Catalogue of Fundamentals, I may be aſſured of the Truth of this Aſſertion, if it be true, That *the Scripture containes all neceſſary points of faith*, and know that I beleiue explicitely all that is expreſt in Scripture, and implicitely all that is contained in them: Now he that beleiues all this, muſt of neceſſity believe all things neceſſary; Therefore without being able to make a Catalogue of Fundamentals, I may be aſſured that I beleiue all things neceſſary, and conſequently that my faith is ſufficient.

I ſaid, of the truth of this Aſſertion, *if it be true:* Becauſe I will not here enter into the Queſtion of the truth of it, it being ſufficient for my preſent purpoſe, that it may be true, and may be believed without any dependance upon a Catalogue of Fundamentalls. And therefore if this be all your reaſon, to demand a particular Catalogue of Fundamentalls, we cannot but think your demand unreaſonable. Eſpecially having your ſelfe expreſſed the cauſe of the difficulty of it, and that is, *Becauſe Scripture doth deliver Divine Truths, but ſeldom qualifies them, or declares whether they be or be not abſolntely neceſſary to ſalvation.* Yet not ſo ſeldome, but that out of it I could giue you an abſtract of the Eſſentiall parts of Chriſtianity, if it were neceſſary, but I haue ſhewed it not ſo, by confuting your reaſon, pretended for the neceſſity of it, & at this time I haue no leaſure to doe you curteſies that are ſo troubleſome to my ſelfe. Yet thus much I will promiſe, that when you deliver *a particular Catalogue of your Church Propoſals* with one hand, you ſhall receiue a particular Catalogue of what I conceiue Fundamentall, with the other. For as yet, I ſee no ſuch faire proceeding as you talke of, nor any performance on your own part of that which ſo clamorouſly you require on ours. For as for the Catalogue which here you haue given us, in ſaying. *You are obliged under pain of damnation to beliene whatſoever the Catholique viſible Church of Chriſt propoſeth as revealed by Almighty God*, it is like a covey of one Patridg, or a flock of one

one ſheep,or a Fleet compos'd of one ſhip,or an Army of one man. The Author of *Charity miſtaken,demands a particular Catalogue of Fundamentall points*; And *We* (ſay you) *again and again demand ſuch a Catalogue.* And ſurely, if this one Propoſition, which here you think to ſtop our mouthes with,be a Catalogue,yet at leaſt ſuch a Catalogue it is not,and therefore as yet you haue not perform'd what you require. For if to ſet down ſuch a Propoſitiō, wherein are compriz'd all points taught by us to be neceſſary to ſalvation, will ſerue you inſteed of a Catalogue,you ſhall haue Catalogues enough. As,we are oblig'd to belieue all under pain of damnation which God commands us to belieue. There's one Catalogue. We are oblig'd under pain of damnation,to belieue all, whereof we may be ſufficiently aſſured, that Chriſt taught it his Apoſtles,his Apoſtles the Church. There's another. We are oblig'd under pain of damnation to belieue Gods word,& all contained in it to be true. There's a third. If theſe generalities will not ſatisfie you, but you will be importuning us to tell you in particular, what they are which Chriſt taught his Apoſtles, and his Apoſtles the Church,what points are contained in Gods word; Then I beſeech you doe us reaſon,and giue us a particular and *exact Inventory of all your Church Propoſalls,without leaving out,or adding any*, ſuch a one which all the Doctors of your Church will ſubſcribe to,& if you receiue not then a Catalogue of Fundamentals, I for my part will giue you leaue to proclaim us Banckrupts.

54 Beſides this deceitfull generality of your Catalogue (as you call it,) another main fault we finde with it, that it is extreamly ambiguous; and therefore to draw you out of the clouds,giue me leaue to propoſe ſome Queſtions to you concerning it. I would know therefore,whether by believing, you mean explicitely or implicitely? If you mean implicitely,I would know whether your Churches infallibility be under pain of damnation to be believed explicitely,or no? Whether any other point or points beſides this,be under the ſame penalty,to be believed explicitely,or no? And if any, what they bee? I would know what you eſteem the Propoſalls of the Catholike viſible Church? In particular,whether the Decree of a Pope *ex Cathedra*, that is,with an intent to oblige all Chriſtians by it, be a ſufficient and an obliging propoſall? Whether men without danger of damnation may examine ſuch a Decree, and if they think they have juſt cauſe, refuſe to obey it? Whether the Decree of a Councell,without the *Popes* confirmation,be ſuch an obliging propoſall,or no? Whether it be ſo in caſe there be no *Pope*,or in caſe it be doubtfull who is *Pope*? Whether the Decree of a generall Councell confirm'd by the *Pope*, be ſuch a Propoſall,and whether he be an Heretique that thinks otherwiſe? Whether the Decree of a particular Councell confirm'd by the *Pope*, be ſuch a propoſall? Whether the Generall uncondemn'd practiſe of the Church for ſome ages be ſuch a ſufficient Propoſition? Whether the conſent of the moſt eminent Fathers of any age, agreeing in the affirmation of any doctrine,not contradicted by any of their Contemporaries,be a ſufficient Propoſition? Whether the Fathers teſtifying

ſuch or ſuch a doctrine or practiſe to be Tradition, or to bee the Doctrine or practiſe of the Church, be a ſufficient aſſurance that it is ſo? Whether we be bound under pain of damnation, to believe every Text of the vulgar Bible, now authoriz'd by the Roman Church, to bee the true tranſlation of the Originalls of the Prophets, and Evangeliſts, and Apoſtles, without any the leaſt alteration? Whether they that lived whē the Bible of *Sixtus* was ſet forth, were bound under pain of damnation to believe the ſame of that? And if not of that, of what Bible they were bound to believe it? Whether the Catholique viſible Church be alwaies that Society of Chriſtians which adheres to the Biſhop of Rome? Whether every Chriſtian, that hath ability and oportunity, be not bound to endeavour to know explicitely the Propoſalls of the Church? Whether Implicite Faith in the Churches Veracity, will not ſaue him that Actually and Explicitely disbelieves ſome doctrine of the Church, not knowing it to be ſo; and Actually believes ſome damnable Hereſie, as that God has the ſhape of a man? Whether an ignorant man be bound to believe any point to be decreed by the Church, when his Prieſt or Ghoſtly Father aſſures him it is ſo? Whether his Ghoſtly Father may not erre in telling him ſo, and whether any man can be oblig'd under pain of damnation, to believe an Errour? Whether he be bound to believe ſuch a thing defined, when a number of Prieſts, perhaps ten or twenty tell him it is ſo? And what aſſurance he can haue, that they neither erre, nor deceive him in this matter? Why Implicite Faith in Chriſt, or the Scriptures ſhould not ſuffice for a mans ſalvation, as well as implicit faith in the Church? Whether when you ſay, *Whatſoever the Church propoſeth*, you meane all that ever ſhe propos'd, or that only which ſhe now propoſeth; and whether ſhee now propoſeth all that ever ſhe did propoſe? Whether all the Books of Canonicall Scripture were ſufficiently declared to the Church to be ſo, and propos'd as ſuch by the Apoſtles? And if not, from whom the Church had this declaration afterwards? If ſo, whether all men ever ſince the Apoſtles time, were bound under paine of damnation to believe the Epiſtle of S. *Iames*, and the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews* to be Canonicall; at leaſt, not to disbelieve it, & believe the contrary? Laſtly, why it is not ſufficient for any mans ſalvation to uſe the beſt meanes he can to inform his conſcience, and to follow the direction of it? To all theſe demands when you haue given faire and ingenuous anſwers, you ſhall heare further from me.

55 *Ad* § 20. At the firſt entrance into this Parag. from our own Doctrine, *That the Church cannot erre in Points neceſſary, it is concluded if we are wiſe, we muſt forſake it in nothing, leaſt we ſhould forſake it in ſomething neceſſary*. To which I anſwer, Firſt, that the ſuppoſition as you underſtand it, is falſely impos'd upon us, and as we underſtand it will doe you no ſervice. For when we ſay, that there ſhall be *a Church alwaies*, ſome where or other, *unerring in Fundamentalls*, our meaning is but this, that *there ſhall be alwaies a Church*, to the very being whereof it is repugnant that it ſhould erre in fundamentals; for if it ſhould doe ſo, it would want the very eſſence of a Church, and therefore ceaſe

to

to be a Church. But we never annexed this privilege *to any one Church of any one Denomination*, as the Greek or the Roman Church: which if we had done, and ſet up ſome ſetled certain Society of Chriſtians, diſtinguiſhable from all others by adhering to ſuch a Biſhop for our Guide in fundamentals, then indeed, and then only might you with ſome colour, though with no certainty, haue concluded that we could not in wiſdome, *forſake this Church in any point, for feare of forſaking it in a neceſſary point*. But now that we ſay not this of any one determinate Church, which alone can perform the office of Guide or Director, but indefinitely of the Church, meaning no more but this, *That there ſhall be alwaies in ſome place or other, ſome Church that erres not in Fundamentalls*; will you conclude from hence, that we cannot in wiſdome forſake this or that, the Roman or the Greek Church, for feare of erring in Fundamentalls?

56 Yea, but you may ſay (for I will make the beſt I can of all your Arguments,) *That this Church thus unerring in Fundamentalls, when Luther aroſe, was by our confeſſion the Roman; and therefore wee ought not in wiſdome to haue departed from it in any thing*. I anſwer: Firſt, that we confeſſe no ſuch thing, that the Church of Rome was then this Church, but only a Part of it, and that the moſt corrupted and moſt incorrigible. Secondly, that if by adhering to the church, we could haue been thus far ſecured, this Argument had ſome ſhew of reaſon. But ſeeing wee are not warranted thus much by any privilege of that Church, that She cannot erre fundamentally, but only from Scripture, which aſſures us that ſhe doth erre very haynouſly, collect our hope, that the Truths ſhe retaines & the practiſe of them, may proue an Antidote to her, againſt the Errors which ſhe maintaines in ſuch Perſons, as in ſimplicity of heart follow this *Abſalom*; wee ſhould then doe againſt the light of our conſcience, and ſo ſinne damnably if we ſhould not abandon the profeſſion of her Errours though not Fundamentall. Neither can we thus conclude, we may ſafely hold with the church of Rome in all her points, for ſhe cannot erre damnably; For this is falſe, ſhe may, though perhaps ſhe does not: But rather thus, Theſe points of Chriſtianity, which have in thē the nature of Antidotes againſt the poyſon of all ſinnes and errours, the Church of Rome, though otherwiſe much corrupted, ſtill retaines; therefore wee hope ſhee erres not fundamentally, but ſtill remaines a Part of the Church. But this can be no warrant to us to think with her in all things: ſeeing the very ſame Scripture, which puts us in hope ſhe erres not fundamentally, aſſures us that in many things, and thoſe of great moment ſhe erres very grievouſly. And theſe Errours though to them that believe them, wee hope they will not be pernicious, yet the profeſſing of them againſt conſcience, could not but bring to us certain damnation. *As for the feare of departing from ſome fundamentall truths withall, while we depart from her errours*, Happily it might work upon us, if adhering to her might ſecure us from it, and if nothing elſe could: But both theſe are falſe. For firſt, adhering to her in all things cannot ſecure us from erring in Fundamentals: Becauſe though *de facto* we hope ſhee does not

erre, yet we know no priviledges ſhe has but ſhe may erre in them herſelfe: and therefore we had need haue better ſecurity hereof then her bare Authority. Then ſecondly, without dependance on her at all, we may be ſecured that we doe not erre fundamentally; I meane by believing al thoſe things plainly ſet down in Scripture, wherein all things neceſſary, and moſt things profitable are plainly delivered. Suppoſe *I* were travelling to *London*, and knew two waies thither, the one very ſafe and convenient, the other very inconvenient, and dangerous, but yet a way to *London*: and that I overtook a Paſſenger on the way, who himſelfe believed, and would fain perſwade me, there was no other way but the worſe, and would perſwade me to accompany him in it, becauſe I confeſſed his way, though very inconvenient, yet a way; ſo that going that way we could not faile of our journies end, by the conſent of both parties: but he believed, my way to be none at all; & therefore I might juſtly feare, leaſt out of a deſire of leaving the worſt way, I left the true, and the only way: If now I ſhould not bee more ſecure upon my own knowledge, then frighted by this fallacy, would you not beg me for a fool? Iuſt ſo might you think of us, if we would bee frighted out of our own knowledge by this bugbeare. For the only & the main reaſon why we believe you not to erre in Fundamentalls, is your holding the *Doctrines of faith in Chriſt and Repentance*: which knowing we hold as well as you, notwithſtanding our departure from you, we muſt needs know that we doe not erre in Fundamentalls, as well as we know that you doe not erre in ſome Fundamentals, & therefore cannot poſſibly feare the contrary. Yet let us be more liberall to you, and grant that which can never be proved, that God had ſaid in plain tearmes, *The Church of Rome ſhall never deſtroy the Foundation*, but with all had ſaid, *that it might and would lay much hay and ſtubble upon it*; That you ſhould never hold any Errour deſtructive of ſalvation, but yet many that were prejudiciall to Edification: I demand, might we haue diſpenſed with our ſelves in the believing and profeſſing theſe Errours in regard of the ſmalneſſe of them? Or had it not been a damnable ſinne to doe ſo, though the Errours in themſelves were not damnable? Had we not had as plain direction to depart frō you in ſome things profitable, as to adhere to you in things neceſſary? In the beginning of your Book, when it was for your purpoſe to haue it ſo, the greatneſſe or ſmalneſſe of the matter was not conſiderable, the Evidence of the Revelation was all in all. But here wee muſt erre with you in ſmall things, for feare of looſing your direction in greater: and for feare of departing too far from you, not goe from you at all, even where we ſee plainly that you haue departed from the Truth.

57 Beyond all this, I ſay, that this which you ſay *in wiſdome we are to doe*, is not only unlawfull, but, if we will proceed according to reaſon, impoſſible. I meane to adhere to you in all things, having no other ground for it, but becauſe you are (as we will now ſuppoſe) Infallible in ſome things, that is, in Fundamentalls. For, whether by skill in Architecture a large ſtructure may be ſupported by a narrow foundation,

foundation, I know not; but ſure I am, in reaſon, no concluſion can be larger then the Principles on which it is founded. And therefore if I conſider what I doe, and be perſwaded, that your infallibility, is but limited, and particular, and partiall, my adherence upon this ground, cannot poſſibly be Abſolute and Vniverſall and Totall. I am confident, that ſhould I meet with ſuch a man amongſt you (as I am well aſſur'd there be many) that would grant your Church infallible only in fundamentalls, which what they are he knowes not, and therefore upon this only reaſon adheres to you in all things: I ſay that I am confident, that it may be demonſtrated, that ſuch a man adheres to you, with a fiduciall and certain aſſent in nothing. To make this cleare (becauſe at the firſt hearing it may ſeem ſtrange) give me leave, good Sir, to ſuppoſe you the man, and to propoſe to you a few queſtions, and to give for you ſuch anſwers to them, as upon this ground you muſt of neceſſity give, were you preſent with mee. Firſt, ſuppoſing you hold your Church infallible in fundamentalls, obnoxious to errour in other things, and that you know not what points are fundamentall, I demand, C. Why doe you believe the doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation? K. becauſe the Church hath taught it, which is infallible. C. What? Infallible in all things, or only in Fundamentalls? K. in Fundamentals only. C. Then in other points She may erre? K. ſhe may. C. and doe you know what Points are Fundamentall, what not? K. No, and therefore I believe her in all things, leaſt I ſhould disbelieve her in fundamentalls. C. How know you then, whether this be a fundamentall Point or no? K. I know not. C. It may be then (for ought you know) an unfundamentall point? K. yes, it may be ſo. C. And in theſe you ſaid the Church may erre? K. yes I did ſo. C. Then poſſibly it may erre in this? K. It may doe ſo. C. Then what certainty have you, that it does not erre in it? K. None at all, but upon this ſuppoſition, that this is a fundamentall. C. And this ſuppoſition you are uncertain of? K. Yes, I told you ſo before. C. And therefore, you can have no certainty of that, which depends upon this uncertainty, ſaving only a ſuppoſitive certainty, if it be a fundamentall truth, which is in plain Engliſh to ſay, you are certain it is true, if it be both true and neceſſary. Verily Sir, if you have no better faith then this, you are no Catholique. K. Good words I pray! I am ſo, and God willing will be ſo. C. You mean, in outward profeſſion and practiſe, but in belief you are not, no more then a Proteſtant is a Catholique. For every Proteſtant yeelds ſuch a kind of aſſent to all the propoſalls of the Church, for ſurely they believe them true, if they be fundamentall truths. And therefore you muſt either believe the Church Infallible in all her propoſalls, be they foundations, or be they ſuperſtructions, or elſe you muſt believe all Fundamentall which ſhee propoſes, or elſe you are no Catholique. K. But I have been taught, that *ſeeing I believed the Church infallible in points neceſſary, in wiſdome I was to believe her in every thing.* C. That was a pretty plauſible inducement, to bring you hither, but now you are here, you muſt goe farther, and believe her infallible in all things, or elſe you were as good goe back again,

which will be a great diſparagement to you, and draw upon you both the bitter and implacable hatred of our Part, and even with your own, the imputation of raſhneſſe and levitie. You ſee, I hope, by this time, that though a man did believe your Church infallible in Fundamentalls, yet he has no reaſon to doe you the curteſy, of believing all her propoſalls; nay if he be ignorant what theſe Fundamentalls are, he has no certain ground to believe her, upon her Authority in any thing. And whereas you ſay, it can be no imprudence to erre with the Church; I ſay, it may be very great imprudence, if the queſtion be, Whether we ſhould erre with the preſent Church, or hold true with God Almighty.

58 *But we are under pain of Damnation to believe and obey her in greater things, and therefore cannot in wiſdome ſuſpect her credit in matters of leſſe moment*, Anſ. I have told you already, that this is falſely to ſuppoſe, that wee grant that in ſome certain points, ſome certain Church is infallibly aſſiſted, and under pain of damnation to be obeyed: whereas all that we ſay is this, that in ſome place or other, ſome Church there ſhall be, which ſhall retain all neceſſary Truths. Yet if your ſuppoſition were true, I would not grant your concluſion, but with this exception, unleſſe the matter were paſt ſuſpicion, and apparently certain, that in theſe things, I cannot believe God, and believe the Church. For then I hope you will grant, that be the thing of never ſo little moment, were it, for inſtance, but that *S. Paul left his cloak at Troas*, yet I were not to gratify the Church ſo farre, as for her ſake to disbelieve what God himſelfe has revealed.

59 Whereas you ſay, *Since we are undoubtedly obliged to believe her in Fundamentalls, and cannot know preciſely, what thoſe fundamentalls be, we cannot without hazard of our ſoules leave her in any point*; Ianſ. Firſt, that this argument proceeds upon the ſame falſe ground with the former. And then, that I have told you formerly, that you fear where no fear is; And though we know not preciſely, juſt how much is Fundamentall, yet we know, that the Scripture containes all Fundamentalls and more too; and therefore that in believing that, we believe all Fundamentalls and more too. And conſequently in departing from you, can be in no danger of departing from that which may prove a Fundamentall truth: For we are well aſſured that certain Errors can never prove Fundamentall Truths.

60 Whereas you adde, That *that viſible Church which cannot erre in Fundamentall, propounds all her definitions without diſtinction to be believed under Anathema's*: Anſ. Again you begge the queſtion, ſuppoſing untruly, that there is, any *that Viſible Church*, I mean any Viſible Church of one Denomination, which cannot erre in points Fundamentall. Secondly, propoſing definitions to be believed under Anathema's, is no good argument, that the Propounders conceive themſelves infallible; but only, that they conceive the Doctrine they condemne is evidently damnable. A plain proof hereof is this, that particular Councells, nay Particular men, have been very liberall of their Anathema's, which yet were never conceived infallible, either

by

by others or themſelves. If any man ſhould now deny Chriſt to be the Saviour of the world, or deny the Reſurrection, I ſhould make no great ſcruple of Anathematizing his doctrine, and yet am very farre from dreaming of Infallibility.

61 And for the *Viſible Churches holding it a point neceſſary to Salvation, that we believe ſhe cannot erre*, I know no ſuch tenet; unleſſe by the Church, you mean the Roman Church, which you have as much reaſon to doe, as that petty King in Africk hath, to think himſelf King of all the world. And therefore your telling us, *if ſhe ſpeak true, what danger is it not to believe her? and if falſe, that it is not dangerous to believe her*, Is ſomewhat like your Popes ſetting your Lawyers to diſpute whether *Conſtantines Donation* were valid or no; whereas the matter of fact was the farre greater queſtion, whether there were any ſuch Donation, or rather when without queſtion there was none ſuch. That you may not ſeem to delude us in like manner, make it appear, that the viſible Church doth hold ſo as you pretend: and then whether it be true or falſe, we will conſider afterwards. But for the preſent, with this inviſible tenet of the Viſible Church, wee will trouble our ſelves no farther.

62 The effect of the next Argument is this, *I cannot without grievous ſinne diſobey the Church, unleſſe I know ſhe commands thoſe things which are not in her power to command: and how farre this power extends, none can better informe me then the Church. Therefore I am to obey, ſo farre as the Church requires my obedience.* I anſwer, Firſt, that neither hath the Catholique Church, but only a corrupt part of it declared her ſelfe, nor required our obedience, in the points conteſted among us. This therefore is falſely, and vainly ſuppoſed here by you, being one of the greateſt queſtions amongſt us. Then ſecondly, that God can better informe us, what are the limits of the Churches power, then the Church her ſelfe, that is, then the Roman Clergy, who being men ſubject to the ſame paſſions with other men, why they ſhould be thought the beſt Iudges in their own cauſe, I doe not well underſtand! But yet we oppoſe againſt them, no humane deciſive Iudges, not any Sect or Perſon, but only God and his Word. And therefore it is in vain to ſay, That *in following her, you ſhall be ſooner excuſed, then in following any Sect or Man applying Scriptures againſt her Doctrine*: Inas much as we never went about to arrogate to our ſelves that infallibility or abſolute Authority, which we take away from you. But if you would haue ſpoken to the purpoſe, you ſhould haue ſaid, that in following her you ſhould ſooner haue been excus'd, then in cleaving to the Scripture, and to God himſelfe.

63 Whereas you ſay, *The fearfull examples of innumerable perſons, who forſaking the Church, upon pretence of her errours, have failed even in fundamentall points, ought to deterre all Chriſtians from oppoſing her in any one doctrine or practiſe*; This is, juſt as if you ſhould ſay, divers men have fallen into Scylla, with going too farre from Charybdis, be ſure therefore ye keep cloſe to Charybdis: divers leaving Prodigality, have fallen into covetouſneſſe, therefore be you conſtant to prodigality;

lity: Many have fallen from worſhipping God perverſely and fooliſhly, not to worſhip him at all, from worſhipping many Gods, to worſhipping none; this therefore ought to deterre men, from leaving ſuperſtition or Idolatry, for fear of falling into Atheiſme and Impiety. This is your counſell and Sophiſtry: but God ſaies clean contrary; *Take heed you ſwerve not, either to the right hand or to the left: you muſt not doe evill that good may come thereon*; therefore neither that you may avoid a greater evill, you muſt not be obſtinate in a certain error, for fear of an uncertain. What if ſome, forſaking the Church of Rome, have forſaken Fundamentall truths? Was this becauſe they forſook the Church of Rome? No ſure, this is *non causa pro causa*: for elſe all that have forſaken that Church ſhould have done ſo, which we ſay they have not. But becauſe they went too farre from her, the golden mean, the narrow way is hard to be found, and hard to be kept; hard, but not impoſſible: hard, but yet you muſt not pleaſe your ſelfe out of it, though you erre on the right hand, though you offend on the milder part, for this is the only way that leads to life, and few there be that find it. It is true if we ſaid, there were no danger in being of the Roman Church, and there were danger in leaving it, it were madneſſe to perſwade any man to leave it. But we proteſt and proclaime the contrary, and that we have very little hope of their Salvation, who either out of negligence in ſeeking the truth, or unwillingneſſe to find it, live and dye in the errors and impieties of that Church: and therefore cannot but conceive thoſe feares to be moſt fooliſh, and ridiculous, which perſwade men to be conſtant in one way to hell, leaſt happily if they leave it, they ſhould fall into another.

64 But, *Not only others, but even Proteſtants themſelves, whoſe example ought moſt to move us, pretending to reforme the Church, are come to affirme that ſhe periſhed for many ages: which D. Potter cannot deny to be a fundamentall errour, againſt the Article of the Creed, I believe the Catholique Church, ſeeing he affirmes, the Donatiſts erred Fundamentally in confining it to Africa.* To this I Anſwer, Firſt, that the errour of the Donatiſts was not, that they held it poſſible that ſome, or many, or moſt parts of Chriſtendome, might fall away from Chriſtianity, and that the Church may looſe much of her amplitude, and be contracted to a narrow compaſſe in compariſon of her former extent: which is prov'd not only poſſible but certain, by irrefragable experience. For who knowes not, that Gentiliſme, and Mahumetiſme, mans wickedneſſe deſerving it, and Gods providence permitting it, have prevail'd, to the utter extirpation of Chriſtianity, upon farre the greater part of the world? And S. *Auſtin* when he was out of the heat of Diſputation, confeſſes the Militant Church to be *like the Moon*, ſometimes increaſing, and ſometimes decreaſing. This therefore was no errour in the Donatiſts, that they held it poſſible, that the Church, from a larger extent, might be contracted to a leſſer: nor that they held it poſſible to be reduced to Africa; (For why not to Africk then, as well as within theſe few ages, you pretend it was to Europe?) But their error was, that they held *de facto*, this was done when

when they had no juſt ground or reaſon to doe ſo: and ſo upon a vain pretence which they could not juſtify, ſeperated themſelves from the communion of all other parts of the Church: and that they required it as a neceſſary condition to make a man a member of the Church, that he ſhould be of their communion, and divide himſelfe from all other Communions from which they were divided: which was a condition both unneceſſary and unlawfull to be required, and therefore the exacting of it was directly oppoſite to the Churches Catholiciſme, in the very ſame nature with their Errours who required Circumciſion, and the keeping of the Law of *Moſes* as neceſſary to ſalvation. For whoſoever requires harder or heavier conditions of men, then God requires of them, he it is that is properly an Enemie of the Churches Vniverſality, by hindering either Men or Countries from adjoyning themſelves to it; which, were it not for theſe unneceſſary and therefore unlawful conditions, in probability would haue made thē members of it. And ſeeing the preſent Church of Rome perſwades men they were as good (for any hope of Salvation they haue) not to be Chriſtians as not to be Roman Catholiques, believe nothing at all, as not believe all which they impoſe upon them: Be abſolutely out of the Churches Communion, as be out of their Communion, or be in any other, whether they be not guilty of the ſame crime, with the *Donatiſts* & thoſe Zelots of the Moſaicall Law, I leave it to the judgement of thoſe that underſtand reaſon! This is ſufficient to ſhew the vanity of this Argument. But I adde moreover, that you neither haue named thoſe Proteſtants who held the Church to haue periſhed for many ages; who perhaps held not the deſtruction but the corruption of the church; not that the true Church, but that the pure Church periſhed: or rather that the Church periſhed not from its life and exiſtence, but from its purity and integrity, or perhaps from its ſplendour and viſibility. Neither have you proved by any one reaſon, but only affirmed it, to be a fundamentall Errour, to hold, that the Church militant may poſſibly bee driven out of the world, and aboliſhed for a time from the face of the earth.

65 *But to accuſe the Church of any Errour in faith, is to ſay, ſhe loſt all faith: For this is the Doctrine of Catholique Divines, that one Errour in faith deſtroyes faith.* To which I anſwer, that to accuſe the Church of ſome Errour in faith, is not to ſay ſhe loſt all faith: For this is not the doctrine of Catholique Divines; But that he which is an Heretique in one Article, may haue true faith of other Articles. And the contrary is only ſaid and not ſhewed in *Charity Miſtaken.*

66 *Ad* § 21. D. *Potter* ſaies, *We may not depart from the Church abſolutely, and in all things*: and from hence you conclude: *Therefore we may not depart from it in any thing.* And this Argument you call a Demonſtration. But a Fallacy, *à dicto ſimpliciter ad dictum ſecundum quid*, was not uſed heretofore to be called a Demonſtration. D. *Potter* ſayes not, that you may not depart from any opinion or any practiſe of the Church: for you tell us in this very place, that he ſaies, even the Catholique may erre: and every man may lawfully depart from Er-

rour. He only ſayes, *you may not ceaſe to be of the Church, nor depart from thoſe things which make it ſo to be*; and from hence you inferre a neceſſity of forſaking it in nothing. Iuſt as if you ſhould argue thus: You may not leaue your friend or brother, therefore you may not leave the Vice of your friend, or the Errour of your brother. What he ſaies of the Catholique Church, p. 75. the ſame hee extends preſently after, *to every true, though never ſo corrupted part of it.* And why doe you not conclude from hence, that no particular Church (according to his judgement) can fall into any Errour, and call this a Demonſtration too? For as he ſaies, p. 75. That *there can be no juſt cauſe to depart from the whole Church of Chriſt, no more then from Chriſt himſelfe*; So p. 76. He tells you, that *whoſoever forſakes any one true member of this body, forſakes the whole.* So that what he ſaies of the one, hee ſaies of the other; and tells you, that neither Vniverſall nor Particular Church, ſo long as they continue ſo, may bee forſaken, hee meanes, *Abſolutely*, no more then Chriſt himſelfe may be forſaken abſolutely: For the Church is the body of Chriſt, and whoſoever forſakes either the Body, or his coherence to any one part of it, muſt forſake his ſubordination, and relation to the Head. Therefore whoſoever forſakes the Church, or any Chriſtian, muſt forſake Chriſt himſelfe.

67 But then he tells you plainly in the ſame place, *That it may be lawfull and neceſſary to depart from a Particular Church in ſome Doctrines and Practiſes:* And this he would haue ſaid even of the Catholike Church, if there had been occaſion, but there was none. For there he was to declare and juſtifie our departure, not from the Catholique Church, but the Roman, which we maintain to be a particular Church. But in other places, you confeſſe his doctrine to be, that even the Catholique church may erre in points not Fundamentall; which you doe not pretend that he ever imputed to Chriſt himſelfe. And therefore you cannot with any candor interpret his words, as if he had ſaid, We may not forſake the Church in any thing, no more then Chriſt himſelfe: but only thus, We may not ceaſe to be of the Church, nor forſake it abſolutely and totally, no more then Chriſt himſelfe. And thus we ſee ſometimes a mountain may travail, and the production may be a mouſe.

68 *Ad* § 22. But D. *Potter, either contradicts himſelfe, or elſe muſt grant the Church infallible; Becauſe he ſaies, if we did not differ from the Roman, we could not agree with the Catholique: which ſaying ſuppoſes the Catholique Church cannot erre.* Anſwer, This Argument, to giue it the right name, is an obſcure and intricate nothing. And to make it appeare ſo, let us ſuppoſe, in contradiction to your ſuppoſition, either that the Catholique Church may erre, but doth not, but that the Roman actually doth: or that the Catholique Church doth erre in ſome few things, but that the Roman erres in many more. And is it not apparent in both theſe caſes (which yet both ſuppoſe the Churches Fallibility) a man may truly ſay, unleſſe I diſſent in ſome opinions from the Roman Church, I cannot agree with the Catholique? Either therefore you muſt retract your imputation laid upon D. *Potter*, or doe

doe that which you condemne in him, and be driven to ſay, that the ſame man may hold ſome errours with the Church of Rome, and at the ſame time with the Catholique Church not hold but condemne them. For otherwiſe in neither of theſe caſes is it poſſible for the ſame man at the ſame time, to agree both with the Roman and the Catholique.

69 In all theſe Texts of Scripture, which are here alleaged in this laſt Section of this Chapter, or in any one of them, or in any other, doth God ſay cleerly and plainly, *The Biſhop of Rome and that Society of Chriſtians which adheres to him ſhall bee ever the infallible guide of Faith?* You will confeſſe, I preſume, he doth not, and will pretend, it was not neceſſary. Yet if the King ſhould tell us the Lord Keeper ſhould judge ſuch and ſuch cauſes, but ſhould either not tell us at all, or tell us but doubtfully who ſhould be Lord Keeper, ſhould we be any thing the neerer for him to an end of contentions? Nay rather would not the diſſentions about the Perſon who it is, increaſe contentions, rather then end them? Iuſt ſo it would have been, if God had appointed a Church to be judge of Controverſies, and had not told us which was that Church. Seeing therefore God does nothing in vain and ſeeing it had been in vain, to appoint a judge of Controverſies, and not to tell us plainly who it is, and ſeeing laſtly, he hath not told us plainly, no not at all who it is, is it not evident he hath appointed none? Ob. But (you will ſay perhaps) *if it be granted once, that ſome Church of one denomination, is the infallible guide of faith, it will be no difficult thing to prove, that yours is the Church, ſeeing no other Church pretends to be ſo.* Anſ. Yes, the Primitive and the Apoſtolique Church pretends to be ſo. That aſſures us, that the *ſpirit was promiſed, and given to them, to lead them into all ſaving truth*, that they might lead others. Ob. *But that Church is not now in the world, and how then, can it pretend to be the guide of Faith?* Anſ. It is now in the world ſufficiently, to be our guide: not by the Perſons of thoſe men that were members of it, but by their Writings which doe plainly teach us, what truth they were led into, and ſo lead us into the ſame truth. Ob. *But theſe writings, were the writings of ſome particular men, and not of the Church of thoſe times: how then doth that Church guide us by theſe writings? Now theſe places ſhew that a Church is to be our guide, therefore they cannot be ſo avoided.* Anſ. If you regard the conception and production of theſe writings, they were the writings of particular men: But if you regard the Reception, and approbation of them, they may be well called the writings of the Church, as having the atteſtation of the Church, to have been written by thoſe that were inſpired, and directed by God. As a ſtatute, though pen'd by ſome one man, yet being ratified by the Parliament, is called the Act, not of that man, but of the Parliament. Ob. But the *words ſeem cleerly enough to prove, that the Church, the Preſent Church of every Age, is Vniverſally infallible.* Anſ. For my part, I know I am as willing and deſirous, that the Biſhop or Church of Rome ſhould be infallible, (provided I might know it) as they are to be ſo eſteemed. But he that would not be deceived muſt

take heed, that he take not his deſire that a thing ſhould be ſo, for a reaſon that it is ſo. For if you look upon Scripture, through ſuch ſpectacles as theſe, they will appeare to you, of what colour pleaſes your fancies beſt: and will ſeem to ſay, not what they doe ſay, but what you would have them. As ſome ſay the *Manna*, wherewith the Iſraelites were fed in the Wilderneſſe, had in every mans mouth, that very taſt which was moſt agreeable to his palate. For my part I profeſſe, I have conſidered them a thouſand times, and have looked upon them (as they ſay,) on both ſides, and yet to me they ſeeme to ſay no ſuch matter.

70 Not the Firſt. For the *Church may erre, and yet the gates of Hell not prevail againſt her.* It may erre, and yet continue ſtill a true Church, and bring forth Children unto God, and ſend ſoules to Heaven. And therefore this can doe you no ſervice, without the plain begging of the point in Queſtion. *viz.* That every errour is one of the gates of Hell. Which we abſolutely deny, and therefore, you are not to ſuppoſe, but to prove it. Neither is our deny all without reaſon. For ſeeing you doe, and muſt grant, that a particular Church, may hold ſome errour, and yet be ſtill a true member of the Church: why may not the Vniverſall Church, hold the ſame errour, and yet remain the true Vniverſall?

71 Not the Second or Third. For *the ſpirit of Truth, may be with a Man, or a Church for ever, and teach him all Truth*: And yet he may fall into ſome errour, if this, *all*, be not *ſimply all*, but all of ſome kind: which you confeſſe to be ſo unqueſtioned and certain, that you are offended with *D. Potter*, for offering to prove it. Secondly, he may fall into ſome errour, even contrary to the truth which is taught him, if it be taught him *only ſufficiently, and not irreſiſtibly*, ſo that he may learne it if he will, not ſo that he muſt and ſhall, whether he will or no. Now who can aſcertain me, that the ſpirits teaching is not of this nature? Or how can you poſſibly reconcile it, with your doctrine of free-will in believing, if it be not of this nature? Beſides, the word in the Originall is ὁδηγήσει, which ſignifies, to be a guide and director only, not to compell or neceſſitate. Who knowes not, that a guide may ſet you in the right way, and you may either negligently miſtake, or willingly leave it? And to what purpoſe doth God complain ſo often, and ſo earneſtly of ſome, that *had eyes to ſee and would not ſee, that ſtopped their eares, and cloſed their eyes, leaſt they ſhould hear and ſee?* Of others *that would not underſtand, leaſt they ſhould doe good: that the light ſhined, and the darkneſſe comprehended it not*: That *he came unto his own, and his own received him not: That light came into the world, and men loved darkneſſe more then light? To what purpoſe ſhould he wonder, ſo few believed his report, and that to ſo few his arme was revealed: And that when he comes, he ſhould find no faith upon earth; If his outward teaching were not of this nature*, that it might be followed, and might be reſiſted? And if it be, then God may teach, and the Church not learn: God may lead, and the Church be refractory and not follow. And indeed, who can doubt, that hath not his eyes vailed with prejudice

dice, that God hath taught the Church of Rome plain enough in the Ep. to the *Corinthians*, that *all things in the Church are to be done for edification*, and that, in any publique Prayers, or Thanks-givings, or Hymnes, or Leſſons of inſtruction, to *uſe a language*, which the aſſiſtants *generally underſtand not*, is not for edification? Though the Church of Rome will not learne this, for feare of confeſſing an errour, and ſo overthrowing her Authority, yet the time will come, when it ſhall appeare, that not only by Scripture, they were taught this ſufficiently, and commanded to believe, but by reaſon and common ſenſe. And ſo for the Communion in both kindes, who can deny but they are taught it by our Saviour *Iohn 6.* in theſe words, according to moſt of your own expoſitions, *Vnleſſe you eat the Fleſh of the ſonne of Man, and drink his Blood, you have no life in you.* (If our Saviour ſpeake there of the Sacrament, as to them he does, becauſe they conceive he does ſo.) Though they may pretend, that receiving in one kind, they receive the blood together with the body, yet they can with no face pretend that they drink it: And ſo obey not our Saviours injunction according to the letter, which yet they *profeſſe is litterally, alwaies to be obeyed, unleſſe ſome impiety, or ſome abſurdity forc us to the contrary*: and they are not yet arrived to that impudence to pretend, that either there is impiety or abſurdity in receiving the Communion in both kinds. This therefore they if not others, are plainly taught by our Saviour in this place. But by S. *Paul* all without exception, when he ſaies, *Let a man examine himſelf, and ſo let him eat of this bread and drinke of this Chalice.* This (*a Man*) that is to examine himſelfe, is *every man*, that can doe it: as is confeſſed on all hands. And therefore it is all one, as if he had ſaid, *let every man examine himſelfe, and ſo let him eat of this bread, and drink of this cup.* They which acknowledge Saint *Pauls* Epiſtles, and S. *Iohns* Goſpell to be the Word of God, one would thinke ſhould not deny, but that they are taught theſe two Doctrines plain enough. Yet we ſee they neither doe, nor will learn them. I conclude therefore, that the ſpirit may very well teach the Church, and yet the Church fall into and continue in Error, by not regarding what ſhe is taught by the Spirit.

72 But all this I have ſpoken upon a ſuppoſition only, and ſhewed unto you, that though theſe promiſes, had been made unto the preſent Church of every age (I might have ſaid though they had been to the Church of Rome by name,) yet no certainty of her Vniverſall infallibility could be built upon them. But the plain truth is, that theſe Promiſes are vainly arrogated by you, and were never made to you, but to the Apoſtles only. I pray deale ingenuouſly and tell me, who were they of whom our Saviour ſaies, *Theſe things have I ſpoken unto you, being preſent with you.* c. 14. 25. *But the comforter, ſhall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatſoever I have told you* v. 26? Who are they to whom he ſaies, *I goe away and come again unto you; and I have told you before it come to paſſe*: v. 28. 29. *You have been with me from the beginning*: c. 15. v. 27? And again, *theſe things I have told you, that when the time ſhall come, you may remember*

that I told you of them: and theſe things I ſaid not to you at the begining, becauſe I was with you, c. 16. 4. *And becauſe I ſaid theſe things unto you, ſorrow hath filled your hearts*. v. 6? Laſtly, who are they of whom he ſaith v. 12. *I have yet many things to ſay unto you, but yee cannot beare them now?* Doe not all theſe circumſtances appropriate this whole diſcourſe of our Saviour to his Diſciples, that were then with him, and conſequently, reſtrain the Promiſes of the ſpirit of truth, which was *to lead them into all truth*, to their Perſons only? And ſeeing it is ſo, is it not an impertinent arrogance and preſumption, for you to lay claim unto them, in the behalfe of your Church? Had Chriſt been preſent with your Church? Did the Comforter bring theſe things to the Remembrance of your Church, which Chriſt had before taught and ſhe had forgotten? Was Chriſt then departing from your Church? And did he tell of his departure before it came to paſſe? Was your Church with him from the begining? Was your Church filled with ſorrow, upon the mentioning of Chriſts departure? Or laſtly, did he, or could he have ſaid to your Church, which then was not extant, *I have yet many things to ſay unto you, but ye cannot beare them now?* as he ſpeaks in the 13. v. immediatly before the words by you quoted. And then goes on, *Howbeit when the ſpirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all Truth*. Is it not the ſame *You* he ſpeaks to, in the 13. v. and that he ſpeaks to in the 14? And is it not apparent to any one that has but halfe an eye, that in the 13. he ſpeaks only to them that then were with him? Beſides in the very text by you alleaged, there are things promiſed, which your Church cannot with any modeſty pretend to. For there it is ſaid, *the ſpirit of Truth*, not only *will guide you into all Truth*, but alſo *will ſhew you things to come*. Now your Church (for ought I could ever underſtand) does not ſo much as pretend to the ſpirit of Propheeie, and knowledge of future events: And therefore hath as little cauſe to pretend to the former promiſe, of being *led by the ſpirit into all truth*. And this is the Reaſon, why both You in this place, and generally, your Writers of Controverſies, when they entreat of this Argument, cite this Text perpetually by halfes, there being in the latter part of it, a cleere, and convincing Demonſtration, that you have nothing to doe with the former. Vnleſſe you will ſay, which is moſt ridiculous, that when our Saviour ſaid, *He will teach you &c.* and *he will ſhew you &c.* He meant one *You* in the former clauſe, and another *You* in the latter.

73 Ob. But this *is to confine Gods ſpirit to the Apoſtles only, or to the Diſciples, that then were preſent with him: which is directly contrary to many places of Scripture*. Anſ. I confeſſe, that to confine the Spirit of God to thoſe that were then preſent with Chriſt is againſt Scripture. But I hope it is eaſy to conceive a difference, between confining the *Spirit of God* to them: and confining *the promiſes made in this place* to them. God may doe many things which he does not promiſe at all: much more, which he does not promiſe in ſuch or ſuch a place.

74 Ob. But *it is promiſed in the* 14. *Chap. that this ſpirit ſhall abide with them for ever: Now they in their perſons were not to abide for ever,*

and

and therefore the Spirit could not abide with them, in their Perſons for ever, ſeeing the coexiſtence of two things, ſuppoſes of neceſsity, the exiſtence of either. Therefore the promiſe was not made to them only in their Perſons, but by them to the Church, which was to abide for ever. Anſ. Your Concluſion is, *not to them only*, but your Reaſon concludes, either nothing at all, or that this Promiſe of abiding with them for ever, was not made to their Perſons at all; or if it were, that it was not performed. Or if you will not ſay (as I hope you will not) that it was not performed, nor that it was not made to their Perſons at all; then muſt you grant, that the word *for ever*, is here uſed in a ſenſe reſtrained, and accommodated to the ſubject here entreated of; and that it ſignifies, *not eternally*, without end of time, *but perpetually* without interruption, for the time of their liues. So that the force, and ſenſe of the Words is, that they ſhould never want the Spirits aſſtance, in the performance of their function: And that the Spirit would not (as Chriſt was to doe,) ſtay with them for a time, and afterwards leave them, but would abide with them, if they kept their ſtation, unto the very end of their lives, which is mans *for ever*. Neither is this uſe of the word, *for ever*, any thing ſtrange, either in our ordinary ſpeech, wherein we uſe to ſay, this is mine for ever, this ſhall be yours for ever, without ever dreaming of the Eternity, either of the thing or Perſons. And then in Scripture, it not only will bear, but requires this ſenſe very frequently, as *Exod.21.6. Deut.15.17. his maſter ſhall boar his eare through with an awle, and he ſhall ſerve him for ever. Pſ.52.9. I will praiſe thee for ever. Pſ.61.4. I will abide in thy Tabernacle for ever. Pſ.119.111. Thy Teſtimonies have I taken as mine heritage for ever:* and laſtly in the Epiſt. to *Philemon*, *He therefore departed from thee for a time, that thou ſhouldeſt receive him for ever.*

75 And thus, I preſume, I have ſhewed ſufficiently, that this *for ever*, hinders not, but that the promiſe may be appropriated to the Apoſtles, as by many other circumſtances I have evinc'd it muſt be. But what now, if the place produced by you, as a main pillar of your Churches infallibility, prove upon tryall, an engine to batter and overthrow it, at leaſt, (which is all one to my purpoſe) to take away all poſſibility of our aſſurãce of it? This will ſeem ſtrange newes to you at firſt hearing, & not farre from a prodigy. And I confeſſe, as you here in this place, and generally all your Writers of controverſy, by whom this text is urged, order the matter, it is very much diſabled, to doe any ſervice againſt you in this queſtion. For with a bold ſacriledge, and horrible impiety, ſomewhat like *Procruſtes* his cruelty, you perpetually cut off the head and foot, the begining and end of it; and preſenting to your confidents, who uſually read no more of the Bible, then is alleadged by you, only theſe words, *I will aſk my Father, and he ſhall give you another Paraclete, that he may abide with you for ever, even the ſpirit of Truth*, conceale in the mean time, the words before, and the words after; that ſo, the promiſe of Gods Spirit, may ſeem to be abſolute, whereas it is indeed moſt cleerely and expreſly conditionall: being both in the words before, reſtrained to thoſe only, that *love God*

and

and keep his Commandements: and in the words after, flatly denyed to all, whom the Scriptures ſtile by the name of *the World*, that is, as the very *antitheſis* gives us plainly to underſtand, *to all wicked and worldly men.* Behold the place entire, as it is ſet down in your own Bible. *If ye love mee keep my Commandements, and I will aske my Father, and he ſhall give you another Paraclete, that he may abide with you for ever, even the ſpirit of the Truth, whom the world cannot receive.* Now from the place there reſtored and vindicated from your mutilation, thus I argue againſt your pretence. We can have no certainty of the infallibility of your Church, but upon this ſuppoſition, that your Popes are infallible in confirming with the Decrees of Generall Councells: we can have no certainty hereof, but upon this ſuppoſition, that the Spirit of truth is promiſed to him, for his direction in this work. And of this again we can have no certainty, but upon ſuppoſall, that he performes the condition, whereunto the promiſe of the ſpirit of truth is expreſly limited, *viz. That he love God and keep his Commandements*; and of this finally, not knowing the Popes heart, we can have no certainty at all; therefore from the firſt to the laſt, we can have no certainty at all of your Churches infallibility. This is my firſt argument: Frō this place another followes, which will charge you as home as the former. If many of the Roman See, were ſuch men as could not receive the ſpirit of Truth, even men of the World, that is Worldly, Wicked, Carnall, Diabolicall men, then the Spirit of Truth, is not here promiſed, but flatly denied them: and conſequently we can have no certainty, neither of the Decrees of Councells, which theſe Popes confirme, nor of the Churches infallibility, which is guided by theſe decrees: But many of the Roman See, even by the confeſſion of the moſt zealous defenders of it, were ſuch men: therefore the ſpirit of truth is not here promiſed but denyed them, and conſequently we can have no certainty, neither of the Decrees which they confirme, nor of the Churches infallibility, which guides her ſelfe by theſe Decrees.

76 You may take as much time as you think fit, to anſwer theſe Arguments. In the mean while I proceed to the conſideration of the next text alleaged for this purpoſe by you: out of S. *Paul* 1. Ep. to *Timothy*: where he ſaith, as you ſay *the Church is the Pillar and ground of truth.* But the truth is you are ſomewhat to bold with S. *Paul.* For he ſaies not in formall termes, what you make him ſay, *the Church is the Pillar and Ground of Truth*, neither is it certain that he meanes ſo: for it is neither impoſſible nor improbable, that theſe words *the pillar and ground of truth*, may have reference not to the Church, but to *Timothy*, the ſenſe of the place *that thou maiſt know how to behave thy ſelfe, as a pillar and ground of truth, in the Church of God, which is the houſe of the living God*, which expoſition offers no violence at all to the words, but only ſuppoſes an Ellipſis of the Particle ὡς, in the greek very ordinary. Neither wants it ſome likelihood, that S. *Paul* comparing the Church to a houſe, ſhould here exhort *Timothy*, to carry himſelf, as a Pillar in that houſe ſhould doe, according as he had given other Principall men in the Church, the name of Pillars; rather then, having called

called the Church a *Houſe*, to call it preſently a *Pillar*; which may ſeem ſomewhat heterogeneous. Yet if you will needs have S. *Paul* referre this not to *Timothy* but the Church, I will not contend about it any farther, then to ſay, poſſibly it may be otherwiſe. But then ſecondly, I am to put you in mind, that the Church which S. *Paul* here ſpeaks of, was that in which *Timothy* converſed, and that was a Particular Church, and not the Roman; and ſuch you will not have to be Vniverſally Infallible.

77 Thirdly, if we grant you out of curteſy (for nothing can enforce us to it) that he both ſpeaks of the Vniverſall Church, and ſaies this of it, then I am to remember you, that many Attributes in Scripture, are not notes of performance, but of duty, and teach us not what the thing or Perſon is of neceſſity, but what it ſhould be. *Ye are the ſalt of the Earth*, ſaid our Saviour to his diſciples: not that this quality was inſeparable from their Perſons, but becauſe it was their office to be ſo. For if they muſt have been ſo of neceſſity, and could not have been otherwiſe, in vain had he put them in fear of that which followes, *If the ſalt hath loſt his ſavour, wherewith ſhall it be ſalted? it is thenceforth good for nothing, but to be caſt forth, and to be trodden under foot.* So the Church may bee by duty, the pillar and ground, that is, the Teacher of Truth, of all truth, not only neceſſary but profitable to ſalvation; and yet ſhe may neglect and violate this duty, and be in fact the teacher of ſome Errour.

78 Fourthly and laſtly, if we deal moſt liberally with you, and grant that the Apoſtle here ſpeaks of the Catholique Church, calls it the *Pillar and ground of Truth*, and that not only becauſe it ſhould, but becauſe it alwaies ſhall and will be ſo, yet after all this, you have done nothing; your bridge is too ſhort, to bring you to the bank where you would be, unleſſe you can ſhew that by truth here, is certainly meant, not only *all neceſſary* to ſalvation, but all that is profitable, abſolutely and *ſimply All*. For that the true Church alwaies ſhall bee the maintainer and teacher of all neceſſary truth, you know we grant and muſt grant, for it is of the eſſence of the Church to be ſo, and any company of men were no more a Church without it, then any thing can be a man, and not be reaſonable. But as a man may be ſtill a man, though he want a hand or an eye, which yet are profitable parts, ſo the Church may be ſtill a Church, though it be defective in ſome profitable truth. And as a man may be a man, that has ſome biles and botches on his body, ſo the Church may be the Church, though it have many corruptions both in doctrine and practice.

79 And thus you ſee we are at liberty from the former places; having ſhewed that the ſenſe of them, either muſt or may be ſuch as will doe your Cauſe no ſervice. But the laſt you ſuppoſe, will be a Gordian knot, and ties us faſt enough: The words are, *He gave ſome Apoſtles, and ſome Prophets &c. to the conſummation of Saints, to the work of the Miniſtry &c. Vntill we all meet into the Vnity of faith &c. That we be not hereafter Children, wavering and carried up and downe with every wind of Doctrine.* Out of which words, this is the only ar-

gument which you collect, or I can collect for you.

There is no meanes to conſerve unity of Faith, againſt every wind of Doctrine, unleſſe it be a Church univerſally infallible.

But it is impious to ſay there is no meanes to conſerue unity of faith againſt every wind of Doctrine:

Therefore there muſt be a Church Vniverſally Infallible.

Whereunto I anſwere, that your major is ſo farre from being confirmed, that it is plainly confuted, by the place alleadged. For that tels us of another meanes for this purpoſe, to wit, the *Apoſtles, and Prophets, and Evangeliſts, and Paſtors, and Doctors*, which Chriſt gave upon his Aſcention, and that their *conſummating the Saints, doing the work of the Miniſtry*, and *Edifying the body of Chriſt*, was the meanes to bring thoſe (which are there ſpoken of, be they who they will,) to *the unity of Faith, and to perfection in Chriſt*, that they might not be *wavering, and carried about, with every wind of falſe Doctrine*. Now the Apoſtles, and Prophets, and Evangeliſts, and Paſtors, and Doctors, are not the preſent Church; therefore the Church is not the only means for this end, nor that which is here ſpoken of.

80 Peradventure by, *he gave*, you conceive, is to be underſtood, *he promiſed that he would give unto the worlds end*. But what reaſon have you for this conceipt? Can you ſhew that the word, ἔδωκε, hath this ſignification in other places, and that it muſt have it in this place? Or will not this interpretation drive you preſently to this blaſphemous abſurdity, that God hath not performed his promiſe? Vnleſſe you will ſay, which for ſhame I think you will not, that you have now, and in all ages ſince Chriſt have had Apoſtles, and Prophets, and Evangeliſts: for as for Paſtors, and Doctors alone, they will not ſerve the turne. For if God promiſed to give all theſe, then you muſt ſay he hath given all, or elſe that he hath broke his promiſe. Neither may you pretend, that the *Paſtors and Doctors were the ſame with the Apoſtles, and Prophets, and Evangeliſts, and therefore having Paſtors and Doctors, you have all*. For it is apparent, that by theſe names, are denoted ſeverall Orders of men, cleerely diſtinguiſhed and diverſified by the Originall Text; but much more plainly by your own Tranſlations, for ſo you read it, *ſome Apoſtles, and ſome Prophets, and other ſome Evangeliſts, and other ſome Paſtors and Doctors:* and yet more plainly in the paralell place, 1. *Cor.* 12. to which we are referr'd by your Vulgar Tranſlation, *God hath ſet ſome in the Church, firſt Apoſtles, ſecondarily Prophets, thirdly Teachers*, therefore this ſubterfuge is ſtopped againſt you. Ob. But *how can they, which died in the firſt Age, keep us in Vnity, and guard us from Errour, that live now, perhaps in the laſt? This ſeemes to be all one, as if a man ſhould ſay, that Alexander, or Iulius Cæſar ſhould quiet a mutiny in the King of Spaines Army*. Anſ. I hope you will grant, that *Hippocrates*, and *Galen*, and *Euclid*, and *Ariſtotle*, and *Saluſt*, and *Cæſar*, and *Livie*, were dead many ages ſince; and yet that we are now preſerved from error by them, in a great part of Phyſick, of Geometry, of Logick, of the Roman ſtory. But what if theſe men had

had writ by divine Inſpiration, and writ compleat bodies of the Sciences they profeſſed, and writ them plainly and perſpicuouſly? You would then have granted, I believe, that their works had been ſufficient to keep us from errour, and from diſſention in theſe matters. And why then ſhould it be incongruous to ſay, that the Apoſtles, and Prophets, and Evangeliſts, and Paſtors, and Doctors, which Chriſt gave upon his aſcention, by their writings, which ſome of them writ but all approved, are even now ſufficient meanes, to conſerve us in Vnity of faith, and guarde us from errour? Eſpecially ſeeing theſe writings are, by the confeſſion of all parts, true and divine, and as we pretend and are ready to prove, contain a plain and perfect Rule of Faith; and as the * Chiefeſt of you acknowledge, *contain immediatly, all the Principall, and Fundamentall points of Chriſtianity*, referring us to the Church and Tradition only for ſome minute particularities. But tell me I pray, the Biſhops that compoſed the Decrees of the Councell of *Trent*, and the Pope that confirmed them, are they meanes to conſerve you in Unity, and keepe you from Error, or are they not? Peradventure you will ſay, *their Decrees are, but not their Perſons:* but you will not deny I hope, that you owe your Vnity, and freedome from Error, to the Perſons that made theſe Decrees: neither will you deny, that the writings which they have left behind them, are ſufficient for this purpoſe. And why may not then the Apoſtles writings be as fit for ſuch a purpoſe, as the Decrees of your Doctors? Surely their intent in writing was to conſerve us in Vnity of Faith, and to keep us from errour, and we are ſure God ſpake in them; but your Doctors from whence they are, we are not ſo certain. Was the Holy-Ghoſt then unwilling, or unable to direct them ſo, that their writings ſhould be fit and ſufficient to attain that end they aimed at in writing? For if he were both able and willing to doe ſo, then certainly he did doe ſo. And then their writings may be very ſufficient meanes, if we would uſe them as we ſhould doe, to preſerve us in Vnity, in all neceſſary points of Faith, and to guard us from all pernitious Error.

* Perron.

81 If yet you be not ſatisfied, but will ſtill pretend that, *all theſe words by you cited, ſeem clearly enough to prove, that the Church is Univerſally infallible, without which Vnity of Faith could not be conſerved againſt every wind of Doctrine*: I Anſ. That to you, which will not underſtand, that there can be any meanes to conſerve the Vnity of Faith, but only that which conſerves your authority over the Faithfull, it is no marvell that theſe words ſeem to prove, that the Church, nay that your Church is univerſally infallible. But we that have no ſuch end, no ſuch deſires, but are willing to leave all men to their liberty, provided they will not improve it to a Tyranny over others, we find it no difficulty to diſcern between *dedit* and *promiſit*, *he gave at his Aſcention*, and *he Promiſed to the worlds end*. Beſides, though you whom it concernes, may happily flatter your ſelves, that you have not only Paſtors, and Doctors, but Prophets, and Apoſtles, and Evangeliſts, and thoſe diſtinct from the former ſtill in your Church; yet we that are diſintereſſed perſons, cannot but ſmile at theſe ſtrange ima-

ginations. Laſtly, though you are apt to think your ſelves ſuch neceſſary inſtruments for all good purpoſes, and that nothing can be well done unleſſe you doe it; that no unity or conſtancy in Religion can be maintained, but inevitably Chriſtendome muſt fall to ruine, and confuſion, unleſſe you ſupport it: yet we that are indifferent and impartiall, and well content, that God ſhould give us his owne favours, by means of his own appointment, not of our chooſing, can eaſily collect out of theſe very words, that not the infallibility of your, or of any Church, but the *Apoſtles, and Prophets, and Evangeliſts &c. which Chriſt gave upon his Aſcention*, were deſigned by him, for the compaſſing all theſe excellent purpoſes, by their preaching while they lived, and by their writings for ever. And if they faile hereof, the Reaſon is not any inſufficiency or invalidity in the meanes, but the voluntary perverſeneſſe of the ſubjects they have to deal with: who, if they would be themſelves, and be content that others ſhould be, in the choice of their Religion the ſervants of God and not of men; if they would allow, that the way to heaven is no narrower now, then Chriſt left it; his yoak no heavier then he made it; that the belief of no more difficulties, is required now to Salvation, then was in the Primitive Church; that no errour is in it ſelfe deſtructive, and excluſive from Salvation now, which was not then; if inſtead of being zealous Papiſts, earneſt Calviniſts, rigid Lutherans, they would become themſelves, and be content that others ſhould be plain and honeſt Chriſtians; if all men would believe the Scripture, and freeing themſelves from prejudice and paſſion, would ſyncerely endeavour to finde the true ſenſe of it, and live according to it, and require no more of others, but to doe ſo; nor denying their Communion to any that doe ſo, would ſo order their publique ſeruice of God, that all which doe ſo may without ſcruple, or hypocriſy, or proteſtation againſt any part of it, joyne with them in it: who does not ſee that (ſeeing as we ſuppoſe here, and ſhall prove hereafter,) all neceſſary truths, are plainly and evidently ſet down in Scripture, there would of neceſſity be among all men, in all things neceſſary, Vnity of Opinion? And notwithſtāding any other differences that are or could be, Vnity of Communion and Charity and mutuall toleration? By which meanes, all Schiſme and Hereſy, would be baniſhed the world, and thoſe wretched contentions which now rend and teare in pieces, not the coat, but the members and bowels of Chriſt, which mutuall pride and Tyranny, and curſing, and killing, and damning, would fain make immortall, ſhould ſpeedily receive a moſt bleſſed cataſtrophe. But of this hereafter, when we ſhall come to the queſtion of Schiſme, wherein I perſwade my ſelfe, that I ſhall plainly ſhew, that the moſt vehement accuſers, are the greateſt offenders, and that they are indeed at this time, the greateſt Schiſmatiques, who make the way to heaven narrower, the yoak of Chriſt heavier, the differences of Faith greater, the conditions of Eccleſiaſticall government harder, and ſtricter, then they were made at the begining by Chriſt and his Apoſtles: they who talk of Unity, but aime at Tyranny, and will have peace with none, but with their ſlaves and vaſſals.

In

In the mean while, though I have ſhewed how Vnity of Faith, & Vnity of Charity too, may be preſerved without your Churches infallibility, yet ſeeing you modeſtly conclude from hence, not that your Church is, but only *ſeemes to be* univerſally infallible, meaning to your ſelfe, of which you are a better judge then I: Therefore I willingly grant your concluſion, and proceed.

82 Whereas you ſay, That D. *Potter limits thoſe promiſes and privileges to fundamentall points*: The truth is, with ſome of them hee meddles not at all, neither doth his Adverſary giue him occaſion: Not with thoſe out of the Epiſtle to *Timothy*, and to the *Epheſians*. To the reſt he giues other anſwer beſides this.

83 But *the words of Scripture by you alleaged are Vniverſall, and mention no ſuch reſtraint to Fundamentals*, as D. *Potter* applies to them: I anſwer, That of the fiue Texts which you alleage, four are indefinite, and only one univerſall, and that you confeſſe is to be reſtrained, and are offended with D. *Potter* for going about to proue it. And *Whereas you ſay, they mention no reſtraint*, intimating that therefore they are not to be reſtrained, I tell you, this is no good conſequence; for it may appeare out of the matter and circumſtances, that they are to be underſtood in a reſtrained ſenſe, notwithſtanding no reſtraint be mentioned. That place quoted by S. *Paul*, and applied by him to our Saviour, *He hath put all things under his feet*, mentions no exception; yet S. *Paul* tels us, not only that it is true or certain, but *it is manifeſt, that He is excepted which did put all things under him.*

84 But *your interpretation is better then D. Potters, becauſe it is literall.* I anſwer, His is Literall as well as yours: and you are miſtaken if you think a reſtrained ſenſe may not be a literall ſenſe; for to *Reſtrained, Literall* is not oppoſed but *unlimited* or abſolute, and to *Literall*, is not oppos'd *Reſtrained*, but *Figuratiue.*

85 Whereas you ſay D. *Potters Brethren reiecting his limitation, reſtrain the mentioned Texts to the Apoſtles*, implying hereby a contrariety between them and him: I anſwer, So does D. *Potter* reſtrain all of them which he ſpeaks of, in the pages by you quoted, to the Apoſtles, in the direct and primary ſenſe of the words. Though he tels you there, the words in a more reſtrained ſenſe are true, being underſtood of the Church Vniverſall.

86 As for your pretence, That *to finde the meaning of thoſe places, you conferre divers Texts, you conſult Originals, you examin Tranſlations, and uſe all the meanes by Proteſtants appointed*, I haue told you before, that all this is vain and hypocriticall, if (as your manner & your doctrine is) you giue not your ſelfe liberty of judgement in the uſe of theſe meanes; if you make not your ſelves Iudges of, but only Advocats for the doctrine of your Church, refuſing to ſee what theſe meanes ſhew you, if it any way make againſt the doctrine of your Church, though it be as cleare as the light at noone. Remoue prejudice, Even the ballance, and hold it even, make it indifferent to you which way you goe to heaven, ſo you goe the true, which Religion be true ſo you be of it, then uſe the meanes and pray for Gods aſſiſtance, and as ſure

as God is true, you ſhall be lead into all neceſſary Truth.

87 Whereas you ſay, *you neither doe, nor haue any poſſible meanes to agree, as long as you are left to your ſelues*: The firſt is very true, That while you differ, you doe not agree. But for the ſecond, That you haue no poſſible means of agreement, as long as you are left to your ſelues, i.e. to your own reaſons and judgement, this ſure is very falſe, neither doe you offer any proofe of it, unleſſe you intended this, that you *doe not* agree, for a proof that you *cannot*; which ſure is no good conſequence, not halfe ſo good as this which I oppoſe againſt it: D. *Potter* and I by the uſe of theſe meanes by you mentioned doe agree concerning the ſenſe of theſe places, therefore there is a poſſible meanes of agreement, and therefore you alſo if you would uſe the ſame meanes, with the ſame minds, might agree ſo farre as it is neceſſary, and it is not neceſſary that you ſhould agree further. Or if there bee no poſſible meanes to agree about the ſenſe of theſe Texts, whilſt wee are left to our ſelves, then ſure it is impoſſible that we ſhould agree in your ſenſe of them which was: That the Church is univerſally infallible. For if it were poſſible for us to agree in this ſenſe of them, then it were poſſible for us to agree. And why then ſaid you of the ſelfe ſame Texts but in the page next before, *Theſe words ſeem cleerly enough to proue that the Church is Vniverſally infallible*, A ſtrange forgetfulneſſe, that the ſame man, almoſt in the ſame breath ſhould ſay of the ſame words, They ſeem cleerly enough to proue ſuch a concluſion true, & yet that three indifferent men, all preſum'd to be lovers of Truth, and induſtrious ſearchers of it ſhould haue no poſſible meanes, while they follow their own reaſon to agree in the Truth of this Concluſion!

88 Whereas you ſay, that *it were great impiety to imagine that God, the lover of Soules, hath left no certaine infallible meanes to decide both this and all other differences ariſing about the interpretation of Scripture, or upon any other occaſion*: I deſire you to take heed, you commit not an impiety in making more impieties then Gods Commandements make. Certainly God is no way oblig'd either by his promiſe or his Loue to giue us all things, that we may imagine would be convenient for us, as formerly I haue proved at large. It is ſufficient that he denies us nothing neceſſary to Salvation. *Deus non deficit in neceſſariis, nec redundat in ſuperfluis*: So D. *Stapleton*. But that the ending of all Controverſies, or having a certain meanes of ending them, is neceſſary to Salvation, that you haue often ſaid and ſuppos'd, but never proved, though it be the main pillar of your whole diſcourſe. So little care you take how ſlight your Foundations are, ſo your building make a faire ſhew. And as little care, how you commit thoſe faults your ſelfe, which you condemne in others. For you here charge them with great impiety, who imagine that *God the lover of Soules hath left no infallible meanes to determine all differences ariſing about the interpretation of Scripture, or upon any other occaſion*: And yet afterwards being demanded by D. *Potter, why the Queſtions between the Ieſuits & Dominicans remain undetermined?* You returne him this croſſe interrogatory, *Who hath aſſured you that the point wherein theſe learned men differ, is a re-*

vealed

vealed Truth, or capable of definition, or is not rather by plain Scripture indeterminable, or by any Rule of faith? So then when you ſay, *it were great impiety to imagine that God hath not left infallible meanes to decide all differences*; I may anſwer, It ſeemes you doe not believe your ſelfe. For in this controverſie which is of as high conſequence as any can be, you ſeem to be doubtfull whether there be any meanes to determin it. On the other ſide, when you aske D. *Potter, who aſſured him that there is any meanes to determine this Controverſie?* I anſwer for him, that you have, in calling *it a great impiety to imagine that there is not ſome infallible meanes to decide this and all other differences ariſing about the Interpretation of Scripture, or upon any other occaſion.* For what trick you can deviſe to ſhew that this difference, between the Dominicans and Ieſuits, which includes a difference about the ſenſe of many Texts of Scripture, & many other matters of moment, was not included under *this and all other differences*, I cannot imagine. Yet if you can finde out any, thus much at leaſt we ſhall gain by it, *that generall ſpeeches are not alwaies to be underſtood generally, but ſometimes with exceptions and limitations.*

89 But if there be any infallible meanes to decide all differences, I beſeech you name them. *You ſay it is to conſult and heare Gods Viſible Church with ſubmiſſive acknowledgment of her Infallibility.* But ſuppoſe the difference be (as here it is) *whether your Church be infallible*, what ſhall decide that? If you would ſay (as you ſhould doe) Scripture and Reaſon, then you foreſee that you ſhould be forced to grant that theſe are fit meanes to decide this Controverſie, and therefore may be as fit to decide others. Therefore to avoid this, you runne into a moſt ridiculous abſurdity, and tell us that this difference alſo, whether the Church be infallible, as well as others, muſt be agreed by *a ſubmiſſiue acknowledgment of the Churches infallibility.* As if you ſhould haue ſaid, My Brethren I perceiue this is a great contention amongſt you, whether the Roman Church be infallible? If you will follow my advice, I will ſhew you a ready meanes to end it; you muſt firſt agree that the Roman Church is infallible, and then your contention whether the Roman Church be infallible, will quickly be at an end. Verily a moſt excellent advice, and moſt compendious way of ending all Controverſies, even without troubling the Church to determine them! For why may not you ſay in all other differences, as you haue done in this? Agree that the Pope is ſupream head of the Church: That the ſubſtance of Bread and Wine in the Sacrament is turned into the body, & bloud of Chriſt: That the Communion is to be given to Lay-men but in one kind: That Pictures may be worſhipped: That Saints are to bee invocated; and ſo in the reſt, and then your differences about the Popes Supremacy, Tranſubſtantiation, and all the reſt will ſpeedily be ended. If you ſay, the advice is good in this, but not in other caſes, I muſt requeſt you not to expect alwaies, to be believed upon your word, but to ſhew us ſome reaſon, why any one thing, namely the Churches infallibility, is fit to prove it ſelfe; and any other thing, by name the Popes Supremacy, or Tranſubſtantiation is not as fit? Or if for

ſhame

ſhame you will at length confeſſe, that the Churches infallibility is not fit to decide this difference, whether the Church be infallible, then you muſt confeſſe it is not fit to decide all: Vnleſſe you will ſay, it may be fit to decide all, and yet not fit to decide this, or pretend that this is not comprehended under all. Beſides if you grant that your Churches infallibilitie cannot poſſibly be well grounded upon, or decided by it ſelfe, then having profeſſed before, that *there is no poſſible meanes beſides this, for us to agree hereupon*, I hope you will giue mee leaue to conclude, that it is impoſſible upon good ground for us to agree that the Roman Church is infallible. For certainly light it ſelfe, is not more cleere then the evidence of this ſyllogiſme;

If there be no other meanes to make men agree upon your Churches infallibility, but only this, and this be no meanes, then it is ſimply impoſſible for men upon good grounds to agree that your Church is infallible:

But there is (as you haue granted) no other poſſible meanes to make men agree hereupon, but only a ſubmiſſive acknowledgment of her Infallibility, And this is apparently no meanes;

Therefore it is ſimply impoſſible for men upon good grounds to agree that your Church is infallible.

90 Laſtly to the place of S. *Auſtine, wherein we are advis'd to follow the way of Catholique diſcipline, which from Chriſt himſelfe by the Apoſtles hath come down even to us, and from us ſhall deſcend to all poſterity*: I anſwer, That the way which S. *Auſtine* ſpake of, & the way which you commend, being divers waies, & in many things cleane contrary, we cannot poſſibly follow them both; and therefore for you to apply the ſame words to them is a vaine equivocation. Shew us any way, & doe not ſay, but proue it *to haue come from Chriſt & his Apoſtles down to us*; and we are ready to follow it. Neither doe wee expect demonſtration hereof, but ſuch reaſons as may make this more probable then the contrary. But if you bring in things into your now Catholique Diſcipline, which Chriſtians in S. *Auſtins* time held abominable, (as the picturing of God,) & which you muſt confeſſe to haue come into the Church ſeven hundred yeares after Chriſt: if you will bring in things, as you haue done the halfe Communion, with a *non obſtante, notwithſtanding Chriſts Inſtitution, and the practiſe of the Primitive Church were to the contrary*: If you will doe ſuch things as theſe, and yet would haue us believe, that your whole Religion came from Chriſt and his Apoſtles, this we conceive a requeſt too unreaſonable for modeſt men to make, or for wiſe men to grant.

CHAP.

CHAP. IIII.

To ſay, that the Creed containes all points neceſſarily to be believed, is neither pertinent *to the Queſtion in hand, nor in it ſelfe* true.

I SAY, neither *pertinent*, nor *true*. Not *pertinent*: Becauſe our Queſtion is not, what points are neceſſary to be explicitely believed; but what points may be lawfully *disbelieved*, or rejected after ſufficient Propoſition that they are divine Truths. You ſay, the Creed containes all points neceſſary to be believed. Be it ſo. But doth it likewiſe containe all points not to be disbelieved? Certainly it doth not. For how many truths are there in holy Scripture not contained in the Creed, which we are not obliged diſtinctly, and particularly to know and believe, but are bound under paine of damnation not to reject, as ſoone as we come to know that they are found in holy Scripture? And we having already ſhewed, that whatſoever is propoſed by Gods Church as a point of faith, is infallibly a truth revealed by God; it followeth that whoſoever denieth any ſuch point, oppoſeth Gods ſacred teſtimony whether that point be contained in the Creed, or no. In vaine then was your care imployed to prove that all points of faith neceſſary to be *explicitely* believed, are contained in the Creed. Neither was that the Catalogue which *Charity Miſtaken* demanded. His demand was (and it was moſt reaſonable) that you would once give us a liſt of all fundamentals, the deniall whereof deſtroyes Salvation; whereas the deniall of other points not fundamentall, may ſtand with ſalvation, although both theſe kinds of points be equally propoſed as revealed by God. For if they be not equally propoſed, the difference will ariſe from diverſity of the *Propoſall*, and not of the *Matter* fundamentall, or not fundamentall. This Catalogue only, can ſhew how farre Proteſtants may diſagree without breach of Vnity in faith; and upon this many other matters depend, according to the ground of Proteſtants. But you will never adventure to publiſh ſuch a Catalogue. I ſay more: You cannot aſſigne any one point ſo *great*, or fundamentall, that the deniall thereof will make a man an Heretique, if it be not ſufficiently propounded, as a divine Truth: Nor can you aſſigne any one point ſo *ſmall*, that it can without hereſie be rejected, if once it be ſufficiently repreſented as revealed by God.

2. Nay, this your inſtance in the Creed, is not only impertinent but directly againſt you. For all points in the Creed are not of their own nature fundamentall, as I ſhewed (*a*) before: And yet it is damnable to deny any one point contained in the Creed. So that it is cleere, that to make an errour damnable, it is not neceſſary that the matter be of it ſelfe fundamentall. a *Cap. 3. n. 3.*

3 Moreover you cannot ground any certainty upon the Creed it ſelfe, unleſſe firſt you preſuppoſe that the authority of the Church is univerſally infallible, and conſequently that it is damnable to oppoſe her declarations, whether they concerne matters great, or ſmall, contayned, or not contained in the Creed. This is cleere. Becauſe we muſt receiue the Creed it ſelf upon the credit of the Church, without which we could not know that there was any ſuch thing as that which we call the *Apoſtles Creed*: and yet the arguments whereby you endeavour to prove, that the Creed containes all fundamentall points, are grounded upon ſuppoſition, that the *Creed* was made *either by the Apoſtles themſelves, or by the* (*b*) *Church of their times from them*: which thing we could not certainly know, if the ſucceeding and ſtill continued Church, may erre in her Traditions: neither can we be aſſured, whether all fundamentall Articles which you ſay were out of the Scriptures, *ſummed and contracted into the Apoſtles Creed*, were faithfully ſummed, and contracted, and not one pretermitted, altered, or miſtaken, unleſſe we undoubtedly know that the Apoſtles compoſed the Creed; and *that* they intended to contract all fundamentall points of faith into it; or at leaſt *that the Church of their times* (for it ſeemeth you doubt whether indeed it were compoſed by the Apoſtles themſelves) did underſtand the Apoſtles aright; and *that the Church of their times*, did intend that the Creed ſhould containe all fundamentall points. For if the Church may erre in points not fundamentall, may ſhe not alſo erre in the particulers which I have ſpecified? Can you ſhew it to be a fundamentall point of faith, that the Apoſtles intended to comprize all points of faith neceſſary to Salvation in the Creed? Your ſelf ſay no more then that it is *very* (*c*) *probable*; which is farre from reaching to a fundamentall point of faith. Your probability is grounded upon *the Iudgment of Antiquity, and even of the Roman Doctours*, as you ſay in the ſame place. But if the Catholique Church may erre, what certainty can you expect from Antiquity, or Doctours? Scripture is *your* totall Rule of faith. Cite therefore ſome Text of Scripture, to prove that the Apoſtles, or *the Church of their times* compoſed the Creed, and compoſed it with a purpoſe that it ſhould containe all fundamentall points of faith. Which being impoſſible to be done, you muſt for the Creed it ſelf rely upon the infallibility of the Church. b *Pag. 216.* c *Pag. 141.*

4. Moreover, the Creed conſiſteth not ſo much in the words, as in their ſenſe and meaning.

All ſuch as pretend to the name of Chriſtians, recite the Creed, and yet many have erred fundamentally, as well againſt the Articles of the Creed, as other points of faith. It is then very frivolous to ſay, the Creed containes all fundamentall points, without ſpecifying, both in what ſenſe the Articles of the Creed be *true*, and alſo in what *true* ſenſe; they be *fundamentall*. For, both theſe taskes, you are to performe, who teach that all truth is not fundamentall: and you doe but
e *Pag.* 216. delude the ignorant, when you ſay, that the Creed, *taken in a Catholique* (e) *ſenſe*, comprehendeth all points fundamentall; becauſe with you, all *Catholique ſenſe* is not fundamentall: for ſo it were neceſſary to ſalvation that all Chriſtians ſhould know the whole Scripture, wherein every leaſt point hath a *Catholique ſenſe*. Or if by Catholique ſenſe, you underſtand that ſenſe which is ſo univerſally to be knowne, and believed by all, that whoſoever failes therein cannot be ſaved, you trifle and ſay no more then this: *All points of the Creed in a ſenſe neceſſary to ſalvation, are neceſſary to ſalvation.* Or: *All points fundamentall, are fundamentall*. After this manner it were an eaſie thing to make many true Prognoſtications, by ſaying it will certainly raine, when it
f *Pag.* 216. raineth. You ſay the Creed (f) was opened and explained, *in ſome parts* in the Creeds of *Nice*, &c. but how ſhall we underſtand the other *parts*, not explained in thoſe Creeds?

5. For what Article in the Creed is more fundamentall, or may ſeem more cleere, then that, wherein we believe IESVS CHRIST to be the Mediatour, Redeemer, and Saviour of mankind, and the founder, and foundation of a *Catholique Church* expreſſed in the Creed? And yet about this Article, how many different doctrines are there, not only of old Heretiques, as *Arius*, *Neſtorius*, *Eutiches*, *&c.* but alſo of Proteſtants, partly againſt Catholiques, and partly againſt one another? For the ſaid maine Article of Chriſt's being the *only* Saviour of the world &c. according to different ſenſes of diſagreeing Sects, doth involve theſe, and many other ſuch queſtions; That Faith in IESVS CHRIST doth juſtifie alone; That Sacraments have no efficiency in Iuſtification; That Baptiſme doth not availe Infants for ſalvation, unleſſe they have an Act of faith; That there is no Sacerdotall Abſolution from ſinnes; That good works proceeding from Gods grace are not meritorious; That there can be no Satisfaction for the temporall puniſhment due to ſinne after the guilt, or offence is pardoned; No Purgatory; No prayers for the dead; No Sacrifice of the Maſſe; No Invocation; No Mediation, or interceſſion of Saints; No inherent Iuſtice: No ſupreme Paſtor, yea no Biſhop by divine Ordinance; No Reall preſence; no Tranſubſtantiation, with diverſe others. And why? Becauſe (forſooth) theſe Doctrines derogate from the Titles of Mediator, Redeemer, Advocate, Foundation, &c. Yea, and are againſt the truth of our Saviours humane nature, if we believe diverſe Proteſtants, writing againſt Tranſubſtantiation. Let then any judicious man conſider, whether *Doctour Potter*, or others doe really ſatisfie, when they ſend men to the Creed for a perfect Catalogue, to diſtinguiſh points fundamentall, from thoſe which they ſay are not fundamentall. If he will ſpeak indeed to ſome purpoſe, let him ſay: This Article is underſtood in this ſenſe; and in this ſenſe it is fundamentall. That other is to be underſtood in ſuch a meaning; yet according to that meaning, it is not ſo fundamentall, but that men may diſagree, and denie it without damnation. But it were no policie for any Proteſtant to deale ſo plainly.

6. But to what end ſhould we uſe many arguments? Even your ſelfe are forced to limit your owne Doctrine, and come to ſay, that the *Creed* is a perfect Catalogue of fundamentall points, *taken as it was further opened and explained in ſome parts* (*by occaſion of emergent Hereſies*) *in*
g *Pag.* 216. *the other Catholique Creeds of Nice, Conſtantinople,* (g) *Epheſus, Chalcedon, and Athanaſius.* But this explication, or reſtriction overthroweth your aſſertion. For as the Apoſtles Creed was not to us a ſufficient Catalogue, till it was explained by the firſt Councell, nor then till it was declared by another, &c. ſo now alſo, as new Hereſies may ariſe, it will need particular explanation againſt ſuch emergent errors; and ſo it is not yet, nor ever will be of it ſelf alone, a particular Catalogue, ſufficient to diſtinguiſh betwixt fundamentall, and not fundamentall points.

7. I come to the ſecond part: *That the Creed doth not containe all maine and principall points of faith*. And to the end we may not ſtrive about things either granted by us both, or no thing concerning the point in queſtion, I muſt premiſe theſe obſervations.

8. Firſt: That it cannot be denied, but that the Creed is moſt full and complete, to that purpoſe for which the holy Apoſtles, inſpir'd by God, meant that it ſhould ſerve, and in that manner as they did intend it, which was, not to comprehend all particular points of faith, but ſuch generall heads, as were moſt befitting, and requiſite for preaching the faith of Chriſt to Iewes, and Gentiles, and might be briefly, and compendiouſly ſet down, and eaſily learned, and remembred. And therefore, in reſpect of Gentiles, the Creed doth mention God, as Creator of all things; and and for both Iewes and Gentiles, the Trinity, the Meſſias, and Saviour, his birth, life, death, reſurrection, and glory, from whom they were to hope remiſſion of ſinnes, and life everlaſting, and by whoſe ſacred Name they were to be diſtinguiſhed from all other profeſſions, by being called
h 2. 2. q. 1. *Art.* 8. Chriſtians. According to which purpoſe *S. Thomas of Aquine* (h) doth diſtinguiſh all the Articles of the Creed into theſe generall heads: That ſome belong to the Majeſty of the *God head*, others to the Myſtery of our Saviour Chriſts *Humane nature*: Which two generall objects of faith, the holy Ghoſt doth expreſſe, and conjoyne, *Ioan.* 17. *Hæc eſt vita æterna &c. This is life everlaſting, that they know thee true GOD, and whom thou haſt ſent IESVS CHRIST.* But it was not their meaning to give us as it were a courſe of Divinity, or a Catechiſme, or a particular expreſſion of all points of Faith, leaving thoſe things to be performed, as occaſion ſhould require,

by

by their own word or writing, for their time; and afterwards for their Succeſſours in the Catholique Church. Our queſtion then is not, whether the Creed be perfect; as farre as the end for which it was compoſed, did require; For we beleive and are ready to give our lives for this: but only we denie, that the Apoſtles did intend to compriſe therein all particular points of beliefe, neceſſary to ſalvation, as even by *D. Potters* owne (*k*) confeſſion, it doth not comprehend *agenda*, or things belonging to practiſe, as *Sacraments*, *Commandements*, the acts of *Hope*, and duties of Charity, which we are obliged not only to practiſe, but alſo to *believe* by divine infallible faith. Will he therefore inferre that the Creed is not perfect, becauſe it containes not all thoſe neceſſary, and fundamentall Objects of faith? He will anſwer, No: becauſe the Apoſtles intended only to expreſſe *credenda*, things to be believed, not practiſed. Let him therefore give us leave to ſay, that the Creed is perfect, becauſe it wanteth none of thoſe Objects of beliefe which were intended to be ſet downe, as we explicated before.

k *Pag.* 235. 215.

9. The ſecond obſervation is, that to ſatisfie our queſtion what points in particular be fundamentall, it will not be ſufficient to alleage the Creed, unleſſe it containes all ſuch points either expreſſely and immediatly; or elſe in ſuch manner, that by evident, and neceſſary conſequence they may be deduced from Articles both clearely, and particularly contained therein. For if the deduction be *doubtfull*, we ſhall not be *ſure*, that ſuch Concluſions be fundamentall: or if the Articles themſelves which are ſaid to be fundamentall, be not diſtinctly, and particularly expreſſed, they will not ſerve us to know, and diſtinguiſh all points fundamentall, from thoſe which they call, not fundamẽtall. We doe not deny, but that all points of faith, both fundamentall & not fundamentall, may be ſaid to be contained in the Creed, in ſome ſenſe; as for example, implicitely, generally, or in ſuch involved manner. For when we explicitely believe the *Catholike Church*, we doe implicitely believe whatſoever ſhe propoſeth as belonging to faith: Or elſe by way of *reductiõ*, that is, when we are once inſtructed in the beliefe of particular points of faith, not expreſſed, nor by neceſſary conſequence deducible from the Creed; we may afterward, by ſome analogy, or proportion, and reſemblance, reduce it to one, or moe of thoſe Articles which are explicitely contained in the Symbole. Thus *S. Thomas* the Cherubim among Divines teacheth (*l*) that the miraculous exiſtence of our Bleſſed Saviours body in the *Euchariſt*, as likewiſe all his other *miracles*, are reduced to Gods *Omnipotency*, expreſſed in the Creed. And *Doctor Potter* ſaith: *The Euchariſt*, (m) *being a ſeale of that holy Union which we have with Chriſt our head, by his ſpirit and Faith, and with the Saints his members by Charity, is evidently included in the Communion of Saints.* But this reductive way, is farre from being ſufficient to inferre out of the Articles of *Gods Omnipotency*, or of the *Communion of Saints*, that our Saviours body is in the Euchariſt, and much leſſe whether it be only in figure, or elſe in reality; by Tranſubſtantiation, or Conſubſtantiation, &c. and leaſt of all, whether or no theſe points be fundamentall. And you hyperbolize, in ſaying, the Euchariſt is *evidently included in the Communion of Saints*, as if there could not have been, or was not a Communion of Saints, before the Bleſſed Sacrament was inſtituted. Yet it is true, that after we know, and believe, there is ſuch a Sacrament, wee may referre it to ſome of thoſe heads expreſſed in the Creed, and yet ſo, as *S. Thomas* referres it to one Article, and *D. Potter* to another; and in reſpect of different analogies or effects, it may be referred to ſeverall Articles. The like I ſay of other points of faith, which may in ſome ſort be reduced to the Creed, but nothing to *D. Potters* purpoſe: But contrarily it ſheweth, that your affirming ſuch and ſuch points to be fundamentall or not fundamentall, is meerely arbitrary, to ſerve your turne, as neceſſity, and your occaſions may require. Which was an old cuſtome amongſt Heretiques, as wee read in (n) *S. Auguſtine*; *Pelagius* and *Celeſtius*, *deſiring fraudulently to avoide the hateſull name of Hereſies, affirmed that the queſtion of Originall ſinne may be diſputed without danger of faith.* But this holy Father affirmes that it belongs to the foundation of Faith. *We may* (ſaith he) *endure a diſputant who erres in other queſtions not yet diligently examined, not yet diligently eſtabliſhed by the whole authority of the Church; their errour may be borne with: but it muſt not paſſe ſo farre as to attempt to ſhake the foundation of the church.* We ſee *S. Auguſtine* places the being of a point fundamentall or not fundamentall, in that it hath beene *examined*, and *eſtabliſhed* by the Church, although the point of which he ſpeaketh, namely Originall Sinne, be not contained in the Creed.

l 2. 2. *q.* 1. *art.* 8. *ad* 6.

m *Pag.* 231.

n *De Peccat. Orig. lib.* 2. *c.* 22.

10. Out of that which hath beene ſaid, I inferre, that *Doctor Potters* paines in alleaging Catholique Doctors, the ancient Fathers, and the Councell of Trent, to prove that the Creed containes all points of faith, was needleſſe; ſince we grant it in manner aforeſaid. But *Doctor Potter*, cannot in his conſcience believe, that Catholique Divines, or the Councell of Trent and the holy Fathers did intend, that all points in particular which we are obliged to believe, are contained explicitely in the Creed; he knowing well enough, that all Catholiques hold themſelves obliged, to believe all thoſe points which the ſaid Councell defines to be believed under an Anathema, and that all Chriſtians believe the commandements, Sacraments &c. which are not expreſſed in the Creed.

11. Neither muſt this ſeeme ſtrange. For who is ignorant, that Summaries, Epitomes, and the like briefe Abſtracts, are not intended to ſpecifie all particulars of that Science, or Subject to which they belong. For as the Creed is ſaid to containe all points of *Faith*; ſo the Decalogue comprehends all Articles, (as I may terme them) which concerne *Charity*, and good life: and yet this cannot be ſo underſtood, as if we were diſobliged frõ performance of any duty, or the eſchew-

ing of any vice, unleſſe it be expreſſed in the ten Commandements. For, (to omit the precepts of receaving Sacraments, which belong to practiſe, or manners, and yet are not contained in the Decalogue) there are many ſinnes, even againſt the law of nature, and light of reaſon, which are not contained in the tenne Commandements, except only by ſimilitude, analogy, reduction, or ſome ſuch way. For example, we find not expreſſed in the Decalogue, either divers ſinnes, as Gluttony, Drunkenneſſe, Pride, Sloth, Covetouſneſſe in deſiring either things ſuperfluous, or with too much greedineſſe; or diuers of our chiefe obligations, as Obedience to Princes, and all Superiours, not only Eccleſiaſticall but alſo Civill, whoſe lawes *Luther*, *Melanæthon*, *Calvin*, and ſome other Proteſtants doe dangerouſly affirme not to oblige in conſcience, and yet theſe men thinke they know the ten Commandements: as likewiſe divers Proteſtants defend Vſury, to be lawfull; and the many Treatiſes of *Civilians*, *Canoniſts*, and *Caſuiſts*, are witneſſes, that divers ſinnes againſt the light of reaſon, and Law of nature, are not diſtinctly expreſſed in the ten Commandements; although when by other diligences they are found to be unlawfull, they may be reduced to ſome of the Commandements, and yet not ſo evidently, and particularly, but that divers doe it in divers manners.

12. My third Obſervation is: That our preſent queſtion being, whether or no the Creed containe ſo fully all fundamentall points of faith, that whoſoever doe not agree in all, and every one of thoſe fundamentall Articles, cannot have the ſame ſubſtance of faith, nor hope of Salvation; *if* I can produce one, or more points, not contained in the Creed, in which if two doe not agree, both of them cannot expect to be ſaved, I ſhall have performed as much as I intend; and *D. Potter* muſt ſeeke out ſome other Catalogue for points fundamentall, then the Creed. Neither is it materiall to the ſaid purpoſe, whether ſuch fundamentall points reſt only in knowledge, and ſpeculation, or beliefe, or elſe be farther referred to work and practiſe. For the *habit*, or vertue of *Faith*, which inclineth, and enableth us to believe both ſpeculative, and practicall verities, is of one and the ſelfe ſame nature, and eſſence. For example, by the ſame *Faith*, whereby I ſpeculatively believe there is a God, I likewiſe believe, that he is to be adored, ſerved, and loved; which belong to practiſe. The reaſon is, becauſe the *Formall Object*, or motive, for which I yeild aſſent to thoſe different ſorts of materiall objects, is the ſame in both, to wit, the revelation, or word of God. Where, by the way I note, that if the *Vnity*, or *Diſtinction*, and nature of faith, were to be taken from the diverſity of things revealed, by one faith I ſhould believe ſpeculative verities, and by another ſuch as tend to practiſe, which I doubt whether *D. Potter* himſelfe will admit.

13 Hence it followeth, that whoſoever denieth any one main practicall revealed truth, is no leſſe an Heretique, then if he ſhould deny a Point reſting in belief alone. So that when *D. Potter*, (to avoid our argument, that all fundamentall points are not contained in the Creed, becauſe in it there is no mention of the Sacraments, which yet are points of ſo main importance, that Proteſtants make the due adminiſtration of them, to be neceſſary and eſſentiall to conſtitute a Church) anſwereth, that the *Sacraments are to be* (p) *reckoned, rather among the* Agenda *of the Church, then the* Credenda; *they are rather divine rites and ceremonies, then Doctrines*, he either grants what we affirme, or in effect ſaies, Of two kinds of revealed truths, which are neceſſary to be believed, the Creed containes one ſort only, *ergo*, it containes all kind of revealed truths neceſſary to be believed. Our queſtion is not, *de nomine* but *re*; not what be called points of faith, or of practiſe, but what points indeed be neceſſarily to be believed, whether they be termed *Agenda*, or *Credenda*: eſpecially the chiefeſt part of Chriſtian perfection conſiſting more in Action, then in barren Speculation; in good works, then bare belief; in doing, then knowing. And there are no leſſe contentions concerning practicall, then ſpeculative truths: as Sacraments, obtaining remiſſion of ſinne, Invocation of Saints, Prayers for dead, Adoration of Chriſt in the Sacrament, and many other: all which doe ſo much the more import, as on them, beſide right belief, doth alſo depend our practiſe, and the ordering of our life. Though *D. Potter* could therefore give us (as he will never be able to doe) a minute, and exact Catalogue of all truths to be believed; that would not make me able enough to know, whether or no I have faith ſufficient for ſalvation; till he alſo did bring in a particular Liſt, of all believed truths, which tend to practiſe, declaring which of them be fundamentall, which not; that ſo every man might know, whether he be not in ſome *Damnable* Errour, for ſome Article of faith, which farther might give influence into *Damnable* works.

p *Pap.* 235.

14 Theſe Obſervations being premiſed, I come to prove, that the Creed doth not contain all points of Faith neceſſary to be known and believed. And, to omit that in generall it doth not tell us, what points be fundamentall, or not fundamentall, which in the way of Proteſtants, is moſt neceſſary to be known; in particular, there is no mention of the greateſt evills, from which mans calamity proceeded, I mean, the ſinne of the Angels, of *Adam*, and of Originall ſinne in us: nor of the greateſt good from which we expect all good, to wit, the neceſſity of *Grace* for all works tending to piety. Nay, there is no mention of Angels, good, or bad. The meaning of that moſt generall head (*Oportet accedentem &c. It behoves* (q) *him that comes to God, to believe that he is, and is a remunerator,*) is queſtioned, by the denial of Merit, which makes God a Giver, but not a Rewarder. It is not expreſſed whether the Article of *Remiſſion of ſinnes* be underſtood by faith alone, or elſe may admit the efficiency of Sacraments. There is no mention of Eccleſiaſticall, Apoſtolicall, *Divine Traditions*, one way or other; or of holy Scriptures in generall

q Heb. 11. 6.

generall, and much leſſe of every book in particular; nor of the Name, Nature, Number, Effects, Matter, Forme, Miniſter, Intention, Neceſſity of Sacraments, and yet the due Adminiſtration of Sacraments, is with Proteſtants an eſſentiall Note of the Church. There is nothing for Baptiſme of Children, nor againſt Rebaptization. There is no mention in favour, or againſt the Sacrifice of the Maſſe, of Power in the Church to inſtitute Rites, Holy daies, &c. and to inflict Excommunication, or other Cenſures: of Prieſthood, Biſhops, and the whole Eccleſiaſticall Hierarchy, which are very fundamentall points; of *S. Peters* Primacy, which to *Calvin* ſeemeth a fundamentall errour; nor of the poſſibility, or impoſſibility to keep Gods commandements; of the proceſſion of the holy Ghoſt from the Father and the Sonne; of Purgatory, or Prayer for the dead, in any ſenſe: And yet D. *Potter* doth not deny, but that *Aerius* was eſteemed an Heretique, for denying (t) all ſort of Commemoration for the dead. Nothing of the Churches Viſibility or Inviſibility, Fallibility or Infallibility; nor of other points controverted betwixt Proteſtants themſeves, and between Proteſtants and Catholiques, which to D. *Potter* ſeem ſo hainous corruptions, that they cannot without damnation joyne with us in profeſſion thereof. There is no mention of the Ceſſation of the Old Law, which yet is a very main point of faith. And many other might be alſo added. (t) Pag. 351

15 But what need we labour to ſpecify particulars? There are as many important points of faith not expreſſed in the Creed, as ſince the worlds begining, now, and for all future times, there have been, are and may be innumerable, groſſe, damnable Hereſies, whoſe contrary truths are not contained in the Creed. For, every fundamentall Error muſt have a contrary fundamentall truth; becauſe of two contradictory propoſitions in the ſame degree, the one is falſe, the other muſt be true. As for example, if it be a damnable error to deny the Bl. Trinity, or the Godhead of our Saviour, the *belief* of them muſt be a truth neceſſary to Salvation; or rather, if we will ſpeak properly, the *Error* is damnable, becauſe the oppoſite *Truth* is neceſſary, as death is frightfull, becauſe life is ſweet; and according to Philoſophy, the Privation is meaſured by the Forme to which it is repugnant. If therefore the Creed contain in particular all fundamentall points of faith, it muſt explicitely, or by cleer conſequence, comprehend all truths oppoſite to innumerable Hereſies of all ages paſt, preſent, and to come, which no man in his wits will affirme it to doe. (t) Pag. 351

16 And here I cannot omit to ſignify how you (s) applaud the ſaying of D. *Vſher*. *That in thoſe propoſitions which without all controverſy are univerſally received in the whole Chriſtian world, ſo much truth is contained, as being joyned with holy Obedience, may be ſufficient to bring a man to everlaſting ſalvation; neither have we cauſe to doubt, but that as many as walk according to this Rule (neither overthrowing that which they have builded, by ſuperinducing any damnable hereſies thereupon, nor otherwiſe vitiating their holy faith, with a lewd and wicked converſation) peace ſhall be upon them, and upon the Iſrael of God.* Now D *Potter* knowes, that the Myſtery of the B. Trinity is not univerſally received in the whole Chriſtian world, as appeares in very many Heretiques, in *Polony*, *Hungary*, and *Tranſilvania*, and therefore according to this Rule of D. *Vſher*, approved by D. *Potter*, the deniall of the B. Trinity, ſhall not exclude Salvation.

17 Let me note by the way, that you might eaſily have eſpied a foul contradiction in the ſaid words of D. *Vſher*, by you recited, and ſo much applauded. For he ſuppoſeth, that a man agrees with other Churches in belief, which joyned with holy Obedience may bring him to everlaſting ſalvation, and yet, that he may *ſuperinduce damnable hereſies*. For how can he *ſuperinduce damnable hereſies*, who is ſuppoſed to believe all *Truths* neceſſary to ſalvation? Can there be any damnable hereſy, unleſſe it contradict ſome neceſſary truth, which cannot happen in one who is ſuppoſed to believe all neceſſary *Truths*? Beſides if one believing all fundamentall Articles in the Creed, may *ſuperinduce damnable hereſies*; it followeth that the fundamentall truths contrary to thoſe damnable hereſies, are not contained in the Creed.

18 According to this Modell of D. *Potters* foundation, conſiſting in the agreement of ſcarce one point of faith; what a ſtrange Church would he make of men concurring in ſome one of few Articles of belief, who yet for the reſt ſhould be holding conceits plainly contradictory: ſo patching up a Religion of men, who agree only in the Article, that Chriſt is our Saviour, but for the reſt, are like to the parts of a Chimæra; having the head of a man, the neck of a horſe, the ſhoulders of an Oxe, the foot of a Lion &c. I wrong them not herein. For in good Philoſophy there is greater repugnancy betweeen aſſent and diſſent, affirmation and negation, *eſt eſt, non non*, (eſpecially when all theſe contradictories pretend to rely upon one and the ſelfe ſame *Motive*, the infallible Truth of Almighty God) then between the integrall parts, as head, neck, &c. of a man, horſe, lion, &c. And thus Proteſtants are farre more bold to diſagree even in matters of faith, then Catholique Divines in queſtions meerely Philoſophicall, or not determined by the Church. And while thus they ſtand only upon *fundamentall* Articles, they doe by their own confeſſion deſtroy the Church, which is the *houſe of God*. For the *foundation* alone of a houſe, is not a houſe, nor can they in ſuch an imaginary Church any more expect Salvation, then the foundation alone of a houſe is fit to afford a man habitation.

19 Moreover, it is moſt evident that Proteſtants by this Chaos rather then Church, doe giue unavoidable occaſion of deſperation to poore ſoules. Let ſome one who is deſirous to ſave his ſoule repaire to D. *Potter*, who maintaines theſe grounds, to know upon whom he may rely, in a matter of ſo great conſequence; I ſuppoſe the Doctors anſwer will be: Vpon the truely Catholique Church. She cannot erre damnably. What underſtand you by the Catholique Church?

Cannot generall Councells, which are the Church *repreſentatiue*, erre? Yes, *they may weakly, or*
t *Pag.* 167. (t) *wilfully miſaply, or miſunderſtand, or neglect Scripture, and ſo erre damnably.* To whom then ſhall I goe for my particular inſtruction? I cannot confer with the united body of the whole Church about my particular difficulties, as your ſelfe affirmes, that the Catholique Church *can-*
u *Pag.* 27. *not be told* (u) *of private iniuries.* Muſt I then conſult with every particular perſon of the Catho-
w *Pag.* 150. lique Church? So it ſeemes, by what you write in theſe words: *The whole* (w) *militant Church (that is all the members of it) cannot poſſibly erre, either in the whole faith, or any neceſſary Article of it.* You ſay, M. *Doctour*, I cannot for my inſtruction acquaint the univerſall Church with my particular ſcruples: You ſay, the Prelates of Gods Church meeting in a lawfull generall Councel may erre dammably: It remaines then, that for my neceſſary inſtruction, I muſt repaire to every particular member of the univerſall Church ſpread over the face of the earth: and yet you teach
x *Pag.* 151. that *the promiſes* (x) *which our Lord hath made unto his Church for his aſſiſtance, are intended not to any particular perſons or Churches, but only to the Church Catholique*, with which (as I ſaid) it is impoſſible for me to confer. Alas! O moſt uncomfortable Ghoſtly Father, you driue me to deſperation! How ſhall I confer with every Chriſtian ſoule, man and woman, by ſea and by land, cloſe priſoner, or at liberty? &c. Yet upon ſuppoſall of this *miraculous* Pilgrimage for *Faith*, before I haue the *faith* of *Miracles*, how ſhall I proceed at our meeting? Or how ſhall I know the man on whom I may ſecurely rely? Procure (will you ſay) to know whether he belieue all fundamentall points of faith. For if he doe, his faith, for point of beliefe, is ſufficient for ſalvation, though he erre in a hundred things of leſſe moment. But how ſhall I know whether hee hold all fundamentall points or no? For till you tell me this, I cannot know whether or no his beliefe be ſound in all fundamentall points. Can you ſay the Creed? Yes, And ſo can many damnable Heretiques. But why doe you aske me this queſtion? Becauſe the Creed containes all fundamentall points of
y *Pag.* 241. faith. Are you ſure of that? not ſure: I hold it very *probable*. (y) Shall *I* hazard my ſoule on *probabilities*, or even wagers? This yeelds a new cauſe of deſpaire. But what? doth the Creed contain all points neceſſary to be believed, whether they reſt in the underſtanding, or elſe doe further extend to practiſe? No. It was compoſed to deliver *Credenda*, not *Agenda* to us; Faith, not *Practiſe*. How then ſhall I know what points of beliefe, which direct my practiſe, be neceſſary to ſalvation? Still you chalk out new paths for Deſperation. Well, are all Articles of the Creed, for their nature and matter, fundamentall? I cannot ſay ſo. How then ſhall I know which in particular be, and which be not fundamentall? Read my Anſwer to a late Popiſh Pamphlet inticuled
z *Pag.* 211. *Charity Miſtaken &c.* there you ſhall finde, that fundamentall doctrines are ſuch *Catholique Ve-*
213.214. *rities, as principally, and eſſentially pertain* (z) *to the Faith, ſuch as properly conſtitute a Church, and are neceſſary (in ordinary courſe) to be diſtinctly believed by every Chriſtian that will be ſaved. They are thoſe grand, and capitall doctrines which make up our Faith in Chriſt; that is, that common faith which is alike precious in all, being one and the ſame in the higheſt Apoſtle, and the meaneſt believer, which the Apoſtle elſe-where cals the firſt principles of the oracles of God, & the forme of ſound words.* But how ſhall I apply theſe generall definitions, or deſcriptions, or (to ſay the truth) theſe only varied words, and phraſes (for I underſtand the word, *fundamentall*, as well as the words, *principall, eſſentiall, grand, and capitall doctrines, &c.*) to the particular Articles of the Creed, in ſuch ſort, as that I may be able preciſely, exactly, particularly, to diſtinguiſh fundamentall Articles from points of leſſe moment? You labour to tell us *what* fundamentall points be, but not *which* they be: and yet unleſſe you doe this, your Doctrine ſerues only, either to make men deſpaire, or elſe to haue recourſe to thoſe whom you call Papiſts, and which giue one certain Rule, that all points defined by Chriſts viſible Church belong to the foundation of Faith, in ſuch ſenſe, as that to deny any one cannot ſtand with ſalvation. And ſeeing your ſelfe acknowledges that theſe men doe not erre in points fundamentall, I cannot but hold it moſt ſafe for me to joyn with them, for the ſecuring of my ſoule, and the avoiding of deſperation, into which this your doctrine muſt caſt all them who underſtand, and believe it. For the whole diſcourſe, and inferences which here I haue made, are either your own direct Aſſertions, or evident conſequences cleerly deduced from them.

20 But now let us anſwer ſome few Objections of D. *Potters*, againſt that which wee haue ſaid before, to avoid our argument. That the Scripture is not ſo much as mentioned in the Creed,
a *Pag.* 234. he ſaith: *The Creed is an abſtract of ſuch* (a) *neceſſary Doctrines as are delivered in Scripture*, or collected out of it; and therefore needs not expreſſe the authority of that which it ſuppoſes.

21 This anſwer makes for us. For by giving a reaſon why it was needleſſe that Scripture ſhould be expreſſed in the Creed, you grant as much as we deſire, namely that the Apoſtles judged it *needleſſe* to expreſſe all neceſſary points of faith in their Creed. Neither doth the Creed ſuppoſe, or depend on Scripture, in ſuch ſort as that we can by any probable conſequence, infer from the Articles of the Creed, that there is any Canonicall Scripture at all; and much leſſe that ſuch Books in particular be Canonicall. Yea the Creed might haue been the ſame although holy Scripture had never been written; and, which is more, the Creed even in priority of time, was before all the Scripture of the new Teſtament, except the Goſpell of *S. Mathew*. And ſo according to this reaſon of his, the Scripture ſhould not mention Articles contained in the Creed. And I note
b *Pag.* 234. in a word, how little connexion D. *Potters* arguments haue, while he tells us, that *the Creed* (b) *is an Abſtract of ſuch neceſſary doctrines as are delivered in Scripture, or collected out of it, & therefore needs not expreſſe the authority of that which it ſuppoſes*; it doth not follow: The Articles of

the

the Creed are delivered in Scripture: therefore the Creed ſuppoſeth Scripture. For two diſtinct writings may well deliver the ſame truths, and yet one of them not ſuppoſe the other, unleſſe D. *Potter* be of opinion that two Doctors cannot, *at one time*, ſpeak the ſame truth.

22 And notwithſtanding, that D. *Potter* hath now told us, it was *needleſſe* that the Creed ſhould expreſſe Scripture, whoſe *Authority it ſuppoſes*, he comes at length to ſay, that the *Nicene Fathers in their Creed confeſſing that the holy Ghoſt ſpake by the Prophets, doth thereby ſufficiently avow the divine Authority of all Canonicall Scripture*. But I would ask him, whether the *Nicene* Creed be not alſo an Abſtract of Doctrines delivered in Scripture, as he ſaid of the Apoſtles Creed, and thence did infer, that it was needleſſe to expreſſe Scripture, *whoſe authority it ſuppoſes*? Beſides, we doe not only believe in generall, that Canonicall Scripture is of divine authority but we are alſo bound under pain of damnation to believe, that ſuch and ſuch particular Books not mentioned in the *Nicene* Creed, are Canonicall. And laſtly D. *Potter* in this Anſwer grants as much as we deſire, which is, that all points of faith are not contained in the Apoſtles Creed, even as it is *explained* by other Creeds. For theſe words (*who ſpake by the Prophets*) are no waies contained in the Apoſtles Creed, and therefore contain an *Addition*, not an *Explanation* thereof.

23 But, *how can it be neceſſary* (ſaith D. *Potter*) *for any Chriſtian to haue more in his Creed then the* (c) *Apoſtles had, and the Church of their times*? I anſwer; You trifle, not diſtinguiſh between the Apoſtles beliefe, and that abridgment of ſome Articles of faith, which we call the Apoſtles *Creed*; and withall you beg the queſtion, by ſuppoſing that the Apoſtles believed no more, then is contained in their Creed, which every unlearned perſon knowes and believes: and I hope you will not deny but the Apoſtles were endued with greater knowledge then ordinarie perſons. c Pag. 221.

24 Your pretended proof out of the Acts, that the Apoſtles *revealed to the Church the whole counſell of God, keeping* (d) *back nothing*, with your gloſſe (*needfull for our ſalvation*) is no proofe, unleſſe you ſtill beg the queſtion, and doe ſuppoſe, that whatſoever the Apoſtles revealed to the Church, is contained in the Creed. And I wonder you doe not reflect that thoſe words were by S. *Paul* particularly directed to Paſtors, and Governours of the Church, as is cleere by the other words; *He called the Ancients of the Church*. And afterward: *Take heed to your ſelues, and to the whole flock wherein the holy Ghoſt hath placed you Biſhops, to rule the Church*. And your ſelfe ſay, *that more knowledge is* (e) *neceſſary in Biſhops, and Prieſts, to whom is committed the government of the Church, and the care of ſoules, then in vulgar Laicks*. Doe you think that the Apoſtles taught Chriſtians nothing but their Creed? Said they nothing of the Sacraments, Commandements, Duties of Hope, Charity, &c. d Acts 20. 27. e Pag. 244.

25 Vpon the ſame affected ambiguity is grounded your other objection: *To ſay the whole faith of thoſe times* (f) *is not contained in the Apoſtles Creed, is all one, as if a man ſhould ſay, this is not the Apoſtles Creed, but a part of it*. For the faith of the Apoſtles is not all one with that which we commonly call their Creed. Did not, I pray you, S. *Mathew*, and S. *John* believe their writings to be Canonicall Scripture? and yet their writings are not mentioned in the Creed. It is therefore more then cleere, that the Faith of the Apoſtles is of larger extent, then the Apoſtles Creed. f Pag. 225, 223.

26 To your demand, why amongſt many things of equall *neceſſity to be believed, the Apoſtles ſhould* (g) *ſo diſtinctly ſet down ſome, and be altogether ſilent of others*? I anſwer: That you muſt anſwer your own demand. For in the Creed there be divers points in their nature, not fundamentall or neceſſary to be explicitely and diſtinctly believed, as aboue wee ſhewed; why are theſe points which are not fundamentall expreſſed, rather then other of the ſame quality? Why our Saviours deſcent to Hell, and Buriall expreſſed, and not his Circumciſion, his Manifeſtation to the three Kings, working of Miracles, &c. Why did they not expreſſe Scriptures, Sacraments, and all fundamentall points of Faith tending to practiſe, as well as thoſe which reſt in beliefe? Their intention was, particularly to deliver ſuch Articles as were fitteſt for thoſe times, concerning the Deity, Trinity, and Meſſias (as heretofore I haue declared) leaving many things to be taught by the *Catholique Church*, which in the Creed we all profeſſe to believe. Neither doth it follow, as you infer, *That as well, nay better, they might haue given no Article, but that* (*of the Church*) *& ſent us to the Church for all the reſt. For in ſetting down others beſides that, and not all, they make us believe we haue all, when* (h) *we haue not all*. For by this kind of arguing, what may not be deduced? One might, quite contrary to your inference, ſay: If the Apoſtles Creed contain all points neceſſary to ſalvation, what need we any Church to teach us? and conſequently what need of the Article concerning the *Church*? What need we the Creeds of *Nice, Conſtantinople, &c.* Superfluous are your Catechiſmes, wherein beſides the Articles of the Creed, you adde divers other particulars. Theſe would be poore conſequences, and ſo is yours. But ſhall I tell you newes? For ſo you are pleaſed to eſteem it. We grant your inference, thus far: That our Saviour Chriſt referred us to his Church, by her to be taught, and by her alone. For, ſhe was before the Creed, and Scriptures; And ſhe to diſcharge this impoſed office of inſtructing us, hath delivered us the Creed, but not it alone, as if nothing elſe were to be believed. We haue beſides it, holy Scripture; we haue unwritten, Divine, Apoſtolicall, Eccleſiaſticall Traditions. It were a childiſh argument: The Creed containes not all things which are neceſſary to be believed: *Ergo*, it is not profitable. Or; The Church alone is ſufficient to teach us by ſome convenient meanes: *Ergo*, ſhe muſt teach us without all meanes, without Creeds, without Councels, without Scripture &c. If the Apoſtles had expreſſed g Pag. 223. h Pag. 223.

preſſed no Article, but that of the Catholique Church, ſhe muſt have taught us the other Articles in particular, by Creeds, or other meanes, as in fact we have even the Apoſtles Creed from the Tradition of the Church. If you will *believe you have all in the Creed, when you have not all*, it is not the Apoſtles, or the Church, that makes you ſo believe, but it is your owne errour, whereby you will needs believe, that the Creed muſt contain *all*. For neither the Apoſtles, nor the Church, nor the Creed it ſelfe tell you any ſuch matter; and what neceſſity is there, that one meanes of inſtruction, muſt involve whatſoever is contained in all the reſt? Wee are not to recite the Creed with anticipated perſwaſion, that it muſt contain what we imagin it ought, for better maintaining ſome opinions of our own; but we ought to ſay, and believe that it containes what we finde in it; of which one Article is to believe the *Catholique Church*, ſurely to be taught by her, which preſuppoſeth that we need other inſtruction beſide the Creed: and in particular we may learn of her, what points be contained in the Creed, what otherwiſe; and ſo we ſhall not be deceaved, by believing we haue all in the Creed, when we have not all: and you may in the ſame manner ſay: *As well, nay better, the Apoſtles might haue given us no Articles* at all, as haue left our Articles tending to practiſe. For in ſetting down one ſort of Articles, and not the other, *they make us believe we haue all, when we haue not all.*

27 To our argument, that Baptiſme is not contained in the Creed, D. *Potter*, beſides his anſwer, that Sacraments belong rather to practiſe then faith, (which I haue already confuted, and which indeed maketh againſt himſelfe, and ſerveth only to ſhew that the Apoſtles intended not to comprize all points in the Creed which we are bound to believe) adds, that the *Creed of* (i) *Nice expreſſed Baptiſme by name, confeſſe one Baptiſme for the remiſſion of ſinnes*. Which anſwer is directly againſt himſelfe, and manifeſtly proues that Baptiſme is an Article of faith, and yet is not contained in the Apoſtles Creed, neither explicitely, nor by any neceſſary conſequence from other Articles expreſſed therein. If to make it an Article of faith be ſufficient that it is contained in the Nicene Councell; he will finde that Proteſtants maintain many errours againſt faith, as being repugnant to definitions of Generall Councels: as in particular, that the very Councell of *Nice* (which ſaith M. *Whitgift*, (k) *is of all wiſe and learned men reverenced, eſteemed and imbraced, next unto the Scriptures themſelues*) decreed that, *to thoſe who were choſen to the Miniſtry unmarried, it was not lawfull to take any wife afterward*, is affirmed by Proteſtants. And your grand Reformer *Luther* (*lib. de Conciliis part. prima*) ſaith, that he underſtands not the Holy Ghoſt in that Councell. For in one Canon it ſaith that thoſe who haue gelded themſelues are not fit to be made Prieſts, in another it forbids them to haue wiues. *Hath* (ſaith he) *the Holy Ghoſt nothing to doe in Councells, but to binde, and load his Miniſters with impoſſible, dangerous, and unneceſſary lawes?* I forbeare to ſhew that this very Article, *I confeſſe one Baptiſme for the Remiſſion of ſinnes*, will be underſtood by Proteſtants in a far different ſenſe from Catholiques, yea Proteſtants among themſelues doe not agree, how Baptiſme forgiues ſinnes, nor what grace it conferres. Only concerning the Vnity of Baptiſme againſt rebaptization of ſuch as were once baptized (which I noted as a point not contained in the Apoſtles Creed) I cannot omit an excellent place of S. *Auguſtine*, where ſpeaking of the Donatiſts he hath theſe words. *They are ſo bold as* (l) *to rebaptize Catholiques, wherein they ſhew themſelues to be the greater Heretiques, ſince it hath pleaſed the univerſall Catholique Church not to make Baptiſme void even in the very Heretiques themſelues.* In which few words this holy Father delivereth againſt the Donatiſts theſe points which doe alſo make againſt Proteſtants: That to make an Hereſie, or an Heretique, knowvn for ſuch, it is ſufficient, to oppoſe the definition of Gods Church: That a propoſition may be Hereticall though it be not repugnant to any Texts of Scripture. For S. *Auguſtine* teacheth that the doctrine of rebaptization, is hereticall, and yet acknowledgeth it cannot be convinced for ſuch out of Scripture. And that neither the Hereſie of rebaptization of thoſe who were baptized by Heretiques, nor the contrary Catholique truth being expreſſed in the Apoſtles Creed, it followeth that it doth not contain all points of faith neceſſary to ſalvation. And ſo we muſt conclude that to believe the *Creed* is not ſufficient for Vnitie of faith, and Spirit in the ſame Church, unleſſe there be alſo a totall agreement both in *beliefe* of other points of faith, and in *externall profeſſion*, and Communion alſo (whereof we are to ſpeak in the next Chapter) according to the ſaying of S. *Auguſtine*: *You are* (m) *with us in Baptiſme, and in the Creed, but in the Spirit of Vnity, and bond of peace, and laſtly in the Catholique Church you are not with us.*

i *Pag.* 237.

k In his defence. page 330.

l *Lib. de Hereſ. in* 69.

m *Aug. ep.* 48.

THE

THE ANSVVER TO THE FOVRTH CHAPTER.

Wherein is ſhewed, that the Creed containes all neceſſary points of meere belief.

1 AND. §. 1.2.3.4.5.6. Concerning the Creeds containing the Fundamentalls of Chriſtianity, this is D. *Potters* aſſertion, delivered in the 207. p. of his book. *The Creed of the Apoſtles (as it is explained in the latter Creeds of the Catholique Church) is esteemed a ſufficient ſummary or Catalogue of Fundamentalls, by the beſt learned Romaniſts and by Antiquity.*

2 By *Fundamentalls* he underſtands *not the Fundamentall rules of good life and action,* (though every one of theſe is to be believed to come from God, & therefore vertually includes an Article of Faith;) but the Fundamentall *doctrines of Faith*; ſuch, as though they have influence upon our lives, as every eſſentiall doctrine of Chriſtianity hath, yet we are commanded to believe them, and not to doe them. The aſſent of our underſtandings is required to them, but no obedience from our wills.

3 But theſe ſpeculative Doctrines again he diſtinguiſhes out of *Aquinas*, *Occham*, and *Canus* and others, into two kinds: of the firſt are thoſe which are the *obiects of Faith, in, and for themſelves*, which by their own nature and Gods prime intention, are eſſentiall parts of that Goſpell: ſuch as the teachers in the Church, cannot without Mortall ſinne omit to teach the learners: ſuch as are intrinſecall to the Covenant between God and man; and not only plainly revealed by God, and ſo *certain* truths, but alſo commanded to be preacht to all men, and to be believed diſtinctly by all, and ſo *neceſſary truths*. Of the ſecond ſort are *Accidentall*, *Circumſtantiall*, *Occaſionall* objects of faith; milliõs whereof there are in holy Scripture; ſuch as are to be believed, not for themſelves, but becauſe they are joyned with others, that are neceſſary to be believed, and delivered by the ſame Authority which delivered theſe. Such as we are not bound to know to bee divine Revelations, (for without any fault we may be ignorant hereof, nay believe the contrary;) ſuch as we are not bound to examine, whether or no they be divine Revelations: ſuch as Paſtors are not bound to teach their Flock, nor their Flock bound to know and remember: no nor the Paſtors themſelves to know them or believe them, or not to disbelieve them abſolutely and alwaies; but then only when they doe ſee, and know them to be delivered in Scripture, as divine Revelations.

4 I ſay when they doe ſo, and not only when they may doe. For to lay an obligation upon us of believing, or not disbelieving any Verity, ſufficient Revelation on Gods part, is not ſufficient: For then ſeeing all the expreſſe Verities of Scripture are either to all men, or at leaſt

to all learned men ſufficiently revealed by God, it ſhould be a damnable ſinne, in any learned man actually to disbelieve any one particular Hiſtoricall verity contained in Scripture, or to believe the contradiction of it, though he knew it not to be there contained. For though he did not, yet he might have known it; it being plainly revealed by God, and this revelation being extant in ſuch a Book, wherein he might have found it recorded, if with diligence he had peruſed it. To make therefore any points neceſſary to be believed, it is requiſite, that either we actually know them to be divine Revelations: and theſe though they be not Articles of faith, nor neceſſary to be believed, in and for themſelves, yet indirectly, and by accident, and by conſequence, they are ſo: The neceſſity of believing them, being inforced upon us, by a neceſſity of believing this Eſſentiall, and Fundamentall article of Faith, *That all Divine Revelations are true*, which to disbelieve, or not to believe, is for any Chriſtian not only impious, but impoſſible. Or elſe it is requiſite that they be, Firſt actually revealed by God. Secondly, commanded under pain of damnation, to be particularly known (I mean known to be divine Revelations,) and diſtinctly to be believed. And of this latter ſort of ſpeculative divine Verities, *D. Potter* affirmed, *that the Apoſtles Creed was a ſufficient ſummary*: yet he affirmed it, not as his own opinion, but as the doctrine of the *ancient Fathers, and your own Doctors*. And beſides, he affirmed it not as abſolutely certain, but very probable.

5 In brief, all that he ſaies is this: It is *very probable, that according to the judgement of the Roman Doctors, and the Ancient Fathers, the Apoſtles Creed is to be eſteemed a ſufficient ſummary of all thoſe doctrines which being meerely* Credenda, *and not* Agenda, *all men are ordinarily, under pain of Damnation, bound particularly to believe.*

6 Now *this aſſertion* (you ſay) *is neither pertinent to the queſtion in hand, nor in it ſelfe true.* Your Reaſons to prove it *impertinent*, put into forme and diveſted of impertinencies are theſe. 1. *Becauſe the queſtion was not, what points were neceſſary to be explicitly believed, but what points were neceſſary not to be disbelieved after ſufficient propoſall. And therefore to give a Catalogue of points, neceſſary to be explicitly believed is impertinent.*

7 *Secondly, becauſe errours may be damnable, though the contrary truths be not of themſelves fundamentall; as that Pontius Pilate was our Saviours Iudge, is not in it ſelfe a Fundamentall truth, yet to believe the contrary were a damnable errour. And therefore to give a Catalogue of Truths in themſelves fundamentall, is no pertinent ſatisfaction to this demand, what errors are damnable?*

8 *Thirdly, becauſe if the Church be not Vniverſally infallible, wee cannot ground any certainty upon the Creed, which we muſt receive upon the Credit of the Church: and if the Church be Vniverſally infallible, it is damnable to oppoſe her declaration in any thing, though not contained in the Creed.*

9 *Fourthly, Becauſe not to believe the Articles of the Creed in the true ſenſe is damnable, therefore it is frivolous to ſay the Creed containes*

all

all Fundamentalls, without ſpecifying in what ſenſe the Articles of it are Fundamentall.

10 *Fifthly, becauſe the Apoſtles Creed (as D. Potter himſelfe confeſſes) was not a ſufficient Catalogue, till it was explained by the firſt Councell; nor then untill it was declared in the ſecond &c. by occaſion of emergent Hereſies: Therefore now alſo as new Hereſies may ariſe, it will need particular explanation, and ſo is not yet, nor ever will be a compleat Catalogue of Fundamentalls.*

11 Now to the firſt of theſe objections I ſay: Friſt, that your diſtinction between points neceſſary to be believed, and neceſſary not to be disbelieved, is more ſubtill then ſound, a diſtinction without a difference: There being no point neceſſary to be believed, which is not neceſſary not to be disbelieved: Nor no point to any man, at any time, in any circumſtances neceſſary not to be disbelieved, but it is to the ſame man, at the ſame time, in the ſame circumſtances, neceſſary to be believed. Yet that which (I believe) you would have ſaid, I acknowledge true, that many points which are not neceſſary to be believed abſolutely, are yet neceſſary to be believed upon a ſuppoſition, that they are known to be revealed by God: that is, become then neceſſary to be believed, when they are known to be Divine Revelations. But then I muſt needs ſay, you doe very ſtrangely, in ſaying, that *the queſtion was, what points might lawfully be disbelieved, after ſufficient Propoſition that they are divine Revelations.* You affirme, that none may; and ſo doe ſ *D. Potter*, and with him all Proteſtants, and all Chriſtians. And how then is this the queſtion? Who ever ſaid or thought, that of Divine Revelations, known to be ſo, ſome might ſafely and lawfully be rejected, and disbelieved, under pretence that they are not Fundamentall? Which of us ever taught, that it was not damnable, either to deny, or ſo much as doubt of the Truth of any thing, whereof we either know, or believe that God hath revealed it? What Proteſtant ever taught that it was not damnable, either to give God the lye, or to call his Veracity into queſtion? Yet you ſay, *The demand of Charity miſtaken was, & it was moſt reaſonable, that a liſt of Fundamẽtalls, ſhould be given, the denyall whereof deſtroies Salvation, whereas the deniall of other points may ſtand with Salvation, although both kinds be equally propoſed, as revealed by God.*

12 Let the Reader peruſe *Charity Miſtaken*, & he ſhall find that this qualification, *although both kinds of points be equally propoſed as revealed by God*, is your addition, and no part of the demand. And if it had, it had been moſt unreaſonable, ſeeing he and you know well enough, that (though we doe not preſently without examination, fall down and worſhip all your Churches propoſals, as divine Revelations) yet, we make no ſuch diſtinction of known divine Revelations, as if ſome only of them were neceſſary to be believed, and the reſt might ſafely be rejected. So that to demand a particular minute Catalogue of all points that may not be disbelieved after ſufficient Propoſition, is indeed to demaund a Catalogue of all points that are or may be, in as much as none may be disbelieved, after ſufficient Propoſition, that it

is a divine Revelation. At leaſt it is to deſire us, Firſt, to tranſcribe into this catalogue, every Text of the whole Bible. Secondly, to ſet down diſtinctly, thoſe innumerous millions of negative and poſitive conſequences, which may be evidently deduced from it: For theſe we ſay, God hath revealed. And indeed you are not aſhamed in plain tearmes to require this of us. For having firſt told us, *that the demand was, what points were neceſſary not to be disbelieved, after ſufficient propoſition that they are Divine Truths*: you come to ſay, *Certainly the Creed containes not all theſe.* And this you prove by asking, *how many Truths are there in holy Scripture, not contained in the Creed, which we are not bound to know and believe, but are bound under pain of damnation not to reject, as ſoon as we come to know that they are found in holy Scripture?* So that in requiring a particular Catalogue of all points, not to be disbelieved, after ſufficient Propoſall, you require us to ſet you down all points contained in Scripture, or evidently deducible from it. And yet this you are pleas'd to call a *reaſonable*, nay, *a moſt reaſonable Demand*: whereas having ingaged your ſelfe to give a Catalogue of your Fundamentalls, you conceive your ingagement very well ſatisfyed by ſaying, *all is Fundamentall which the Church propoſes*, without going about, to give us an endleſſe Inventory of her Propoſalls. And therefore from us, in ſtead of a perfect particular of Divine Revelations of all ſorts, (of which with a leſſe hyperbole then S. *John* uſeth, we might ſay, *If they were to be written, the world would not hold the books that muſt be written*;) me thinkes you ſhould accept of this generall, All Divine Revelations are true, and to be believed.

13 The very truth is, the main Queſtion in this buſineſſe is not, *what divine Revelations are neceſſary to be believed, or not rejected when they are ſufficiently propoſed*: for all without exception, all without queſtion are ſo; But *what Revelations are ſimply and abſolutely neceſſary to be propoſed to the beliefe of Chriſtians, ſo that that Society, which does propoſe, and indeed believe them, hath for matter of Faith, the eſſence of a true Church; that which does not, has not.* Now to this queſtion, though not to yours, *D. Potter's* aſſertion (if it be true) is apparently very pertinent. And though not a full and totall ſatisfaction to it, yet very effectuall, and of great moment towards it. For the main queſtion being, what points are neceſſary to Salvation: and points neceſſary to Salvation, being of two ſorts, ſome of *ſimple belief*, ſome of *Practiſe and obedience*, he that gives you a ſufficient ſummary, of the firſt ſort of neceſſary points, hath brought you halfe way towards your journies end. And therefore that which he does, is no more to be ſlighted, as vain and impertinent, then an Architects work is to be thought impertinent towards the making of a houſe, becauſe he does it not all himſelfe. Sure I am, if his aſſertion be true, as I believe it is, a corollary may preſently be deduced from it, which if it were imbraced, cannot in all reaſon, but doe infinite ſervice, both to the truth of Chriſt, and the peace of Chriſtendome. For ſeeing falſehood and errour could not long ſtand againſt the power of truth, were they not ſupported by tyranny and worldly advantages, he that could aſſert

Chriſtians

Chriſtians to that liberty which Chriſt and his Apoſtles left them, muſt needs doe Truth a moſt Heroicall ſervice. And ſeeing the over-valuing of the differences among Chriſtians, is one of the greateſt maintainers of the Schiſme of Chriſtendome, he that could demonſtrate that only theſe points of Beliefe, are ſimply neceſſary to ſalvation, wherein Chriſtians generally agree, ſhould he not lay a very faire and firme foundation of the peace of Chriſtendome? Now the Corollary which I conceive would produce theſe good effects, and which flowes naturally from D. *Potters* Aſſertion, is this, *That what Man or Church ſoever beleeves the Creed, and all the evident conſequences of it ſincerely and heartily, cannot poſſibly (if alſo he beleeve the Scripture) be in any Errour of ſimple beleife which is offenſiue to God; nor therefore deſerve for any ſuch Errour to be deprived of his life, or to be cut off from the Churches Communion, and the hope of Salvation.* And the production of this againe would be this (which highly concernes the Church of Rome to think of,) *That whatſoever Man or Church does for any errour of ſimple beleife, depriue any man ſo qualified as aboue, either of his temporall life, or liuelyhood or liberty, or of the Churches Communion, and hope of ſalvation, is for the firſt vniuſt, cruell, and tyrannous: Schiſmaticall, preſumptuous, and uncharitable for the ſecond.*

13 Neither yet is this (as you pretend) to take away the neceſſity of beleeving thoſe verities of Scripture, which are not contained in the Creed, when once we come to know that they are written in Scripture, but rather to lay a neceſſity upon men of beleeving all things written in Scripture, when once they know them to be there written. For he that beleeves not all knowne Divine Revelations to be true, how does he believe in God? Vnleſſe you will ſay, that the ſame man, at the ſame time may not believe God, and yet believe in him. The greater difficulty is, how it will not take away the neceſſity of beleeving Scripture to be the word of God? But that it will not neither. For though the Creed be granted a ſufficient ſummary of *Articles of meere Faith*, yet no man pretends that it containes the *Rules of obedience*, but for them, all men are referred to Scripture. Beſides, he that pretends to believe in God, obligeth himſelfe to beleeve it neceſſary to obey that which reaſon aſſures him to be the Will of God. Now reaſon will aſſure him that beleeves the Creed, that it is the Will of God he ſhould beleeve the Scripture: even the very ſame Reaſon which moves him to beleeve the Creed: Vniverſall, and never failing Tradition, having given this Teſtimony both to Creed and Scripture, that they both by the works of God were ſealed, & teſtified to be the words of God. And thus much be ſpoken in Anſwere to your firſt Argument; the length whereof will be the more excuſable, If I oblige my ſelf to ſay but little to the Reſt.

14 I come then *to your ſecond.* And in Anſwer to it, denie flatly, as a thing deſtructive of it ſelf, that any Errour can be damnable, unleſſe it be repugnant immediatly or mediatly, directly or indirectly, of it ſelf or by accident, to ſome Truth for the matter of it fundamentall. And to your example of *Pontius Pilat's being Iudge of Chriſt*, I ſay the

deniall of it in him that knowes it to be revealed by God, is manifeſtly deſtructive of this fundamentall truth, that *all Divine Revelations are true*. Neither will you find any errour ſo much as by accident damnable, but the rejecting of it will be neceſſarily laid upon us, by a reall beleif of all Fundamentals, and ſimply neceſſary Truths. And I deſire you would reconcile with this, that which you have ſaid § 15. *Every Fundamentall Errour muſt have a contrary Fundamentall Truth, becauſe, of two Contradictory propoſitions, in the ſame degree, the one is falſe, the other muſt be true, &c.*

15 *To the Third* I Anſwer; That the certainty I have of the Creed, That it was from the Apoſtles, and containes the principles of Faith, I ground it not upon Scripture, and yet not upon the Infallibility of any preſent, much leſſe of your Church, but upon the Authority of the Ancient Church, and written Tradition, which (as D. *Potter* hath proved) gave this conſtant Teſtimony unto it. Beſides I tell you, it is guilty of the ſame fault which D. *Potter's* Aſſertion is here accuſed of: having perhaps ſome colour toward the proving it falſe, but none at all to ſhew it impertinent.

16 *To the Fourth*, I Anſwer plainly thus, That you finde fault with D. *Potter* for his Vertues: you are offended with him for not uſurping the Authority which he hath not; in a word for not playing the *Pope*. Certainly if Proteſtants be faulty in this matter, it is for doing it too much, and not too little. This preſumptuous impoſing of the ſenſes of men upon the words of God, the ſpeciall ſenſes of men upon the generall words of God, and laying them upon mens conſciences together, under the equall penaltie of death, and damnation; this Vaine conceit that we can ſpeak of the things of God, better then in the word of God: This Deifying our owne Interpretations, and Tyrannous inforcing them upon others; This reſtraining of the word of God from that latitude and generality, and the underſtandings of men from that liberty, wherein Chriſt and the Apoſtles left them, [a] is, and hath been the only fountaine of all the Schiſmes of the Church, and that which makes them immortall the common incendiary of Chriſtendome, and that which (as I ſaid before) teares into pieces, not the coat, but the bowels, and members of Chriſt: *Ridente Turcâ nec dolente Iudæo*. Take away theſe Wals of ſeparation, and all will quickly be one. Take away this *Perſecuting, Burning, Curſing, Damning* of men for not ſubſcribing to the *words of men*, as the words of God; Require of Chriſtians only to believe Chriſt, and to call no man maſter but him only; Let thoſe leave claiming Infallibility that have no title to it, and let them that in their words diſclaime it, diſclaime it likewiſe in their actions; In a word, take away tyranny, which is the Divels inſtrument to ſupport errours, and ſuperſtitions, and impieties, in the ſeverall parts of the world, which could not otherwiſe long withſtand the power of Truth, I ſay take away tyranny, and reſtore Chriſtians to their juſt and full liberty of captivating their underſtanding to Scripture only, and as Rivers when they have a free paſſage, runne all to the Ocean, ſo it may well be hoped by Gods bleſſing, that Vniverſall

[a] This perſwaſion is no ſingularity of mine, but the doctrine which I have learn't from Divines of great learning and judgement. Let the Reader be pleaſed to peruſe the ſeaventh booke of *Acontius de Stratag. Satanæ*. And *Zanchius* his laſt *Oration* delivered by him after the compoſing of the diſcord between him and *Amerbachius*, and he ſhall confeſſe as much.

ſall Liberty thus moderated, may quickly reduce Chriſtendome to Truth and Vnitie. Theſe thoughts of peace (I am perſwaded) may come from the God of peace, and to his bleſſing I commend them, and proceed.

18 *Your fift and laſt obiection* ſtands upon a falſe and dangerous ſuppoſition: That *new Hereſies may ariſe*. For an Hereſie being in it ſelfe nothing elſe but a Doctrine Repugnant to ſome Article of the Chriſtian Faith, to ſay that new Hereſies may ariſe, is to ſay, that new Articles of Faith may ariſe: and ſo ſome great ones among you ſtick not to profeſſe in plaine tearmes, who yet at the ſame time are not aſhamed to pretend that your whole Doctrine is Catholique and Apoſtolique. So *Salmeron*: *Non omnibus omnia dedit Deus, ut qualibet ætas ſuis gaudeat veritatibus, quas prior ætas ignoravit. God hath not given all things to All: So that every age hath its proper verities, which the former age was ignorant of*: Diſp. 57. In Ep. ad *Rom*: And againe in the Margent: *Habet Vnumquodq; ſæculum peculiares revelationes divinas, Every age hath its peculiar Divine Revelations*. Where that he ſpeaks of ſuch Revelations as are, or may by the Church be made matters of Faith, no man can doubt that reads him; an example whereof, he gives us a litle before in theſe words. *Vnius Auguſtini doctrina Aſſumptionis B. Deiparæ cultum in Eccleſiam introduxit. The Doctrine of Auguſtine only, hath brought in to the Church the Worſhip of the Aſſumption of the Mother of God. &c.* Others againe mince and palliate the matter with this pretence, that your Church undertakes not to coyne new Articles of faith, but only to declare thoſe that want ſufficient declaration. But if ſufficient declaration be neceſſary to make any doctrine an Article of Faith, then this doctrine which before wanted it, was not before an Article of faith; and your Church by giving it the Eſſentiall forme, and laſt complement of an Article of faith, makes it, though not a Truth, yet certainly an Article of faith. But I would faine know, whether Chriſt and his Apoſtles knew this Doctrine, which you pretend hath the matter, but wants the forme of an Article of faith, that is, *ſufficient declaration*, whether they knew it to be a neceſſary Article of the faith, or no! If they knew it not to be ſo; then either they taught what they knew not, which were very ſtrange; or elſe they taught it not: and if not, I would gladly be informed, ſeeing you pretend to no new Revelations, from whom you learn't it? If they knew it, then either they conceal'd or declar'd it. To ſay they conceal'd any neceſſary part of the Goſpell, is to charge them with farre greater ſacriledge, then what was puniſhed in *Ananias* and *Saphira*. It is to charge theſe glorious Stewards, and diſpenſers of the Myſteries of Chriſt, with want of the great vertue requiſite in a Steward, which is *Fidelity*. It is to charge them with preſumption for denouncing Anathema's, even to Angels, in caſe they ſhould teach any other doctrine, then what they had received from thē, which ſure could not merit an Anathema, if they left any neceſſary part of the Goſpell untaught. It is in a word, in plaine tearmes to give them the lye, ſeeing they profeſſe plainly and frequently, that they taught Chriſtians *the whole doctrine of Chriſt*. If they did know

and

and declare it, then was it a full and formall Article of faith; and the contrary a full and formall Hereſie, without any need of further declaration: and then their Succeſſours either continued the declaration of it, or diſcontinued: If they did the latter, how are they ſuch faithfull depoſitaries of Apoſtolique Doctrine as you pretend? Or what aſſurance can you give us, that they might not bring in new and falſe Articles, as well as ſuffer the old and true ones to be loſt? If they did continue the declaration of it, and deliver it to their Succeſſours, and they to theirs, and ſo on perpetually, then continued it ſtill a full and formall Article of faith, and the repugnant doctrine a full and formall Hereſie, without and before the definition or declaration of a Councell. So that Councells, as they cannot make that a truth or falſhood, which before was not ſo: ſo neither can they make or declare that to be an Article of Faith, or an Hereſie, which before was not ſo. The ſuppoſition therefore on which this argument ſtands, being falſe and ruinous, whatſoever is built upon it, muſt together with it fall to the ground. This explication therefore, and reſtriction of this doctrine, (whereof you make your advantage) was to my underſtanding unneceſſary. The Fathers of the Church in after times might have juſt cauſe to declare their judgmẽt, touching the ſenſe of ſome generall Articles of the Creed: but to oblige others to receave their declarations under paine of damnation, what warrant they had I know not. He that can ſhew, either that the Church of all Ages was to have this Authority; or that it continued in the Church for ſome Ages, and then expired: He that can ſhew either of theſe things let him: for my part I cannot. Yet I willingly confeſſe the judgment of a Councell, though not infallible, is yet ſo farre directive, and obliging, that without apparent reaſon to the contrary, it may be ſinne to reject it, at leaſt not to afford it an outward ſubmiſſion for publique peace-ſake.

19 *Ad* § 7. 8. 9. Were I not peradventure more fearefull then I need to be of the imputation of tergiverſation, I might very eaſily rid my hands of the remainder of this Chapter: For in the Queſtion there diſcuſſed, you grant (for ought I ſee) as much as D. *Potter* deſires; and D. *Potter* grants as much as you deſire, and therefore that I ſhould diſeaſe my ſelf, or my Reader with a punctuall examination of it, may ſeeme ſuperfluous. Firſt, that which you would have, and which your Arguments wholy drive at, is this, That *the Creed doth not containe all maine and principall poynts of faith of all ſorts, whether they be ſpeculacive, or practicall*, whether they containe matter of ſimple beleife, or whether they containe matter of practiſe and obedience. This D. *Potter* grants, *page* 215. 235. And you grant that he grants it, §. 8. Where your words are, *as even by* D. *Potters owne confeſſion, it (the Creed) doth not comprehend Agenda, or things belonging to practice, as Sacraments, Commandements, the Acts of hope, and duties Charity.* And if you will inferre from hence, that therefore *C. M.* hath no reaſon to reſt in the Apoſtles Creed, as a perfect Catalogue of Fundamentalls, and a full ſatisfaction to his demande, I haue without any offence of D. *Potter*, granted as much, if that would content you. But ſeeing you goe

goe on, and becauſe his aſſertion is not (as neither is it pretended to be,) a totall ſatisfaction to the demand, caſheere it as impertinent, and nothing towards it, here I have been bold to ſtop your proceeding, as unjuſt and unreaſonable. For as if you ſhould requeſt a Friend to lend you, or demand of a debtor to pay you a hundred pounds, and he could or ſhould let you have but fifty, this were not fully to ſatisfy your demand, yet ſure it were not to doe nothing towards it: Or as this rejoynder of mine, though it be not an anſwer to all your Bookes, but only to the Firſt conſiderable Part of it, and ſo much of the Second as is materiall, and falls into the firſt, yet I hope you will not deal ſo unkindly with me, as for this reaſon, to condemne it of impertinence: So *D. Potter*, being demanded a Catalogue of Fundamentals of Faith, and finding them of two kinds, and thoſe of one kind ſumm'd up to his hand in the Apoſtles Creed, and this Creed confign'd unto him for ſuch a ſummary by very great Authority, if upon theſe conſiderations he hath intreated his Demander to accept of thus much in part of paiment, of the Apoſtles Creed, as a ſufficient ſummary of theſe Articles of faith, which are *meerely Credenda*, me thinkes he hath little reaſon to complain, that he hath not been fairely, and ſquarely dealt with. Eſpecially, ſeeing for full ſatisfaction, by *D. Potter* and all Proteſtants he is referr'd to Scripture, which we affirme containes evidently all neceſſary points of Faith and rules of obedience: and ſeeing *D. Potter*, in the very place hath ſubjoyned, though not a Catalogue of Fundamentalls, which (becauſe to ſome more is Fundamentall, to others leſſe, to others nothing at all) had been impoſſible, yet ſuch a comprehenſion of them, as may ſerve every one, that will make a conſcionable uſe of it, in ſtead of a Catalogue. For thus he ſaies, *It ſeemes to be fundamentall to the faith, and for the Salvation of every member of the Church, that he acknowledge and believe all ſuch points of faith, whereof he may be ſufficiently convinced that they belong to the Doctrine of Ieſus Chriſt.* This generall rule if I ſhould call a Catalogue of Fundamentalls, I ſhould have a Preſident for it with you above exception, I mean your Self; for, *ch.*3.§.19. juſt ſuch another propoſition you have called by this name. Yet becauſe it were a ſtrange figure of ſpeech, I forbear it; only I will be bold to ſay, that this Aſſertion is as good a Catalogue of Fundamentalls, as any you will bring of your Church propoſalls, though you take as much time to doe it, as he that undertook to make an Aſſe ſpeak.

20 I come now to ſhew that you alſo have requited *D. Potter* with a mutuall courteous acknowledgement of his aſſertion, That the Creed is a ſufficient ſummary of all the neceſſary Articles of Faith, which are meerely *Credenda*.

21 Firſt then, §.8. you haue theſe words, *That it cannot be denied that the Creed is moſt full and compleat to that purpoſe, for which the holy Apoſtles, inſpired by God, meant that it ſhould ſerve, and in that manner as they did intend it, which was, not to comprehend all particular points of faith, but ſuch generall heads as were moſt befitting and requiſite for preaching the faith of Chriſt, to Iewes and Gentiles, and might be*

briefly, and compendiously ſet down, and eaſily learnt and remembred. Theſe words I ſay, being fairely examined, without putting them on the rack, will amount, to a full acknowledgement of *D. Potters* Aſſertion. But before I put them to the queſtion, I muſt crave thus much right of you, to grant me this moſt reaſonable poſtulate, that the doctrine of *repentance from dead workes*, which S. *Paul* ſaith, was one of the two only things which he preacht, and the doctrine *of Charity, without which* (the ſame S. *Paul* aſſures us that) *the knowledge of all myſteries, and all faith is nothing*, were doctrines more neceſſary and requiſite, and therefore more fit to be preacht to Iewes and Gentiles, then theſe, *under what judge our Saviour ſuffered*, that *he was buried*, and *what time he roſe again*: which you have taught us cap. 3. §. 2. *for their matter and nature in themſelves not to be Fundamentall.*

22. And upon this grant, I will aske no leave to conclude, that, whereas you ſay, *the Apoſtles Creed was intended for a comprehenſion, of ſuch heads of faith, as were moſt befitting and requiſite, for preaching the faith of Chriſt, &c.* You are now, for fear, of too much debaſing thoſe high doctrines of Repentance and Charity, to reſtrain your aſſertion, as *D. Potter* does his, and (though you ſpeak indefinitely) to ſay you meant it, only of thoſe heads of faith, which are *meerely Credenda.* And then the meaning of it, (if it have any,) muſt be this, That the Creed is full for the Apoſtles intent, which was to comprehend all ſuch generall heads of faith, which being points of *ſimple belief*, were moſt fit and requiſite, to be preached to Iewes & Gentiles, and might be briefly and compendiouſly ſet down, and eaſily learned and remembred. Neither I nor you, I believe, can make any other ſenſe of your words then this. And upon this ground thus I ſubſume. But all the points of belief, which were neceſſary, under pain of damnation, for the Apoſtles to preach, and for thoſe to whom the Goſpell was preached, particularly to know and believe, were moſt fit and requiſite, nay more then ſo, neceſſary to be preached to all both Iewes and Gentiles, and might be briefly and compendiouſly ſet down, and eaſily learnt and remembred: Therefore the Apoſtles intent by your confeſſion was in this Creed, to comprehend all ſuch points. And you ſay, *the Creed is moſt full and compleat, for the purpoſe which they intended.* The Major of this Syllogiſme is your own. The Minor I ſhould think needs no proof, yet becauſe all men may not be of my mind, I will prove it by its parts; and the firſt part thus,

There is the ſame neceſſity, for the doing of theſe things, which are commanded to be done, by the ſame Authority, under the ſame penalty:

But the ſame Authority *viz.* Divine, under the ſame penalty, to wit, of damnation, commanded the Apoſtles, to preach all theſe Doctrines which we ſpeak of, and thoſe to whom they were preached, particularly to know and believe them: For we ſpeak of thoſe only, which were ſo commanded, to be preached and believed:

Therefore all theſe points were alike neceſſary to be preached to all both Iewes and Gentiles. Now

Now that all theſe doctrines we ſpeak of, may be briefly and compendiouſly ſet down, and eaſily learned and remembred, He that remembers, that we ſpake only of ſuch Doctrines as are neceſſary to be taught and learned, will require hereof no farther demonſtration. For, (not to put you in minde of what the Poet ſaies, *Non ſunt longa quibus nihil eſt quod demere poſſis,*) who ſees not, that ſeeing the greateſt part of men are of very mean capacities, that it is neceſſary that that may be learnt eaſily, which is to be learn't of all? What then can hinder me from concluding thus,

All the Articles of ſimple belief, which are fit and requiſite to be preached, and may eaſily be remembred, are by your confeſſion comprized in the Creed:

But all the neceſſary Articles of faith are requiſite to be preached, and eaſy to be remembred;

Therefore they are all comprized in the Creed?

Secondly, from grounds granted by you, I argue thus,

Points of belief in themſelves fundamentall, are more requiſite to be preached then thoſe which are not ſo: (this is evident.)

But the Apoſtles have put into their Creed ſome points that are not in themſelves Fundamentall: (ſo you confeſſe, *ubi ſupra.*)

Therefore if they have put in all, moſt requiſite to be preached, they have put in all, that in themſelves are fundamentall.

Thirdly and Laſtly, from your own words §. 26. thus I conclude my purpoſe,

The Apoſtles intention was, particularly to deliver in the Creed ſuch Articles as were fitteſt for thoſe times, concerning the Deity, Trinity, and Meſſias; (Thus you, now I ſubſume,)

But all points ſimply neceſſary, by vertue of Gods command, to be preached and believed in particular, were as fit for thoſe times as theſe here mentioned;

Therefore their intention was, to deliver in it particularly all the neceſſary points of belief.

23 And certainly, he that conſiders the matter adviſedly, either muſt ſay that the Apoſtles were not the Authors of it, or that this was their deſigne in compoſing it, or that they had none at all. For whereas you ſay, *their intent was, to comprehend in it, ſuch generall heads as were moſt befitting and requiſite for preaching the faith;* and elſewhere, *Particularly to deliver ſuch Articles as were fitteſt for thoſe times;* Every wiſe man may eaſily ſee that your deſire here was, to eſcape away in a cloud of indefinite termes. For otherwiſe, in ſtead of ſuch generall heads, and ſuch Articles, why did not you ſay plainly, all ſuch, or ſome ſuch? This had been plain dealing, but I fear, croſſe to your deſigne: which yet you have failed of. For that which you have ſpoken (though you are loath to ſpeak out,) either ſignifies nothing at all; or that which I and *D. Potter* affirme: *viz.* That the Apoſtles Creed containes all thoſe points of belief, which were by Gods command, of neceſſity to be preached to all, and believed by all. Neither when I ſay ſo, would I be ſo miſtaken, as if I ſaid, that all points in the Creed are

thus neceſſary: For Punies in Logick, know that univerſall affirmatives, are not ſimply converted. And therefore it may be true, that all ſuch neceſſary points, are in the Creed; though it be not true, that all points in the Creed are thus neceſſary: which I willingly grant, of the points by you mentioned. But this rather confirmes, then any way invalidates my aſſertion. For how could it ſtand with the Apoſtles wiſedome, to put in any points circumſtantiall and not neceſſary, and at the ſame time, to leave out any that were eſſentiall and neceſſary for that end, which you ſay, they propoſed to themſelves, in making the Creed, that is, *The preaching of the faith, to Iewes and Gentiles?*

24 Neither may you hope, to avoid the preſſure of theſe acknowledgements, by pretending as you doe §. 10. that you doe indeed, acknowledge the Creed to contain, all the neceſſary articles of faith; but yet ſo, that they are not either there expreſſed in it, or deducible from it, by evident conſequence, but *only by way of implication or Reduction.* For firſt, not to tell you, that no propoſition, is implied in any other, which is not deducible from it; nor ſecondly, that the article of the Catholique Church, wherein you will have all implyed, implies nothing to any purpoſe of yours, unleſſe out of meer favour wee will grant the ſenſe of it to be, that the Church is infallible, and that yours is the Church: to paſſe by all this, and require no anſwer to it, this one thing I may not omit; that the Apoſtles intent was (by your own confeſſion) particularly to deliver in the Creed, ſuch articles of belief as were fitteſt for thoſe times (and all neceſſary articles I have proved were ſuch:) now to deliver particularly, and to deliver only implicitly, to be delivered particularly in the Creed, and only to be reducible to it, I ſuppoſe are repugnances hardly reconcileable. And therefore though we deſire you, not to grant, that the Creed containes all points of Faith of all ſorts, any other way then by implication or reduction, no nor ſo neither; yet you have granted, and muſt grant, of the Fundamentall points of ſimple belief, thoſe which the Apoſtles were commanded in particular to teach all men, and all men in particular to know and believe, that theſe are delivered in the Creed, after a more particular and punctuall manner, then implication or reduction comes to.

25 *Ad* §. 10. 11. 12. 13. 14. 15. It is vain for you to hope, that the teſtimonies of the Ancient & Modern Doctors, alleadged to this purpoſe by *D. Potter* in great abundance, will be turn'd off, with this generall deceitfull Anſwer, That the Allegation of them was needleſſe to prove, that the Creed containes all points of faith, under pretence that you grant it in manner aforeſaid. For what if you grant it in manner aforeſaid, yet if you grant it not (as indeed you doe but inconſtantly) in the ſenſe which their teſtimonies require, then for all this their teſtimonies may be alleadged to very good purpoſe. Now let any man read them, with any tolerable indifference, and he ſhall find they ſay plainly, that all points of faith, neceſſary to be particularly believed, are explicitly contained in the Creed; and that your gloſſe of implication and reduction, had it been confronted with their ſentences, would have

have been much out of countenance, as having no ground nor colour of ground in them. For example. If *Azorius* had thought thus of it, how could he have called it, *A brief comprehenſion of the faith, and a ſumme of all things to be believed, and as it were, a ſigne, or cognizance whereby Chriſtians are to be differenced and diſtinguiſhed, from the impious and misbelievers, who profeſſe either no faith, or not the right?* If *Huntly* had been of this mind, how could he have ſaid of it with any congruity,[b] *That the rule of faith is expreſſely contained in it, and all the prime foundations of faith:* And *that the Apoſtles were not ſo forgetfull as to omit any prime principall foundation of faith in that Creed which they delivered to be believed by all Chriſtians.* The words of *Filiucius* are pregnant to the ſame purpoſe,[c] *There cannot bee a fitter Rule, from whence Chriſtians may learn what they are explicitly to believe, then that which is contained in the Creed.* Which words cannot be juſtified, if all points neceſſary to be believed explicitely, be not compriſed in it. *To this end* (ſaith *Putean*)[d] *was the Creed compos'd by the Apoſtles, that Chriſtians might haue a forme whereby they might profeſſe themſelues Catholiques.* But certainly the Apoſtles did this in vain, if a man might profeſſe this, and yet for matter of faith be not a Catholique.

a *Azor. part. 1. c. 5.*

b *Cont. 2. c. 10. n. 10.*

c *Moral. quæſt. Tr. 2. c. 2. n. 34.*

d *In 2. 2. qu. 2. Art. 3. Dub. Vlt.*

26 The words of *Cardinal Richelieu*[e], exact this ſenſe, and refuſe your gloſſe as much as any of the former: *The Apoſtles Creed is the Summary and Abridgment of that faith which is neceſſary for a Chriſtian; Theſe holy perſons being by the Commandement of Ieſus Chriſt to diſperſe themſelves over the world, and in all parts by preaching the Goſpell to plant the faith, eſteemed it very neceſſary to reduce into a ſhort ſumme all that which Chriſtians ought to know, to the end that being diſperſed into divers parts of the world, they might preach the ſame thing in a ſhort forme, that it might be the eaſier remembred. For this effect they called this Abridgment a Symbole, which ſignifies a mark or ſigne, which might ſerue to diſtinguiſh true Chriſtians which imbraced it, from Infidels which rejected it.* Now I would fain know how the compoſition of the Creed could ſerue for this end, and ſecure the Preachers of it, that they ſhould preach the ſame thing, if there were other neceſſary Articles not compriz'd in it. Or how could it be a ſigne to diſtinguiſh true Chriſtians from others, if a man might believe it all, and for want of believing ſomething elſe, not be a true Chriſtian?

e *Inſtruction du Chreſtien Lecon premiere.*

27 The words of the [f] *Author of the conſideration of foure heads propounded* to *King Iames*, require the ſame ſenſe and utterly renounce your qualification. *The Symbole is a briefe yet entire Methodicall ſumme of Chriſtian Doctrine, including all points of faith either to bee preached by the Apoſtles, or to be believed by their Diſciples: Delivered both for a direction unto them, what they were to preach and others to believe, as alſo to diſcern and put a difference betwixt all faithfull Chriſtians and misbelieving Infidels:*

f *Ch. 3. Conſid. 1. §. 5. p. 119.*

28 Laſtly, [g] *Gregory of Valence* affirmes our Aſſertion even in termes: *The Articles of faith contained in the Creed are as it were the firſt principles of the Chriſtian faith, in which is contained the ſumme of Evangelicall doctrine, which all men are bound explicitely to believe.*

g *2. 2. diſ. 1. q. 2. p. 4. in fin.*

29 To theſe Teſtimonies of your own Doctors, I ſhould haue added the concurrent ſuffrages of the ancient Fathers, but the full and free acknowledgment of the ſame *Valentia* in the place aboue quoted will make this labour unneceſſary. *So iudge* (ſaith hee) *the holy Fathers affirming that this Symbole of faith was compoſed by the Apoſtles, that all might haue a ſhort ſumme of thoſe things which are to be belieued, and are diſperſedly contain'd in Scripture.*

30 Neither is there any diſcord between this Aſſertion of your Doctors, and their holding themſelues oblig'd to belieue all the points which the Councell of Trent defines. For Proteſtants & Papiſts may both hold, that all points of beliefe neceſſary to be known & belieued, are ſumm'd up in the Creed: and yet both the one & the other think themſelues bound to belieue whatſoever other points, they either know or belieue to be revealed by God. For the Articles which are neceſſary to be known that they are revealed by God, may bee very few; and yet thoſe which are neceſſary to be believed, when they are revealed and known to be ſo, may be very many.

31 But *Summaries and Abſtracts are not intended to ſpecifie all the particulars of the ſcience or ſubiect to which they belong.* Yes if they bee intended for perfect Summaries, they muſt not omit any neceſſary doctrine of that Science whereof they are Summaries; though the Illuſtration and Reaſons of it they may omit. If this were not ſo, a man might ſet down forty or fifty of the Principall definitions and diviſions, and rules of Logick, and call it a Summary or Abſtract of Logick. But ſure, this were no more a Summary, then that were the picture of a man in little, that wanted any of the parts of a man; or that a totall ſumme wherein all the particulars were not caſt up. Now the Apoſtles Creed you here intimate that it was intended for a Summary: otherwiſe why talk you here of Summaries, and tell us that they need not contain all the particulars of their ſcience? And of what I pray may it be a Summary, but of the Fundamentals of Chriſtian faith? Now you haue already told us, *That it is moſt full and compleat to that purpoſe for which it was intended.* Lay all this together, and I belieue the product will be; That the Apoſtles Creed is a perfect Summary of the Fundamentalls of the Chriſtian faith: and what the duty of a perfect Summary is, I haue already told you.

32 Whereas therefore to diſproue this Aſſertion, in divers particles of this Chapter, but eſpecially the fourteenth, you muſter up whole armies of doctrines, which you pretend are neceſſary, and not contain'd in the Creed; I anſwer very briefly thus: That the doctrines you mention, are either concerning matters of practiſe, and not ſimple beliefe; or elſe they are ſuch doctrines wherein God has not ſo plainly revealed himſelfe, but that honeſt and good men, true Lovers of God and of Truth, thoſe that deſire aboue all things to know his will and doe it, may erre, and yet commit no ſinne at all, or only a ſinne of infirmity, and not deſtructiue of ſalvation; or laſtly, they are ſuch Doctrines which God hath plainly revealed, and ſo are neceſſary to be belieued when they are known to be divine, but not neceſſary to be known

known & believed, not neceſſary to be known for divine, that they may be believed. Now all theſe ſorts of doctrines are impertinent to the preſent Queſtion. For D. *Potter* never affirmed either that the neceſſary duties of a Chriſtian, or that all Truths piouſly credible, but not neceſſary to be believed, or that all Truths neceſſary to bee believed upon the ſuppoſall of divine Revelation, were ſpecified in the Creed. For this he affirmes, only of ſuch ſpeculatiue divine verities, which God hath commanded particularly to be preached to all, and believed by all. Now let the doctrines objected by you be well conſidered, and let all thoſe that are reducible to the three former heads be diſcarded, and then of all theſe Inſtances againſt D. *Potters* Aſſertion, there will not remain ſo much as one.

33 Firſt the Queſtions touching the conditions to bee performed by us to obtaine remiſſion of ſinnes; the Sacraments; the Commandements, and the poſſibility of keeping them, the neceſſity of imploring the Aſſiſtance of Gods Grace and Spirit for the keeping of them: how farre obedience is due to the Church: Prayer for the Dead: The ceſſation of the old Law: are all about *Agenda*, and ſo cut off upon the firſt conſideration.

34 Secondly, the Queſtion touching Fundamentalls, is profitable but not fundamentall. He that belieues all Fundamentals, cannot bee damned for any errour in faith, though he belieue more or leſſe to bee fundamental then is ſo. That alſo of the proceſſion of the holy Ghoſt from the Father and the Sonne: of Purgatory: of the Churches Viſibility: of the Books of the new Teſtament which were doubted of by a conſiderable part of the Primitiue Church: (untill I ſee better reaſon for the contrary then the bare authority of men,) I ſhall eſteem of the ſame condition.

35 Thirdly, Theſe Doctrines that *Adam* and the Angels ſinned: that there are Angels good and bad: that thoſe bookes of Scripture which were never doubted of by any conſiderable part of the Church, are the word of God: that S. *Peter* had no ſuch primacy as you pretend: that the Scripture is a perfect rule of faith, & conſequently that no neceſſary doctrine is unwritten: that there is no one Society or ſucceſſion of Chriſtians abſolutely infallible: Theſe to my underſtanding are truths plainly revealed by God, and neceſſary to be believed by them who know they are ſo. But not ſo neceſſary, that every man & woman is bound under pain of damnation particularly to know thē to be divine Revelations, and explicitely to believe them. And for this reaſon, theſe with innumerable other points, are to be referred to the third ſort of doctrines aboue mentioned, which were never pretended to haue place in the Creed. There remaines one only point of all that Army you muſtred together, reducible to none of theſe heads, & that is, that God is, and is a Remunerator, which you ſay is queſtioned by the deniall of merit. But if there were ſuch a neceſſary indiſſoluble coherence between this point and the doctrine of merit, mee thinks with as much reaſon, and more charity you might conclude, That we hold merit, becauſe we hold this point; Then that we deny this point, becauſe

becauſe we deny merit. Beſides, when Proteſtants deny the doctrine of Merits, you know right well, for ſo they haue declared themſelues a thouſand times, that they mean nothing elſe, but with *David*, that *their well doing extendeth not, is not truly beneficiall to God*: with our Saviour, *when they haue done all which they are commanded, they haue done their duty only*, and no curteſie: And laſtly, with S. *Paul*, that *all which they can ſuffer for God* (and yet ſuffering is more then doing) *is not worthy to bee compared to the glory that ſhall be revealed.* So that you muſt either miſunderſtand their meaning in denying Merit, or you muſt diſcharge their doctrine of this odious conſequence, or you muſt charge it upon *David* and *Paul* and *Chriſt* himſelfe. Nay you muſt either grant their deniall of true Merit juſt & reaſonable, or you muſt ſay, that our good actions are really profitable to God: that they are not debts already due to him, but voluntary and undeſerved Favours: and that they are equall unto and well worthy of eternall glory which is prepar'd for them. As for the inconvenience which you ſo much feare, That the deniall of Merit makes God a Giver only, & not a Rewarder; I tell you, good Sir, you feare where no feare is, and that it is both moſt true on the one ſide, that you in holding good Works meritorious of eternall glory make God a rewarder only & not a giver, contrary to plain Scripture, affirming that *The gift of God is eternall life*; And that it is moſt falſe on the other ſide, that the doctrine of Proteſtants makes God a giver only and not a rewarder: In as much as their doctrine is, That God giues not Heaven but to thoſe which doe ſomething for it, and ſo his gift is alſo a Reward; but withall that whatſoever they doe is due unto God before hand, and worth nothing to God, and worth nothing in reſpect of Heaven, and ſo mans work is no Merit, and Gods reward is ſtill a Gift.

36 Put the caſe the Pope, for a reward of your ſervice done him in writing this Book, had given you the honour and meanes of a Cardinall, would you not, not only in humility but in ſincerity haue profeſſed, that you had not merited ſuch a Reward? And yet the Pope is neither your Creatour nor Redeemer, nor Preſerver, nor perhaps your very great Benefactour, ſure I am, not ſo great as God Almighty, and therefore hath no ſuch right and title to your ſervice as God hath in reſpect of precedent obligations. Beſides, the work you haue done him hath been really advantagious to him: and laſtly, not altogether unproportionable to the fore-mentioned Reward. And therefore if by the ſame work you will pretend that either you haue or hope to haue deſerved immortall happineſſe, I beſeech you conſider well whether this be not to ſet a higher value upon a Cardinal's cap, then a Crowne of immortall glory, and with that Cardinall to prefer a part in *Paris* before a part in *Paradiſe*.

37 In the next Paragraph you beat the ayre again, and fight manfully with your own ſhadow. The point you ſhould haue ſpoken to, was this, That there are ſome points of ſimple beliefe neceſſary to bee explicitely believed, which yet are not contained in the Creed. Inſteed hereof you trouble your ſelfe in vain to demonſtrate, That *many important*

portant points of faith, are not contained in it, which yet D. *Potter* had freely granted, and you your ſelfe take particular notice of his granting of it. All this paines therefore you have imployed to no purpoſe: ſaving that to ſome negligent Reader you may ſeem to have ſpoken to the very point, becauſe that which you ſpeak to, at the firſt hearing, ſounds ſomewhat neere it. But ſuch a one I muſt intreat to remember, there be many more points of faith then there be Articles of Simple belief, neceſſary to be explicitly believed: And that though all of the former ſort are not contained in the Creed, yet all of the latter ſort may be. As for your diſtinction, between Hereſies that have been, and Hereſies that are, and Hereſies that may be, I have already proved it vaine; and that whatſoever may be an Hereſie, that is ſo; and whatſoever is ſo, that alwaies hath been ſo, ever ſince the publication of the Goſpell of Chriſt. The doctrine of your Church may like a ſnow-ball increaſe with rowling, and again if you pleaſe melt away and decreaſe: But as *Chriſt Ieſus*, ſo his Goſpell, *is yeſterday and to day, and the ſame for ever.*

38 Our Saviour ſending his Apoſtles to preach, gave them no other commiſſion then this: *Goe teach all nations, Baptizing them in the name of the Father, the Sonne, and the Holy-Ghoſt, teaching them to obſerve all things, whatſoever I have commanded you.* Theſe were the bounds of their commiſſion. If your Church have any larger, or if ſhe have a commiſſion at large, to teach what ſhe pleaſes, and call it the Goſpell of Chriſt, let her produce her Letters-patents from heaven for it. But if this be all you have, then muſt you give me leave to eſteeme it both great ſacriledge in you to forbid any thing, be it never ſo ſmall or ceremonious, which Chriſt hath commanded: as the receiving of the Communion in both kindes: and as high a degree of preſumption, to enjoyne men to believe, that there are or can be any other fundamentall Articles of the Goſpell of Chriſt, then what Chriſt himſelfe commanded his Apoſtles to teach all men; or any damnable Hereſies, but ſuch as are plainly repugnant to theſe prime Verities.

39 *Ad* §. 16.17. The ſaying of the moſt learned Prelate, and excellent man, the *Arch-Biſhop of Armach*, is only related by *D. Potter* p. 155. and not applauded: though the truth is, both the Man deſerves as much applauſe as any man, and his ſaying as much as any ſaying; it being as great, and as good a truth, and as neceſſary for theſe miſerable times, as poſſibly can be uttered. For this is moſt certain, and I believe you will eaſily grant it, that to reduce Chriſtians to unity of Communion, there are but two waies that may be conceived probable: The one, by taking away diverſity of opinions touching matters of Religion: The other by ſhewing that the diverſity of opinions, which is among the ſeverall Sects of Chriſtians, ought to be no hinderance to their Vnity in Communion.

40 Now the former of theſe is not to be hoped for without a miracle, unleſſe that could be done, which is impoſſible to be performed, though it be often pretended; that is, unleſſe it could be made evident

to all men, that God hath appointed ſome viſible Iudge of Controverſies, to whoſe judgement all men are to ſubmit themſelves. What then remaines, but that the other way muſt be taken, and Chriſtians muſt be taught to ſet a higher value upon theſe high points of faith and obedience wherein they agree, then upon theſe matters of leſſe moment wherein they differ, and underſtand that agreement in thoſe, ought to be more effectuall to joyne them in one Communion, then their difference in other things of leſſe moment to divide them? When I ſay, *in one Communion*, I mean, in a common Profeſſion of thoſe articles of faith, wherein all conſent: A joynt worſhip of God, after ſuch a way as all eſteem lawfull; and a mutuall performance of all thoſe works of charity, which Chriſtians owe one to another. And to ſuch a Communion what better inducement could be thought of, then to demonſtrate that what was univerſally believed of all Chriſtians, if it were joyned with a love of truth, and with holy obedience, was ſufficient to bring men to heaven? For why ſhould men be more rigid then God? Why ſhould any errour exclude any man from the Churches Communion, which will not deprive him of eternall ſalvation? Now that Chriſtians doe generally agree in all thoſe points of doctrine, which are neceſſary to Salvation, it is apparent, becauſe they agree with one accord, in believing all thoſe Bookes of the Old and New Teſtament, which in the Church were never doubted of to be the undoubted word of God. And it is ſo certain that in all theſe Bookes, all neceſſary doctrines are evidently contained, that of all the four Evangeliſts this is very probable, but of S. *Luke* moſt apparent, that in every one of their Bookes they have comprehended the whole ſubſtance of the Goſpell of Chriſt. For what reaſon can be imagined, that any of them ſhould leave out any thing which he knew to be neceſſary, and yet (as apparently all of them have done) put in many things which they knew to be only profitable and not neceſſary? What wiſe and honeſt man that were now to write the Goſpell of Chriſt, would doe ſo great a work of God after ſuch a negligent faſhion? Suppoſe *Xaverius* had been to write the Goſpell of Chriſt for the Indians, think you he would have left out any Fundamentall doctrine of it? If not, I muſt beſeech you to conceive as well of S. *Matthew*, and S. *Marke*, and S. *Luke*, and S. *Iohn*, as you doe of *Xaverius*. Beſides, if every one of them have not in them all neceſſary doctrines, how have they complied with their own deſigne, which was, as the titles of their Bookes ſhew, to write *the Goſpell of Chriſt*, and not a part of it? Or how have thy not deceived us, in giving them ſuch titles? By the whole Goſpell of Chriſt, I underſtand not the whole Hiſtory of Chriſt, but all that makes up the Covenant between God and man. Now if this be wholly contained in the Goſpell of S. *Marke* and S. *Iohn*, I believe every conſidering man will bee inclinable to believe that then without doubt, it is contained, with the advantage of many other very profitable things, in the larger Goſpells of S. *Matthew*, and S. *Luke*. And that S. *Markes* Goſpell wants no neceſſary Article of this Covenant, I preſume you will not deny, if you believe *Irenæus* when

when he ſaies, *Mathew to the Hebrewes in their tongue publiſhed the Scripture of the Goſpell: When Peter and Paul did preach the Goſpell, and found the Church or a Church at Rome, or of Rome, and after their departure Mark the ſcholler of Peter, delivered to us in writing thoſe things which had been preached by Peter; and Luke, the follower of Paul, compiled in a book the Goſpell which was preached by him: And afterwards Iohn, reſiding in Aſia, in the Citty of Epheſus, did himſelfe alſo ſet forth a Goſpell.*

41 In which words of *Irenæus*, it is remarkable that they are ſpoken by him againſt ſome Heretiques, that pretended (as you know who doe now adaies) that *ſome neceſſary Doctrines of the Goſpell were unwritten*, and that *out of the Scriptures, truth* (he muſt mean ſufficient truth,) *cannot be found by thoſe which know not Tradition.* Againſt whom to ſay, that part of the Goſpell which was preached by *Peter* was written by S. *Marke*, and ſome other neceſſary parts of it omitted, had been to ſpeak impertinently, and rather to confirme then confute their errour. It is plain therefore, that he muſt mean, as I pretend, that all the neceſſary doctrine of the Goſpell, which was preached by S. *Peter*, was written by S. *Marke*. Now you will not deny, I preſume, that S. *Peter* preached all, therefore you muſt not deny that S. *Marke* wrote all. *Lib. 3. c. 2.*

42 Our next inquiry let it be touching S. *Iohns* intent in writing his Goſpell, whether it were to deliver ſo much truth, as being believed and obeyed would certainly bring men to eternall life, or only part of it, and to leave part unwritten? A great man there is, but much leſſe then the Apoſtle, who ſaith, that *writing laſt, he purpoſed to ſupply the defects of the other Evangeliſts, that had wrote before him*: which (if it were true) would ſufficiently juſtify what I have undertaken, that at leaſt all the four Evangeliſts have in them, all the neceſſary parts of the Goſpell of Chriſt. Neither will I deny, but S. *Iohns* ſecondary intent might be to ſupply the defects of the former three Goſpels, in ſome things very profitable. But he that pretends, that any neceſſary doctrine is in S. *Iohn* which is in none of the other Evangeliſts, hath not ſo well conſidered them as he ſhould doe, before he pronounce ſentence of ſo weighty a matter. And for his prime intent in writing his Goſpell, what that was, certainly no Father in the world underſtood it better then himſelfe. Therefore let us hear him ſpeak: *Many other ſignes* (ſaith he) *alſo did Ieſus in the ſight of his Diſciples, which are not written in this Book: But theſe are written, that you may believe that Ieſus is Chriſt the ſonne of God, and that believing you may have life in his name.* By (*theſe are written*) may be underſtood, either *theſe things* are written, or *theſe ſignes* are written. Take it which way you will, this concluſion will certainly follow, That either all that which S. *Iohn* wrote in his Goſpell, or leſſe then all, and therefore all much more was ſufficient to make them believe that which being believed with lively faith, would certainly bring them to eternall life.

43 This which hath been ſpoken (I hope) is enough to juſtify my undertaking to the full, that it is very probable that every one of the foure Evangeliſts has in his book the whole ſubſtance, all the neceſſary

ceſſary parts of the Goſpell of Chriſt. But for S. *Luke*, that he hath written ſuch a perfect Goſpell, in my judgement it ought to be with them that believe him, no manner of queſtion. Conſider firſt the introduction to his Goſpell, where he declares what he intends to write, in theſe words, *For as much as many have taken in hand to ſet forth in order a declaration of thoſe things, which are moſt ſurely believed amongſt us, even as they delivered unto us, which from the beginning were eye-witneſſes, and miniſters of the word, it ſeemed good to me alſo, having had perfect underſtanding of things from the firſt, to write to thee in order, moſt excellent Theophilus, that thou mighteſt know the certainty, of thoſe things wherein thou haſt been inſtructed.* Adde to this place, the entrãce to his *Hiſtory of the Acts of the Apoſtles: The former treatiſe have I made, O Theophilus, of all that Ieſus began both to doe and teach, untill the day in which he was taken up.* Weigh well theſe two places, and then anſwer me freely and ingenuouſly to theſe demands. 1. Whether S. *Luke* does not undertake the very ſame thing which he ſaies, *many had taken in hand?* 2. Whether this were not *to ſet forth in order, a declaration of thoſe things which are moſt ſurely believed amongſt Chriſtians?* 3. Whether the whole Goſpell of Chriſt, and every neceſſary doctrine of it, were not ſurely believed among Chriſtians? 4. Whether they which were *Eye-witneſſes and miniſters of the word from the begining, delivered not the whole Goſpell of Chriſt?* 5. Whether he does not undertake to write in order theſe things *whereof he had perfect underſtanding* from the firſt? 6. Whether he had not perfect underſtanding of the whole Goſpell of Chriſt? 7. Whether he doth not undertake to write to *Theophilus* of all thoſe things *wherein he had been inſtructed?* 8. And whether he had not been inſtructed in all the neceſſary parts of the Goſpell of Chriſt? 9. Whether in the other Text, *All things which Ieſus began to doe and teach*, muſt not at leaſt imply, all the Principall and neceſſary things? 10. Whether this be not the very interpretation of your Rhemiſh Doctors, in their Annotation upon this place? 11. Whether all theſe Articles of the Chriſtian faith, without the belief whereof, no man can be ſaved, be not the Principall and moſt neceſſary things which *Ieſus* taught? 12. And laſtly, whether many things which S. *Luke* has wrote in his Goſpell, be not leſſe principall, and leſſe neceſſary then all and every one of theſe? When you have well conſidered theſe propoſalls, I believe you will be very apt to think (if S. *Luke* be of credit with you) That all things neceſſary to ſalvation, are certainly contained in his writings alone. And from hence you will not chooſe but conclude, that ſeeing all the Chriſtians in the world, agree in the belief of what S. *Luke* hath written, and not only ſo, but in all other Books of Canonicall Scripture, which were never doubted of in and by the Church, the Learned Arch-Biſhop had very juſt, and certain ground to ſay, *That in theſe Propoſitiõs, which without Controverſy are univerſally received in the whole Chriſtian world, ſo much truth is contained, as being joyned with holy obedience, may be ſufficient to bring a man to everlaſting Salvation; and that we have no cauſe to doubt, but that as many*

as

as walk according to this rule, neither overthrowing that which they have builded, by ſuperinducing any damnable Hereſy thereupon, nor otherwiſe vitiating their holy faith, with a lewd and wicked converſation, peace ſhall be upon them, and upon the Iſrael of God.

44 Againſt this, you object two things. The one, that by this Rule, *ſeeing the Doctrine of the Trinity is not received univerſally among Chriſtians, the deniall of it ſhall not exclude Salvation.* The other, that the *Biſhop contradicts himſelfe, in ſuppoſing a man may believe all neceſſary Truths, and yet ſuperinduce ſome damnable Hereſies.*

45 To the firſt I anſwere, what I conceive he would, whoſe words I here juſtify, that he hath declared plainly in this very place, that he meant, not an abſolute, but a limited Vniverſality, and ſpeaks not of propoſitions univerſally believed by all Profeſſions of Chriſtianity that are, but only, by all thoſe ſeverall Profeſſions of Chriſtianity, that have any large ſpread in *any part of the world.* By which words he excludes from the univerſality here ſpoken of, the denyers of the Doctrine of the Trinity, as being but a handfull of men, in reſpect of all, nay in reſpect of any of theſe profeſſions which maintain it. And therefore it was a great fault in you, either willingly to conceal theſe words, which evacuate your objection, or elſe negligently to overſee them. Eſpecially ſeeing your friend, to whom you are ſo much beholding, *Paulus Veridicus*, in his ſcurrilous and ſophiſticall Pamphlet, againſt *B. Vſhers* Sermon, hath ſo kindly offered to lead you by the hand to the obſervation of them, in theſe words: *To conſider of your Coinopiſta, or communiter Credenda, Articles, as you call them, univerſally believed of all theſe ſeverall Profeſſions of Criſtianity, which have any large ſpread in the World: Theſe Articles for example, may be the Vnity of the Godhead, the Trinity of perſons, the immortality of the Soule, &c.* Where you ſee that your friend, whom you ſo much magnify, hath plainly confeſſed that, notwithſtanding the Biſhops words, the denyall of the doctrine of the Trinity, may exclude Salvation; and therefore in approving and applauding his Anſwer to the Biſhops Sermon, you have unawares allowed this Anſwer of mine to your own greateſt objection.

46 Now for the foule contradiction, which you ſay the *Doctor* might eaſily haue eſpied in the Biſhops ſaying, he deſires your pardon for his overſight, for *Paulus Veridicus* his ſake; who though he ſet him ſelfe to finde faults with the Biſhops Sermon, yet it ſeemes this hee could not finde, or elſe queſtionleſſe wee ſhould haue heard of it from him. And therefore if D. *Potter*, being the Biſhops friend, haue not been more ſharp-ſighted then his enemies, this he hopes to indifferent judges, will ſeem no unpardonable offence. Yet this I ſay, not as if there were any contradiction at all, much leſſe any foul contradiction in the Biſhops words; but as *Antipherons* picture, which he thought he ſaw in the ayre before him, was not in the ayre but in his diſturb'd phanſie: ſo all the contradiction which here you deſcant upon, is not indeed in the Biſhops ſaying, but in your imagination. For wherein, I pray, lies this foule contradiction? *In ſuppoſing* (ſay you) *a man may believe*

all Truths neceſſary to ſalvation, and yet ſuperinduce a damnable Hereſie. I anſwer, It is not certain that his words doe ſuppoſe this: neither if they doe, does he contradict himſelfe. I ſay it is not certain that his words import any ſuch matter. For ordinarily men uſe to ſpeake and write ſo, as here he does, when they intend not to limit or reſtrain, but only to repeat and preſſe & illuſtrate what they haue ſaid before. And I wonder, why with your Eagles eyes you did not eſpy another foule contradiction in his words as well as this; and ſay, that he ſuppoſes a man may walk according to the rule of holy obedience, and yet vitiate his holy faith with a lewd and wicked converſation? Certainly a lewd converſation is altogether as contradictious to holy obedience, as a damnable hereſie to neceſſary truth. What then was the reaſon that you eſpied not this foule contradiction in his words, as well as that? Was it becauſe, according to the ſpirit and Genius of your Church, your zeal is greater to that which you conceive true doctrine, then holy obedience; and think ſimple errour a more capitall crime, then ſins committed againſt knowledge and conſcience? Or was it becauſe your Reaſon told you, that herein he meant onely to repeat and not to limit what he ſaid before? And why then had you not ſo much candour to conceave, that he might haue the ſame meaning in the former part of the diſiunction; and intend no more but this, Whoſoever walks according to this rule of believing all neceſſary Truths and holy obedience, (neither poiſoning his faith of thoſe Truths which he holds, with the mixture of any damnable Hereſie, nor vitiating it with a wicked life) Peace ſhall be upon him! In which words what man of any ingenuity will not preſently perceive that the words within the parentheſis, are only a repetition of, and no exception from thoſe that are without? S. *Athanaſius* in his Creed tells us, *The Catholique Faith is this, that we worſhip one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Vnity, neither confounding the Perſons nor dividing the Subſtance*; and why now doe you not tell him that he contradicts himſelfe, and ſuppoſes that we may worſhip a Trinity of Perſons, and one God in ſubſtance, and yet confound the Perſons, or divide the ſubſtance; which yet is impoſſible, becauſe Three remaining Three, cannot be confounded, and One remaining One cannot be divided? If a man ſhould ſay unto you, he that keeps all the Commandements of God, committing no ſinne either againſt the loue of God, or the loue of his neighbour, is a perfect man: Or thus, he that will liue in conſtant health had need be exact in his diet, neither eating too much, nor too little: Or thus, hee that will come to London muſt goe on ſtraight forward in ſuch a way, and neither turn to the right hand or to the left; I verily belieue you would not finde any contradiction in his words, but confeſſe them as coherent and conſonant as any in your Book. And certainly if you would look upon this ſaying of the Biſhop with any indifference, you would eaſily perceive it to be of the very ſame kinde, & capable of the very ſame conſtruction. And therefore one of the grounds of your accuſation is uncertain. Neither can you aſſure us, that the Biſhop ſuppoſes any ſuch matter as you pretend. Neither if he did ſuppoſe this (as perhaps he did) were this to contradict

dict himſelfe. For though there can be no damnable Hereſie, unleſſe it contradict ſome neceſſary Truth, yet there is no contradiction but the ſame man may at once belieue this Hereſie and this Truth; becauſe there is no contradiction that the ſame man, at the ſame time, ſhould believe contradictions. For, firſt, whatſoever a man believes true, that he may and muſt believe; But there haue been ſome who have believed and taught that contradictions might be true, againſt whom *Ariſtotle* diſputes in the third of his *Metaphyſicks*; Therefore it is not impoſſible that a man may belieue Contradictions. Secondly, they which believe there is no certainty in Reaſon, muſt belieue that contradictions may be true: For otherwiſe there will be certainty in this Reaſon; This contradicts Truth therefore it is falſe. But there be now divers in the world who believe there is no certainty in reaſon, (and whether you be of their minde or no, I deſire to be inform'd;) Therefore there be divers in the world who believe contradictions may be true. Thirdly, They which doe captivate their underſtandings to the beliefe of thoſe things which to their underſtanding ſeem irreconcileable contradictions, may as well belieue reall contradictions: (For the difficulty of believing ariſes not from their being repugnant, but from their ſeeming to be ſo:) But you doe captivate your underſtandings to the beliefe of thoſe things which ſeem to your underſtandings irreconcileable contradictions; Therefore it is as poſſible and eaſie for you to believe thoſe that indeed are ſo. Fourthly, ſome men may be confuted in their errours, and perſwaded out of them; but no mans errour can be confuted, who together with his errour doth not believe and grant ſome true principle that contradicts his Errour: for nothing can bee proved to him who grants nothing, neither can there be (as all men know) any rationall diſcourſe but out of grounds agreed upon by both parts. Therfore it is not impoſſible but abſolutely certain, that the ſame man at the ſame time may believe contradictions. Fiftly, It is evident, neither can you without extream madneſſe and uncharitableneſſe, deny, that we belieue the Bible, thoſe Books I mean which we believe Canonicall: Otherwiſe why diſpute you with us out of them, as out of a common Principle? Either therefore you muſt retract your opinion, and acknowledge that the ſame man at the ſame time may believe cõtradictions, or elſe you will run into a greater inconvenience, and be forc'd to confeſſe, that no part of our Doctrine contradicts the Bible. Sixtly, I deſire you to vindicate from contradiction theſe following Aſſertions: That there ſhould be Length and nothing long: Breadth, & nothing broad: Thickneſſe, and nothing thick: Whiteneſſe, & nothing white: Roundneſſe, and nothing round: Weight, and nothing heavy: Sweetneſſe, and nothing ſweet: Moiſture, and nothing moiſt: Fluidneſſe, and nothing flowing: many Actions, and no Agent: Many Paſſions, and no Patient: That is, that there ſhould be a Long, broad, thick, white, round, heavy, ſweet, moiſt, flowing, active, paſſive, nothing! That Bread ſhould be turned into the ſubſtance of Chriſt, and yet not any thing of the Bread become any thing of Chriſt; neither the matter, nor the form, nor the Accidents of Bread, be made either the matter or

the

the Forme, or the Accidents of Chriſt. That Bread ſhould be turned into nothing, and at the ſame time with the ſame action turn'd into Chriſt, and yet Chriſt ſhould not be nothing. That the ſame thing at the ſame time ſhould haue its juſt dimenſions, and juſt diſtance of its parts, one from another, and at the ſame time not haue it, but all its parts together in one & the ſelfe ſame point. That the body of Chriſt, which is much greater, ſhould be contained wholly and in its full dimenſions without any alteration, in that which is leſſer, and that not once only, but as many times over as there are ſeverall points in the Bread and Wine. That the ſame thing at the ſame time ſhould bee wholly aboue it ſelfe, and wholly below it ſelfe, within it ſelfe, and without it ſelfe, on the right hand, and on the left hand, and round about it ſelfe. That the ſame thing at the ſame time ſhould moue to and from it ſelfe, and lye ſtill: Or that it ſhould be carried from one place to another through the middle ſpace, and yet not move. That it ſhould be brought from heaven to earth, and yet not come out of Heaven, nor be at all in any of the middle ſpace between Heaven and Earth. That to be one, ſhould be to be undivided from it ſelfe, and yet that one and the ſame thing ſhould be divided from it ſelfe. That a thing may be, & yet be no where. That a Finite thing may be in all places at once. That a Body may be in a place, and haue there its dimenſions, & colour, & all other qualities, and yet that it is not in the power of God to make it viſible, and tangible there, nor capable of doing or ſuffering any thing. That there ſhould be no certainty in our ſenſes, and yet that we ſhould know ſomething certainly, & yet know nothing but by our ſēſes. That that which is, and was long agoe, ſhould now begin to be. That that is now to be made of nothing, which is not nothing but ſomething. That the ſame thing ſhould be before and after it ſelfe. That it ſhould bee truly and really in a place, and yet without Locality. Nay, that hee which is Omnipotēt ſhould not be able to give it Locality in this place, where it is, as ſome of you hold: or if he can, as others ſay he can, that it ſhould be poſſible, that the ſame man, for example You or I, may at the ſame time, be awake at *London*, and not awake but aſleep at *Rome*: There run or walk, here not run or walk, but ſtand ſtill, ſit, or lye along: There ſtudy or write, here doe neither, but dine or ſup: There ſpeak, here be ſilent. That he may in one place freez for cold, in another burn with heat. That he may be drunk in one place, and ſober in another: Valiant in one place, and a Coward in another: A theef in one place, honeſt in another. That he may be a Papiſt and goe to Maſſe in *Rome*; A Proteſtant and goe to Church in *England*. That he may dye in *Rome*, and liue in *England*: or dying in both places may goe to Hell from *Rome*, and to Heaven from *England*. That the Body and Soule of Chriſt ſhould ceaſe to be where it was, & yet not goe to another place, nor be deſtroyed. All theſe, and many other of the like nature are the unavoidable, & moſt of them the acknowledged conſequences of your doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation, as is explained one where or other by your School-men. Now I beſeech you, Sir, to try your skill, & if you can compoſe their repugnance, and make peace between them; Certainly

tainly, none but you ſhall be *Catholique Moderator*. But if you cannot doe it, and that after an intelligible manner, then you muſt give me leave to believe, that either you doe not believe Tranſubſtantiation, or elſe that it is no contradiction, that men ſhould ſubjugate their underſtandings to the belief of contradictions.

47 Laſtly, I pray tell me whether you have not ſo much Charity in ſtore for the *Biſhop of Armach, and D. Potter*, as to think that they themſelves believe this ſaying, which the one preacht and printed, the other reprinted, and as you ſay applauded? If you think they doe, then certainly you have done unadviſedly, either in charging it with a foul contradiction, or in ſaying, it is impoſſible, that any man ſhould at once believe contradictions. Indeed that men ſhould not aſſent to contradictions, and that it is unreaſonable to doe ſo, I willingly grant: But to ſay it is impoſſible to be done, is againſt every mans experience, and almoſt as unreaſonable, as to doe the thing which is ſaid to be impoſſible. For though perhaps it may be very difficult, for a man in his right wits, to believe a contradiction expreſſed in termes, eſpecially if he believe it to be a contradiction, yet for men being cowed and awed by ſuperſtition, to perſwade themſelves upon ſlight and triviall grounds, that theſe or theſe, though they ſeem contradictions, yet indeed are not ſo, and ſo to believe them: or if the plain repugnance of them, be veil'd and diſguiſ'd a little, with ſome empty unintelligible non-ſenſe diſtinction; or if it be not expreſt but implyed, nor direct but by conſequence, ſo that the parties, to whoſe faith the propoſitions are offerd, are either innocently, or perhaps affectedly ignorant of the contrariety of them: for men in ſuch caſes, eaſily to ſwallow and digeſt contradictions, he that denies it poſſible, muſt be a meer ſtranger in the world.

48 *Ad* §. 18. This Paragraph conſiſts of two immodeſt untruths, obtruded upon us without ſhew, or ſhadow of Reaſon: and an evident ſophiſme, grounded upon an affected miſtake of the ſenſe of the word *Fundamentall*.

49 The firſt untruth is, that *D. Potter makes a Church, of men agreeing ſcarcely in one point of faith: of men concurring in ſome one or few Articles of belief, and in the reſt holding conceits plainly contradictory: Agreeing only in this one Article, that Chriſt is our Saviour; but for the reſt, like to the parts of a Chimæra &c.* Which I ſay is a ſhameleſſe calumny, not only becauſe *D. Potter* in this point delivers not his own judgement, but relates the opinion of others, M. *Hooker*, and *M. Morton*; but eſpecially, becauſe even theſe men (as they are related by D. *Potter*) to the conſtituting of the very eſſence of a Church, in the loweſt degree, require not only *Faith in Chriſt Ieſus the ſonne of God and Saviour of the World*, but alſo *ſubmiſſion to his Doctrine in mind and will*. Now I beſeech you Sir, tell me ingenuouſly, whether the doctrine of Chriſt may be called without blaſphemy, *ſcarcely one point of Faith?* or whether it conſiſts only, *of ſome one or few Articles of belief?* Or whether there be nothing in it, but only this Article, *That Chriſt is our Saviour?* Is it not manifeſt to all the world, that Chriſti-

ans of all Profeſſions doe agree with one conſent, in the belief of all thoſe Bookes of Scripture, which were not doubted of in the ancient Church, without danger of damnation? Nay is it not apparent, that no man at this time, can without hypocriſy, pretend to believe in Chriſt, but of neceſſity he muſt doe ſo? Seeing he can have no reaſon to believe in Chriſt, but he muſt have the ſame to believe the Scripture. I pray then read over the Scripture once more, or if that be too much labour, the New Teſtament only: and then ſay whether there be nothing there, but *ſcarcely one point of Faith? But ſome one or two Articles of beleif? Nothing but this Article onely, that Chriſt is our Saviour?* Say whether there be not there an infinite number of Divine Verities, Divine precepts, Divine promiſes, and thoſe ſo plainly and undoubtedly delivered, that if any ſees them not, it cannot be becauſe he cannot, but becauſe he will not! So plainly, that whoſoever ſubmits ſyncerely to the doctrine of Chriſt, in mind and will, cannot poſſibly but ſubmit to theſe in act and performance. And in the reſt, which it hath pleaſed God, for reaſons beſt known to himſelfe, to deliver obſcurely or ambiguouſly, yet thus farre at leaſt they agree, that the ſenſe of them intended by God, is certainly true, and that they are without paſſion or prejudice to endeavour to find it out: The difference only is, which is that true ſenſe which God intended. Neither would this long continue, if the walls of ſeparation, whereby the Divell hopes to make their Diviſions eternall, were pulled down; and errour were not ſupported againſt Truth, by humane advantages. But for the preſent, God forbid the matter ſhould be ſo ill as you make it! For whereas you looking upon their points of difference and agreement, through I know not what ſtrange glaſſes, have made the firſt innumerable, and the other ſcarce a number: the truth is clean contrary; That thoſe divine Verities, Speculative and Practicall, wherein they univerſally agree (which you will have to be but a few, or but one, or ſcarcely one) amount to *many millions*, (if an exact account were taken of them:) And on the other ſide, the Ponts in variance, are in compariſon but few, and thoſe not of ſuch a quality, but the Error in them may well conſiſt with the belief & obedience of the entire Covenant, ratified by Chriſt between God and man. Yet I would not be ſo miſtaken, as if I thought the errours even of ſome Proteſtants unconſiderable things, and matters of no moment. For the truth is, I am very fearfull, that ſome of their opinions, either as they are, or as they are apt to be miſtaken, (though not of themſelves ſo damnable, but that good and holy men may be ſaved with thē, yet) are too frequent occaſions of our remiſnes, and ſlackneſſe, in running the race of Chriſtian Profeſſion, of our deferring Repentance, and converſion to God, of our frequent relapſes into ſinne, & not ſeldome of ſecurity in ſinning; & conſequently, though not certain cauſes, yet too frequent occaſions of many mens damnation: and ſuch I conceive all theſe doctrines, which either directly or obliquely, put men in hope of eternall happineſſe, by any other means ſaving only the narrow way *of ſincere and univerſall obedience*, grounded upon a true and lively faith. Theſe Errours therefore, I doe not

elevate

elevate or extenuate: and on condition the ruptures made by them might be compoſed, doe heartily wiſh, that the cement were made of my deereſt blood, and only not to be an Anathema from Chriſt! Only this I ſay, that neither are their points of agreement ſo few, nor their differences ſo many, as you make them, nor ſo great as to exclude the oppoſite Parties from being members of one Church Militant, & joynt heires of the glory of the Church Triumphant.

50 Your other palpable untruth is, that *Proteſtants are farre more bold to diſagree even in matters of faith, then Catholique Divines* (you mean your own,) *in Queſtions meerely Philoſophicall, or not determined by the Church*. For neither doe they differ at all, in *matters of faith*, if you take the word in the higheſt ſenſe, and mean by matters of faith, ſuch doctrines as are *abſolutely neceſſary* to Salvation, to be believed or not to be disbelieved. And then in thoſe wherein they doe differ, with what colour or ſhadow of Argument, can you make good, that *they are more bold to diſagree, then you are in Queſtions meerely Philoſophicall, or not determined by the Church?* For is there not as great repugnancy between your aſſent and diſſent, your affirmation and negation, your *Eſt Eſt, Non Non*, as there is between theirs? You follow your Reaſon, in thoſe things wich are not determined by your Church; and they theirs, in things not plainly determined in Scripture. And wherein then conſiſts their greater, *their farre greater boldneſſe?* And what if they in their contradictory opinions, pretend both to rely upon the truth of God, doth this make their contradictions ever a whit the more repugnant? I had alwaies thought, that all contradictions had been equally contradictions, and equally repugnant; becauſe the leaſt of them are as farre aſunder, as *Eſt* and *Non Eſt* can make them, and the greateſt are no farther. But then you in your differences, (by name, about Predetermination, the Immaculate Conception, the Popes Infallibility,) upon what other motive doe you rely? Doe not you cite Scripture, or Tradition, or both, on both ſides? And doe you not pretend, that both theſe are the infallible Truths of Almighty God?

51 You cloſe up this Section with a fallacy, proving forſooth, that *we deſtroy, by our confeſſion, the Church which is the houſe of God, becauſe we ſtand only upon Fundamentall Articles, which cannot make up the whole fabrick of the faith, no more then the foundation of a houſe alone can be a houſe.*

52 But I hope, Sir, you will not be difficult in granting, that that is a houſe which hath all the neceſſary parts belonging to a houſe: Now by Fundamentall Articles, we mean all thoſe which are neceſſry. And you your ſelfe, in the very leafe after this, take notice that *D. Potter* does ſo. Where to this Queſtion: How ſhall I know in particular which points be, and which be not Fundamentall? You ſcurrilouſly bring him in making this ridiculous anſwer, *Read my Anſwer to a late Pamphlet intituled Charity Miſtaken &c. There you ſhall find that Fundamentall doctrines are ſuch Catholique Verities, as principally, and eſſentially pertain to the faith, ſuch as properly conſtitute a*

Church, and are neceſſary (in ordinary courſe) to be diſtinctly believed by every Chriſtian that will be ſaved. All which wordes he us'd, not to tell you what points be fundamentall, as you diſhoneſtly impoſe upon him, but to explain what he meant by the word Fundamentall. May it pleaſe you therefore now at laſt, to take notice, that by *Fundamentall* we mean *all and only that which is neceſſary*; and then I hope you will grant, that we may ſafely expect ſalvation in a Church which hath all things fundamentall to Salvation! Vnleſſe you will ſay, that more is neceſſary, then that which is neceſſary.

19.53 This long diſcourſe, ſo full of un-ingenious dealing with your adverſary, perhaps would have done reaſonably in a Farce or a Comedy, & I doubt not but you have made your ſelfe & your courteous Readers good ſport with it. But if *D. Potter* or I, had been by when you wrote it, we ſhould have ſtopt your carere at the firſt ſtarting, & have put you in mind of theſe old Schoole Proverbs, *Ex falſo ſuppoſito ſequitur quodlibet*, and *Vno abſurdo dato, ſequuntur mille.* For whereas you ſuppoſe, firſt, that to a man deſirous to ſave his ſoul, and requiring, whoſe direction he might rely upon? the Doctors anſwer would be, *Vpon the truly Catholique Church*: I ſuppoſe upon bettter reaſon, becauſe I know his mind, that he would adviſe him to call *no man Maſter on Earth*, but according to Chriſts command, to rely upon the direction of God himſelfe. If he ſhould enquire where he ſhould find this direction? He would anſwer him; In his word contained in Scripture. If he ſhould enquire what aſſurance he might have, that the Scripture is the word of God? He would anſwer him, that the doctrine it ſelfe is very fit and worthy to be thought to come from God, *nec vox hominem ſonat*, and that they which wrote and delivered it, confirmed it to be the word of God, by doing ſuch works as could not be done, but by power from God himſelfe. For aſſurance of the Truth hereof, he would adviſe him to rely upon that, which all wiſe men, in all matters of belief rely upon; and that is, the Conſent of Ancient Records, and Vniverſall Tradition. And that he might not miſtruſt him as partiall in this adviſe, he might farther tell him, that a gentleman that would be nameleſſe, that has written a book againſt him, called *Charity maintained by Catholiques*, though in many things he differ from him, yet agrees with him in this, that *Tradition is ſuch a principle as may be reſted in, and which requires no other proof.* As indeed no wiſe man doubts but there was ſuch a man as *Iulius Cæſar*, or *Cicero*, that there are ſuch Citties as *Rome* or *Conſtantinople*, though he have no other aſſurance for the one or the other, but only the *ſpeech* of people. This tradition therefore he would counſell him to rely upon, and to believe that the book which we call Scripture, was confirmed abundantly by the workes of God, to be the word of God. Believing it the word of God, he muſt of neceſſity believe it true: and if he believe it true, he muſt believe it containes all neceſſary directions unto eternall happineſſe, becauſe it affirmes it ſelfe to doe ſo. Nay he might tell him, that ſo farre is the whole book, from wanting any neceſſary direction to his eternall Salvation, that one only Author, that hath writ but two little

bookes

bookes of it, S. *Luke* by name in the begining of his *Goſpell*, and in the begining of his *Story*, ſhewes plainly that he alone hath written at leaſt ſo much as is neceſſary. And what they wrote, they wrote by Gods direction, for the direction of the world, not only for the Learned, but for all that would doe their true endeavour to know the will of God, and to doe it; therefore you cannot but conceive, that writing to all and for all, they wrote ſo as that in things neceſſary they might be underſtood by all. Beſides that, here he ſhould finde, that God himſelfe has engaged himſelfe by promiſe, that if he would loue him, and keep his Commandements, and pray earneſtly for his ſpirit, and bee willing to be directed by it, he ſhould undoubtedly receiue it, even the *Spirit of Truth which ſhall lead him into all truth*; that is certainly, into all neceſſary Truths, and ſuffer him to fall into no pernicious errour. The ſumme of his whole direction to him briefly would be this, Believe the Scripture to be the word of God, uſe your true endeavour to finde the true ſenſe of it, and to liue according to it, and then you may reſt ſecurely that you are in the true way to eternall happineſſe. This is the ſubſtance of that Anſwer which the Doctor would make to any man in this caſe; and this is a way ſo plain, that fooles, unleſſe they will, cannot erre from it. Becauſe not knowing abſolutely all truth, nay not all profitable truth, and not being free from errour; but endeavoring to know the truth and obey it, and endeavouring to be free from errour, is by this way made the onely condition of ſalvation. As for your ſuppoſition, That he would adviſe ſuch a man to rely upon the Catholique Church for the finding out the doctrine of Chriſt, hee utterly diſclaimes it, and truly very juſtly: There being no certaine way to know that any company is a true Church, but only by their profeſſing the true doctrine of Chriſt. And therefore as it is impoſſible I ſhould know ſuch a company of Philoſophers are Peripateticks, or Stoicks, unleſſe I firſt know what was the doctrine of the Peripateticks, and Stoicks; ſo is it impoſſible that I ſhould certainly know any company to be the Church of Chriſt, before I know what is the doctrine of Chriſt, the Profeſſion whereof conſtitutes the viſible Church, the Beliefe and Obedience the inviſible. And therefore whereas you would have him be directed by the Catholique Church to the doctrine of Chriſt; the contrary rather is moſt certaine and neceſſary, that by the foreknowledge of the doctrine of Chriſt, he muſt be directed to a certaine aſſurance, which is, if he meane not to chooſe at a venture, but deſire to have certaine direction to it. This ſuppoſition therefore, being the hinge whereon your whole diſcourſe turnes, is the *Minerva* of your owne Brayne; and therefore were it but for this, have we not great reaſon to accuſe you of ſtrange immodeſty, in ſaying as you doe, That *the whole diſcourſe & inferences which here you have made, are either D. Potters own direct aſſertions, or evident conſequences cleerely deduced frō them?* Eſpecially ſeeing your proceeding in it is ſo conſonant to this ill beginning, that it is in a manner wholly made up, not of *D. Potters* aſſertions, but your owne fictions obtruded on him.

54 ~~Anſwer~~. To the next Queſtion, *Cannot Generall Councels erre?*

You pretend he anſwers § 19. *They may erre damnably.* Let the Reader ſee the place, and he ſhall finde, *damnably* is your addition. To the third demand, *Muſt I conſult* (about my difficulties) *with every particular perſon of the Catholique Church?* You anſwer for him, (that which is moſt falſe) that *it ſeemes ſo by his words; The whole militant Church, that is, all the members of it cannot poſſibly erre either in the whole faith, or any neceſſary Article of it.* Which is very certaine, for ſhould it doe ſo, it ſhould be the Church no longer. But what ſenſe is there that you ſhould collect out of theſe words, that every member of the militant Church muſt be conſulted with? By like reaſon, if he had ſaid that all men in the world cannot erre; If he had ſaid that God in his own perſon, or his Angels, could not erre in theſe matters, you might haue gathered from hence, that he laid a neceſſity upon men in doubt, to conſult with Angels, or with God in his own perſon, or with all men in the world. Is it not evident to all ſober men, that to make any man or men fit to be conſulted with, beſides the underſtanding of the matter, it is abſolutely requiſite that they may bee ſpoken with? And is it not apparently impoſſible, that any man ſhould ſpeak with all the members of the Militant Church? Or if hee had ſpoken with them all, know that he had done ſo? Nay does not D. *Potter* ſay as much in plain termes? Nay more, doe not you take notice that hee does ſo in the very next words before theſe, where you ſay, *he affirmes that the Catholique Church cannot be told of private injuries*: unleſſe you will perſwade us there is a difference between the Catholique Church, and the whole Militant Church. For whereas you make him deny this of the Catholique Church united, and affirm it of the Militant Church diſperſed into particulars; The truth is, he ſpeaks neither of united nor diſperſed, but affirmes ſimply (as appeares to your ſhame by your own quotations) that *the Catholique Church cannot bee told of private iniuries*: and then, that the *whole Militant Church cannot erre.* But then beſides, that the united Church cannot be conſulted, and the diſperſed may, what a wild imagination is it? and what a ſtrange injuſtice was it in you to father it upon him? I beſeech you Sir, to conſider ſeriouſly how far blinde zeal to your ſuperſtition hath tranſported you beyond all bounds of honeſty and diſcretion, & made you careleſſe of ſpeaking either truth or ſenſe, ſo you ſpeak againſt D. *Potter*!

55 Again, you make him ſay, *The Prelates of Gods Church meeting in a lawfull Councell may erre damnably*: and from this collect, *It remaines then for your neceſſary inſtruction you muſt repaire to every particular member of the Vniverſall Church, ſpread over the face of the earth.* And this is alſo *Pergula pictoris, veri nihil, omnia ficta.* The Antecedent falſe, (not for the matter of it, but) that D. *Potter* ſaies it; And the conſequence as far from it, as Gades from Gange; and as coherent as a rope of ſand. A generall Councell may erre; therefore you muſt travell all the world over, and conſult with every particular Chriſtian! As if there were nothing elſe to be conſulted with: nay, as if according to the doctrine of Proteſtants, (for ſo you muſt ſay,) there were nothing

thing to be conſulted with, but only a Generall Councell, or all the world! Haue you never heard that Proteſtants ſay, That men for their direction muſt conſult with Scripture? Nay, doth not D. *Potter* ſay it often in this very Book which you are confuting? Nay more, in this very page out of which you take this peece of your *Cento*, *A Generall Councell may erre damnably*: are there not theſe plain words, *In ſearches of Truth* (he meanes divine Truth) *God ever directs us to the infallible rule of Truth, the Scripture?* With what conſcience then or modeſty can you impoſe upon him this unreaſonable conſequence, & yet pretend that your whole diſcourſe, is either his own direct aſſertion, or evident conſequences, cleerely deduc'd from them? You adde, that yet he teaches (as if he contradicted himſelfe) *that the promiſes of God made to the Church for his aſſiſtance, are not intended to particular perſons, but only to the Catholique Church*: which ſure agrees very well with any thing ſaid by D. *Potter*. If it be repugnant to what you ſaid for him falſely, what is that to him?

56 Neither yet is this *to drive any man to deſperation*: unleſſe it be ſuch a one; as hath ſuch a ſtrong affection to this word, *Church*, that he will not goe to heaven, *unleſſe he hath a Church to lead him thither*. For what though a Councell may erre, and the whole Church cannot be conſulted with, yet this is not to ſend you on the Fooles *Pilgrimage for faith*, and bid you goe and *conferre with every Chriſtian ſoul, man and woman, by Sea and by Land, cloſe priſoner, or at liberty*, as you dilate the matter: But to tell you very briefly, that Vniverſall Tradition directs you to the word of God, and the word of God directs you to Heaven. And therefore here is no cauſe of deſperatiõ, no cauſe for you to be ſo vain, and tragicall, as here you would ſeeme. *Yet upon ſuppoſall* (you ſay) *of this miraculous pilgrimage for faith, before I have the faith of Miracles, how ſhall I proceed at our meeting? Or how ſhall I know the man on whom I may ſecurely rely?* And hereunto, you frame this anſwere for the Doctor; *Procure to know whether he believe all Fundamentall points of faith*: Whereas in all the Doctors book, there is no ſuch anſwer to any ſuch queſtion, or any like it. Neither doe you as your cuſtome is, note any page where it may be found; which makes mee ſuſpect, that ſure you have ſome priuate licence to uſe Heretiques (as you call them) at your pleaſure, and make them anſwer any thing to any thing.

57 Wherein I am yet more confirmed by the anſwer you put in his mouth to your next demand, *How ſhall I know whether he hold all Fundamentall points or no?* For whereas hereunto D. *Potter* hauing given one Anſwer fully ſatisfactory to it, which is, *If he truly believe the undoubted bookes of Canonicall Scripture, he cannot but believe all Fundamentalls*; and another which is but ſomethings towards a full ſatisfaction of it, That *the Creed containes all the fundamentalls of ſimple Belief*: you take no notice of the former, and pervert the latter, and make him ſay, *The Creed containes all fundamentalls of faith*. Whereas you know, and within ſixe or ſeven lines after this confeſſe, that he never pretended it to contain *all ſimply*, but *all of one ſort*, all *neceſſary points*

points of ſimple belief. Which aſſertion becauſe he modeſtly delivers as very probable (being willing to conclude rather leſſe then more then his reaſons require,) hereupon you take occaſion to aske: *Shall I hazard my ſoul on probabilities, or even wagers!* As if whatſoever is but probable, though in the higheſt degree of probability, were as likely to be falſe as true! Or becauſe it is but Morally, not Mathematically certain that there was ſuch a Woman as Q. *Elizabeth*, ſuch a man as H. the 8. that is in the higheſt degree probable, therefore it were an even wager there were none ſuch! By this reaſon, ſeeing the truth of your whole Religion depends finally upon *Prudentiall motives*, which you doe but pretend to be very credible, it will be *an even wager that your Religion is falſe.* And by the ſame reaſon, or rather infinitely greater, ſeeing it is impoſſible for any man (according to the grounds of your Religion) to know himſelfe, much leſſe another to be a true Pope, or a true Prieſt; nay to have a Morall certainty of it, becauſe theſe things are obnoxious to innumerable ſecret and undiſcernable nullities, it will be an even wager, nay (if we proportion things indifferently,) a hundred to one, that every Conſecration and Abſolution of yours is void, & that whenſoever you adore the Hoſt, you and your Aſſiſtants commit Idolatry: That there is a nullity in any Decree that a Pope ſhall make, or any Decree of a Councell which he ſhall confirme: Particularly it will be at leaſt an even wager, that all the Decrees of the Councell of Trent are void, becauſe it is at moſt but very probable that the Pope which confirmed them was true Pope. If you miſlike theſe inferences, then confeſſe you have injur'd *D. Potter* in this alſo, that you have confounded and made all one, Probabilities, and even wagers. Whereas every ordinary Gameſter can informe you, that though it be a thouſand to one that ſuch a thing will happen, yet it is not ſure, but very probable.

58 To make the meaſure of your injuſtice yet fuller, you demand, *If the Creed containes only points of ſimple belief, how ſhall you know what points of belief are neceſſary which direct our practiſe? D. Potter* would have anſwered you in our Saviours words, *ſearch the Scriptures.* But you have a great minde it ſeemes to be a deſpairing, and therefore having propos'd your Queſtion, will not ſuffer him to give you Anſwer, but ſhut your eares and tell him, *ſtill he chalkes out new paths for deſperation.*

59 In the reſt of your interlude, I cannot but commend one thing in you, that you keep a *decorum*, and obſerve very well the Rule given you by the great Maſter of your Art,

--Servetur ad imum
Qualis ab incepto proceſſerat & ſibi conſtet:

One vein or ſcurrility and diſhoneſty runs clean through it, from the begining to the end. Your next demand then is, *Are all the Articles of the Creed for their nature and matter Fundamentall?* and the Anſwer, *I cannot ſay ſo.* Which Anſwer (though it be true) *D. Potter* no where gives it, neither hath he occaſion, but you make it for him, to bring in another queſtion; and that is, *How then ſhall I know, which in particular be, and which*

which be not Fundamentall? D.Potter would have anſwered, It is a vain quēſtion: believe all, and you ſhall be ſure to believe all that is Fundamentall.

60 But what ſaies now his prevaricating Proxy? What does he make him ſay? This which followes: *Read my anſwer to a late Popiſh Pamphlet, intituled Charity Miſtaken: There you ſhall finde, that Fundamentall doctrines, are ſuch Catholique verities, as principally and eſſentially pertain to the faith, ſuch as properly conſtitute a Church, and are neceſſary in ordinary courſe, to be diſtinctly believed by every Chriſtian that will be ſaved. They are thoſe Grand and Capitall Doctrines which make up our Faith, that is, the common faith, which is alike pretious in all; being one and the ſame, in the higheſt Apoſtle, and the meaneſt believer, which the Apoſtle elſewhere calls the firſt Principles of the Oracles of God, and the forme of ſound words.*

61 But in earneſt, Good Sir, doth the Doctor in theſe places by you quoted, make to this queſtion this ſame ſottiſh anſwer? Or doe you think that againſt an Heretique nothing is unlawfull? Certainly if he doth anſwer thus, I will make bold to ſay he is a very foole. But if he does not, (as indeed he does not) then:--- But I forbeare you, and beſeech the Reader to conſult the places of D.*Potters* book; and there he ſhall find, that in the former halfe of theſe (as you call them) varied words and phraſes, he declared only what he meant by the word *Fundamentall*, which was needfull to prevent miſtakes, and cavilling about the meaning of the word, which is metaphoricall, and therefore ambiguous; and that the latter halfe of them, are ſeverall places of Scripture imployed by *D.Potter*, to ſhew that his diſtinction of Fundamentall and not Fundamentall hath expreſſe ground in it. Nay of theſe two places, very pertinent unto two very good purpoſes, you have exceeding fairely patcht together a moſt ridiculous anſwer, to a queſtion that *D. Potter* never dream't of. *But the words*, you will ſay, *are in D.Potters Book, though in divers places, and to other purpoſes.* Very true: And ſo the words of *Auſonius* his obſcene *Feſcennine*, are taken out of *Virgil*, yet *Virgil* ſurely was not the Author of this Poem. Beſides, in *D.Potters* book, there are theſe words, *Dread Soveraigne, amongſt the many excellent vertues which have made your Majeſties perſon ſo deare unto God, &c.* And why now may you not ſay as well, that in theſe he made Anſwer to your former queſtion, what points of the Creed were, and what were not Fundamentalls?

62 But *unleſſe this queſtion may be anſwered, his doctrine you ſay ſerves only, either to make men deſpaire, or elſe to have recourſe to theſe whom we call Papiſts.* It ſeemes a little thing will make you deſpaire, if you be ſo ſullen as to doe ſo, becauſe men will not trouble themſelves to ſatisfy your curious queſtions. And I pray be not offended with me for ſo eſteeming it, becauſe as before I told you, if you will believe all the points of the Creed, you cannot chooſe but believe all the points of it that are fundamentall, though you be ignorant which are ſo, and which are not ſo. Now I believe your deſire to know which are Fundamentalls, proceeds only from a deſire to be aſſur'd that you

doe believe them; which ſeeing you may be aſſured of, without knowing which they be, what can it be but curioſity to deſire to know it? Neither may you think to mend your ſelfe herein one whit by having recourſe to them whom we call Papiſts; for they are as farre to ſeek as wee in this point, which of the Articles of the Creed are, for their nature and matter, fundamentall, and which are not. Particularly, you will ſcarce meet with any amongſt their Doctors, ſo adventurous, as to tell you for a certain, whether or no the conception of Chriſt by the Holy Ghoſt, his being born of a Virgin, his Buriall, his deſcent into Hell, and the Communion of Saints, be points of their own nature and matter fundamentall. Such I mean, as without the diſtinct and explicite knowledge of them no man can be ſaved.

63 But you will ſay, *at leaſt they give this certain rule, that all points defined by Chriſts viſible Church, belong to the foundation of faith, in ſuch ſenſe, as to deny any ſuch, cannot ſtand with Salvation.* So alſo Proteſtants give you this more certain rule, That whoſoever believes heartily thoſe books of Scripture, which all the Chriſtian Churches in the world acknowledge to be Canonicall, and ſubmits himſelfe indeed to this, as to the rule of his belief, muſt of neceſſity believe all things fundamentall, and if he live according to his faith, cannot fail of Salvation. But beſides, what certainty have you, that that rule of Papiſts is ſo certain? By the viſible Church it is plain, they mean only their own: and why their own only ſhould be the Viſible Church, I doe not underſtand: and as little, why all points defined by this Church ſhould belong to the foundation of faith. Theſe things you had need ſee well and ſubſtantially proved, before you rely upon them, otherwiſe you expoſe your ſelfe to danger of imbracing damnable errors inſtead of Fundamentall truth's. But you will ſay D. *Potter himſelfe acknowledges, that we doe not erre in Fundamentalls.* If he did ſo, yet me thinkes you have no reaſon to reſt upon his acknowledgement with any ſecurity, whom you condemne of errour in many other matters. Perhaps exceſſe of Charity to your perſons, may make him cenſure your errors more favourably then he ſhould doe. But the truth is, and ſo I have often told you, though the Doctor hope that your errors are not ſo unpardonably deſtructive, but that ſome men, who ignorantly hold them may be ſaved, yet *in themſelves*, he profeſſes and proclaimes them *damnable*, and ſuch as he feares, will be certainly deſtructive to ſuch as you are, that is, to all thoſe, *who have eyes to ſee and will not ſee them.*

64 *Ad* §.20.21.22.23. In the Remainder of this Chapter, you promiſe to anſwer D. *Potters* Arguments, againſt that which you ſaid before. But preſently forgetting your ſelfe, in ſtead of anſwering his Arguments, you fall a confuting his Anſwers to your own. The arguments objected by you which here you vindicate, were two. 1. *The Scripture is not ſo much as mentioned in the Creed, therefore the Creed containes not all things neceſſary to be believed.* 2. *Baptiſme is not contained in the Creed, therefore not all things neceſſary.* To both which Arguments my Anſwer ſhortly is this, that they prove ſomething, but

it

it is that which no man here denies. For D.*Potter* (as you have alſo confeſſed) never ſaid, nor undertook to ſhew, that the Apoſtles intended to comprize in the Creed, all points abſolutely, which we are bound to believe, or after ſufficient propoſall, not to disbelieve; which yet here and every where you are obtruding upon him: But only that they purpoſed to comprize in it, all ſuch doctrines purely ſpeculative, all ſuch matters of ſimple belief, as are in ordinary courſe, neceſſary to be diſtinctly and explicitly believed by all men. Neither of theſe objections doe any way infringe or impeach the truth of this Aſſertion. Not the firſt, becauſe according to your own doctrine, all men are not bound to know explicitely what books of Scripture are Canonicall. Nor the ſecond, becauſe Baptiſme is not a matter of Faith, but practiſe: not ſo much to be believed, as to be given, and received. And againſt theſe Anſwers, whether you have brought any conſiderable new matter, let the indifferent Reader judge. As for the other things, which D.*Potter* rather glanceth at, then builds upon, in anſwering theſe objections, as the Creed's being collected out of Scripture, and ſuppoſing the Authority of it, which *Gregory of Valentia* in the place above cited, ſeemes to me to confeſſe, to have been the Iudgement of the Ancient Fathers: and the *Nicene* Creed's intimating the authority of Canonicall Scripture, and making mention of Baptiſme: Theſe things were ſaid *ex abundanti*; and therefore I conceive it ſuperfluous to examine your exceptions againſt them. Prove that D.*Potter* did affirme that the Creed containes all things neceſſary to be believed of all ſorts, and then theſe objections will be pertinent, and deſerve an anſwer. Or produce ſome point of ſimple belief, neceſſary to be explicitly believed, which is not contained either in termes, or by conſequence in the Creed, and then I will either anſwer your Reaſons, or confeſſe I cannot. But all this while you doe but trifle, and are ſo farre from hitting the marke, that you rove quite beſide the But.

65 *Ad* §. 23.24.25. D.*Potter* demands, *How it can be neceſſary for any Chriſtian to have more in his Creed then the Apoſtles had, and the Church of their times?* You Anſwer, *That he trifles, not diſtinguiſhing between the Apoſtles belief, and that abridgement of ſome Articles of faith, which we call the Apoſtles Creed.* I reply, that it is you which trifle, affectedly confounding (what D.*Potter* hath plainly diſtinguiſhed) the Apoſtles belief of the whole Religion of Chriſt, as it comprehends both what we are to doe, and what we are to believe, with their belief of that part of it, which containes not duties of obedience, but only the neceſſary Articles of ſimple faith. Now though the Apoſtles Beleife be, in the former ſenſe, a larger thing then that which we call the Apoſtles Creed: yet in the latter ſenſe of the word, the Creed (I ſay) is a full comprehenſion of their belief; which you your ſelfe have formerly confeſſed, though ſomewhat fearfully, and inconſtantly: and here again unwillingneſſe to ſpeak the truth, makes you ſpeak that which is hardly ſenſe, and call it *an abridgement of ſome Articles of Faith.* For I demand, theſe *ſome Articles* which you ſpeak of, which are they? Thoſe that are out of the Creed, or thoſe that are

in it? Thoſe that are in it, it comprehends at large, and therefore it is not an abridgement of them: Thoſe that are out of it, it comprehends not at all, and therefore it is not an abridgement of them. If you would call it now an abridgement of the Faith, this would be ſenſe, and ſignify thus much, That all the neceſſary Articles of the Chriſtian faith are compriz'd in it. For this is the proper duty of abridgements, to leave out nothing neceſſary, and to take in nothing unneceſſary.

66 Moreover, in anſwer to this demand you tell us, that *the Doctor beggs the Queſtion, ſuppoſing that the Apoſtles believed no more then is contained in their Creed.* I Anſwer, He ſuppoſes no ſuch matter; but only that they knew no more neceſſary Articles of ſimple belief, then what are contained in their Creed. So that here you abuſe D. *Potter* and your Reader, by taking ſophiſtically without limitation, that which is delivered with limitation.

67 But this demand of *D. Potters*, was equivalent to a Negation, and intended for one: *How can it be neceſſary for any Chriſtian, to have more in his Creed, then the Apoſtles had?* All one with this, *It cannot be neceſſary &c.* And this negation of his, he inforces with many arguments, which he propoſes by way of interrogation, thus. *May the Church of after Ages make the narrow way to heaven, narrower then our Saviour left it? Shall it bee a fault to ſtraiten and encumber the Kings high way with publique nuiſances; and is it lawfull by adding new Articles to the faith, to retrench any thing from the Latitude of the King of Heavens high way to eternall happineſſe? The yoake of Chriſt, which he ſaid was eaſy, may it be juſtly made heavier by the Governors of the Church in after Ages? The Apoſtles profeſſe they revealed to the Church the whole Counſell of God, keeping back nothing needfull for our Salvation. What tyranny then to impoſe any new unneceſſary matters on the faith of Chriſtians, eſpecially (as the late Popes have done) under the high commanding forme,* Qui non crediderit, damnabitur? *If this may be done, why then did our Saviour reprehend the Phariſes ſo ſharpely, for binding heavy burdens, and laying them on mens ſhoulders? And why did he teach them, that in vain they worſhipped God, teaching for doctrines mens Traditions? And why did the Apoſtles call it tempting of God, to lay thoſe things upon the necks of Chriſtians, that were not neceſſary?*

68 All which interrogations ſeeme to me to containe ſo many plain and convincing Arguments of the premiſed Aſſertion; to all which (one excepted,) according to the adviſe of the beſt Maſters of Rhetorique in ſuch Caſes, you have anſwered very diſcreetly, by ſaying O. But when you write againe, I pray take notice of them: and if you can deviſe no faire, and ſatisfying anſwer to them, then be ſo ingenuous as to grant the Concluſion, That no more can be neceſſary for Chriſtians to beleeve now, then was in the Apoſtles time. A concluſion of great importance, for the deciſion of many Controverſies, & the disburdening of the faith of Chriſt from many incumbrances.

69 As for that one, which you thought you could faſten upon, grounded on the 20. Act. 27. let me tell you plainly, that by your Anſwering

ſwering this, you have ſhewed plainly that it was wiſely done of you to decline the reſt. You tell D. *Potter*, That *needfull for ſalvation* is his gloſſe, which perhaps you intended for a peice of an Anſwer. But good Sir, conſult the place, and you ſhall find, that there S. *Paul* himſelf ſaies that he kept back οὐδὲν τῶν συμφερόντων, *not any thing that was profitable*: and I hope you will make no difficulty to grant, that whatſoever is needfull for ſalvation, is very profitable.

70 But then you ſay, *This is no prooſe unleſſe he beg the Queſtion, and ſuppoſe, that whatſoever the Apoſtles revealed to the Church is contained in the Creed.* I Anſwer, it is not D. *Potter* that beggs the Queſtion, but you that miſtake it: which is not here in this particular place, Whether all points of ſimple Beleife neceſſary for the ſalvation of the Primitive Chriſtians, were contained in the Apoſtles Symbole? (for that and the proofes of it follow after, in the next, §. p. 229. of D. *Potters* Booke:) but, whether any thing can be neceſſary for Chriſtians to beleeve now, which was not ſo from the beginning? D. *Potter* maintaines the negative; and to make good his opinion, thus he argues, S. *Paul* declared to the *Epheſians* the whole Counſell of God touching their Salvation; Therefore that which S. *Paul* did not declare, can be no part of the Counſell of God, and therefore not neceſſary. And againe: S. *Paul* kept back nothing from the *Epheſians* that was profitable; Therefore he taught them all things neceſſary to ſalvation. Conſider this I pray a little better, and then I hope you will acknowledge, that here was no *Petitio principij*, in D. *Potter*, but rather *Ignoratio Elenchi*, in you.

71 Neither is it materiall, that theſe words were particularly directed by S. *Paul*, to the Paſtours of the Church: For (to ſay nothing that the point here iſſuable, is not, Whom he taught, whether Prieſts or Laymen? But how much he taught, and whether all things neceſſary?) it appeares plainly out of the Text, and I wonder you ſhould read it ſo negligently as not to obſerve it, that though he ſpeaks now to the Paſtors, yet he ſpeaks of what he taught not only them, but alſo the Laity as well as them. *I have kept back nothing* (ſaies S. *Paul*) *that was profitable, but have ſhewed, and have taught you publikely, and from houſe to houſe; Teſtifying* (I pray obſerve) *both to the Iewes, and alſo to the Greeks, Repentance towards God, & Faith towards our Lord Ieſus Chriſt.* And a little after, *I know that yee all, among whom I have gone Preaching the Kingdome of God, ſhall ſee my face no more: Wherefore I take you to record this day, that I am innocent from the blood of all men; for I have kept nothing back, but have ſhewed you all the Counſell of God.* And againe, *Remember that by the ſpace of three yeares I ceaſed not to warne every one night and day with teares.* Certainly though he did all theſe things to the Paſtours among the reſt, nay above the reſt, yet without controverſie, they whom he taught publikely, and from houſe to houſe: The *Iewes* and *Greeks* to whom he teſtified, (1.) preach'd Faith and Repentance: Thoſe all, amongſt whom he went preaching the kingdome of God: Thoſe, Every one, whom for three yeares together he warned, were not Biſhops and Paſtors only.

72 Neither is this to ſay, that the Apoſtles taught Chriſtians nothing but their Creed, nothing of the Sacraments, Cõmandements, &c. for that is not here the point to be proved: but only, that they taught them all things neceſſary, ſo that nothing can be neceſſary which they did not teach them. But how much of this they put into their Creed, whether *all the neceſſary points of ſimple beleife*, as we pretend, or only as you ſay, *I know not what*, is another Queſtion, and which comes now to be farther examined. D. *Potter*, in confirmation of it, beſides the authorities which you formerly ſhifted of, with ſo egregious tergiverſation, urges fiue ſeuerall Arguments.

73 The ſenſe of the firſt is this, *If all the neceſſary points of ſimple beliefe be not compriz'd in the Creed, it can no way deſerue the name of the Apoſtles Creed, as not being their Creed in any ſenſe, but onely a part of it.* To this you anſwer § 25. *Vpon the ſame affected ambiguity, &c.* Anſw. It is very true that their whole faith was of a larger extent, but that was not the Queſtion: But whether all the points of ſimple beliefe which they taught as neceſſary to be explicitely believed, be not contained in it? And if thus much at leaſt of Chriſtian Religion bee not comprized in it, I again deſire you to inform me how it could be call'd the Apoſtles Creed!

74 Foure other Reaſons D. *Potter* urges to the ſame purpoſe, grounded upon the practiſe of the Ancient Church; The laſt whereof you anſwer in the ſecond part of your Book. But to the reſt, drawne from the ancient Churches appointing her Infants to be inſtructed (for matters of ſimple beliefe,) only in the Creed: From her admitting Catechumens unto Baptiſme: and of Strangers to her Communion upon their only profeſſion of the Creed, you haue not, for ought I can perceaue, thought fit to make any kind of anſwer.

75 The difficulties of the 27. and laſt § of this Chapter, haue been ſatisfied. So that there remaines unexamined onely the 26. *Section*, wherein you exceed your ſelfe in ſophiſtry: Eſpecially in that trick of Cavillers, which is to anſwer objections by other objections; an excellent way to make controverſies endleſſe! D. *Potter* deſires to be reſolved, *Why amongſt many things of equall neceſſity to be believed, the Apoſtles ſhould diſtinctly ſet down ſome in the Creed, and bee altogether ſilent of others?* Inſtead of reſolving him in this difficulty, you put another to him, and that is, *Why are ſome points not Fundamentall expreſſed in it, rather then others of the ſame quality?* Which demand is ſo far from ſatisfying the former doubt, that it makes it more intricate. For upon this ground it may be demanded, How was it poſſible that the Apoſtles ſhould leave out any Articles ſimply neceſſary, and put in others not neceſſary, eſpecially if their intention were (as you ſay it was) to deliver in it ſuch Articles as were fitteſt for thoſe times? Vnleſſe (which were wondrous ſtrange) unneceſſary Articles were fitter for thoſe times, then neceſſary. But now to your Queſtion, the Anſwer is obvious: Theſe unneceſſary things might be put in, becauſe they were circumſtances of the neceſſary, *Pontius Pilate* of Chriſts Paſſion, The third day of the Reſurrectiõ; neither doth the adding of thẽ make

the

the Creed ever a whit the leſſe portable, the leſſe fit to be underſtood, and remembred. And for the contrary reaſons, other unneceſſary things might bee left out. Beſides, who ſees not that the addition of ſome unneceſſary circumſtances is a thing that can hardly be avoided without affectation! And therefore not ſo great a fault, nor deſerving ſuch a cenſure, as the omiſſion of any thing eſſentiall to the work undertaken, and neceſſary to the end propoſed in it.

76 You demand again (as it is no hard matter to multiply demands,) *why our Saviours deſcent to Hell, and Buriall was expreſſed, and not his circumciſion, his manifeſtation to the three Kings, and working of Miracles?* I anſwer: His Reſurrection, Aſcenſion, and ſitting at the right hand of God, are very great Miracles, and they are expreſſed. Beſides, S. *Iohn* aſſures us, *That the Miracles which Chriſt did, were done and written not for themſelves that they might be believed*, but for a farther end, that *we might believe that Ieſus was the Chriſt, and believing haue eternall life.* He therefore that believes this may be ſaved, though he haue no explicite and diſtinct faith of any Miracle that our Saviour did. His Circumciſion & Manifeſtation to the Wiſe men (for I know not upon what grounds you call them *Kings*) are neither things ſimply neceſſary to be known, nor haue any neer relation to thoſe that are ſo. As for his Deſcent into Hell, it may (for ought you know) be put in as a thing neceſſary of it ſelfe to be known. If you ask why more then his Circumciſion, I refer you to the Apoſtles for an anſwer, who put that in, and left this out of their Creed: and yet ſure, were not ſo *forgetfull after the receiving of the holy Ghoſt, as to leaue out any prime & principall foundation of the faith*, which are the very words of your own *Gordonius Huntlæus, Cont.2.c.10.num.10.* Likewiſe his Buriall was put in perhaps as neceſſary of it ſelfe to be known. But though it were not, yet hath it manifeſtly ſo neer relation to theſe that are neceſſary, (his Paſſion & Reſurrection, being the Conſequent of the one, and the Antecedent of the other,) that it is no marvell if for their ſakes it was put in. For though I verily believe that there is no neceſſary point of this nature, but what is in the Creed, yet I doe not affirme, becauſe I cannot prove it, that there is nothing in the Creed but what is neceſſary. You demand thirdly, *Why did they not expreſſe Scriptures, Sacraments, and all Fundamentall points of faith tending to practiſe, as well as thoſe which reſt in Beliefe?* I anſwer; Becauſe their purpoſe was to comprize in it only thoſe neceſſary points which reſt in beliefe: which appeares, becauſe of practicall points there is not in it ſo much as one.

77 D. *Potter* ſubjoynes to what is ſaid aboue, *That as well, nay better they might have given no Article but that of the Church, and ſent us to the Church for all the reſt: For in ſetting down others beſides that, and not all, they make us beleeve we have all, when we have not all.* This conſequence you deny: and neither give reaſon againſt it, nor ſatisfie his reaſon for it, which yet in my judgment is good and concluding. The Propoſition to be proved is this, That if your Doctrine were trve, this ſhort Creed, *I beleeve the Roman Church to be infallible*, would have been better, that is, more effectuall to keep the beleevers of it from

from Hereſie, and in the true faith, then this Creed which now we have. A propoſition ſo evident, that I cannot ſee how either you, or any of your Religion, or indeed any ſenſible man can from his heart deny it. Yet becauſe you make ſhew of doing ſo, or elſe, which I rather hope, doe not rightly apprehend the force of the Reaſon, I will endeavour briefly to adde ſome light and ſtrength to it, by comparing the effects of theſe ſeverall ſuppoſed Creeds.

78 The former Creed therefore would certainly produce theſe effects in the beleevers of it: An impoſſibility of being in any formall Hereſie: A neceſſity of being prepared in mind to come out of all Errour in faith, or materiall Hereſie; which certainly you will not denie, or if you doe, you pull downe the only pillar of your Church and Religion, and denie that which is in effect the only thing you labour to prove through your whole Book.

79 The latter Creed which now we have, is ſo un-effectuall for theſe good purpoſes, that you your ſelf tell us of innumerable, groſſe, damnable Hereſies, that have been, are, and may be, whoſe contrary Truths are neither explicitly, nor by conſequence comprehended in this Creed: So that no man by the beleife of this Creed without the former, can be poſſibly guarded from falling into them, and continuing obſtinate in them. Nay, ſo far is this Creed from guarding them from theſe miſchiefes, that it is more likely to enſnare thē into them, by ſeeming and yet not being a full comprehenſion of all neceſſary points of faith: which is apt (as experience ſhewes,) to miſ-guide men into this pernitious errour, That believing the Creed, they believe all neceſſary points of faith, whereas indeed they doe not ſo. Now upon theſe grounds I thus conclude: That Creed which hath great commodities and no danger, would certainly be better then that which hath great danger, and wants many of theſe great commodities; But the former ſhort Creed propos'd by me, *I believe the Roman Church to be infallible*, (if your doctrine be true,) is of the former condition, and the latter, that is, the Apoſtles Creed, is of the latter, Therefore the former (if your doctrine be true) would without controverſie be better then the latter.

80 But (ſay you) by this kind of arguing, one might inferre quite contrary. *If the Apoſtles Creed contain all points neceſſary to Salvation, what need have wee of any Church to teach us? And conſequently what need of the Article of the Church?* To which I anſwer: that having compared your inference and D. *Potters* together, I cannot diſcover any ſhadow of reſemblance between them, nor any ſhew of Reaſon, why the perfection of the Apoſtles Creed, ſhould exclude a neceſſity of ſome body to deliver it. Much leſſe why the whole Creed's containing all things neceſſary ſhould make the beliefe of a part of it unneceſſary. As well (for ought I underſtand) you might avouch this inference to be as good as D. *Potters*: The Apoſtles Creed contains all things neceſſary, therefore there is no need to believe in God. Neither does it follow ſo well as *D. Potters* argument followes, That if the Apoſtles Creed containes all things neceſſary, that all other Creeds

and

and Catechiſmes, wherein are added divers other Particulars, are ſuperfluous. For theſe other Particulars may be the duties of obedience, they may be profitable points of Doctrine, they may be good expoſitions of the Apoſtles Creed, and ſo not ſuperfluous, and yet for all this the Creed may ſtill contain all points of belief that are ſimply neceſſary. Theſe therefore are poor conſequences, but no more like *D. Potters* then an apple is like an oiſter.

81 But this conſequence after you have ſufficiently ſlighted and diſgraced it, at length you promiſe *us newes, and pretend to grant it.* But what is that which you mean to grant? That the Apoſtles did put no Article in their Creed but only that of the Church? Or that, if they had done ſo, they had done better then now they have done? This is D. *Potters* inference out of your Doctrine: and truly if you ſhould grant this, this were newes indeed? Yes, ſay you *I will grant it, but only thus farre, that Chriſt hath referred us only to his Church.* Yea, but this is clean another thing, and no newes at all, that you ſhould grant that, which you would fain have granted to you. So that your dealing with us is juſt as if a man ſhould profer me a curteſy, and pretend that he would oblige himſelfe by a note under his hand, to give me twenty pound, and in ſtead of it write, that I owe him forty, and deſire me to ſubſcribe to it and be thankfull. Of ſuch favours as theſe it is very ſafe to be liberall.

82 You tell us afterward (but how it comes in I know not) that *it were a childiſh argument, The Creed containes not all things neceſſary; Ergo, It is not Profitable!* Or, *the Church alone is ſufficient to teach us by ſome convenient meanes: Ergo, She muſt teach us without meanes.* Theſe indeed are childiſh arguments, but for ought I ſee, you alone are the father of them: for in D. *Potters* book, I can neither meet with them, nor any like them. He indeed tels you, that if (by an impoſſible ſuppoſition) your Doctrine were true, another and a farre ſhorter Creed would have been more expedient: even this alone, *I believe the Roman Church to be infallible.* But why you ſhould conclude, he makes this Creed unprofitable, becauſe he ſaies another that might be conceived upon this falſe ſuppoſition, would be more profitable: or, that he laies a neceſſity upon the Church, of teaching without meanes: or, of not teaching this very Creed which now is taught; theſe things are ſo ſubtill that I cannot apprehend them. To my underſtanding, by thoſe words, *And ſent us to the Church for all the reſt,* he does rather manifeſtly imply, that the reſt might be very well, not only profitable but neceſſary, and that the Church was to teach this by Creeds, or Catechiſmes, or Councells, or any other meanes which ſhe ſhould make choice of, for being Infallible ſhe could not chooſe amiſſe.

83 Whereas therefore you ſay, *If the Apoſtles had expreſt no Article but that of the Catholique Church, ſhe muſt haue taught us the other Articles in particular by Creeds, or other meanes:* This is very true, but no way repugnant to the truth of this which followes, that the Apoſtles (if your doctrine be true) had done better ſervice to the Church,

though they had never made this Creed of theirs which now we haue, if inſteed thereof, they had commanded in plain termes that for mens perpetuall direction in the faith, this ſhort Creed ſhould be taught all men, *I believe the Roman Church ſhall be for ever infallible.* Yet you muſt not ſo miſtake me, as if I meant, that they had done better not to haue taught the Church the ſubſtance of Chriſtian Religion; For then the Church not having learnt it of them, could not haue taught it us. This therefore I doe not ſay: but ſuppoſing they had written theſe Scriptures as they haue written, wherein all the Articles of their Creed are plainly delivered, and preached that Doctrine which they did preach, and done all other things as they have done, beſides the compoſing their Symbole: I ſay, if your doctrine were true, they had done a work infinitely more beneficiall to the Church of Chriſt, if they had never compos'd their Symbole, which is but an imperfect comprehenſion of the neceſſary points of ſimple beliefe, and no diſtinctiue mark (as a Symbole ſhould be) between thoſe that are good Chriſtians, and thoſe that are not ſo; But inſteed thereof, had delivered this one Propoſition, which would haue been certainly effectuall for all the aforeſaid good intents and purpoſes, *The Roman Church ſhall be for ever infallible in all things, which ſhe propoſes as matters of faith.*

84 Whereas you ſay, *If we will believe we haue all in the Creed whē we haue not all, it is not the Apoſtles fault but our own*: I tell you plainly, if it be a fault, I know not whoſe it ſhould be but theirs. For ſure it can be no fault in me to follow ſuch Guides whether ſoever they lead me; Now I ſay, they haue led me into this perſwaſion, becauſe they haue given me great reaſon to believe it, and none to the contrary. The reaſon they haue given me to believe it, is, becauſe it is apparent and confeſt, they did propoſe to themſelues in compoſing it, ſome good end or ends: As *that Chriſtians might haue a forme, by which* (for matter of faith) *they might profeſſe themſelues Catholiques*, So *Putean* out of *Th. Aquinas*: *That the faithfull might know, what the Chriſtian people is to believe explicitely*, So *Vincent Filiucius*: *That being ſeparated into divers parts of the world, they might preach the ſame thing*: And *that, that might ſerve as a mark to diſtinguiſh true Chriſtians from Infidels*, So Cardinall *Richlieu*. Now for all theſe and for any other good intent, I ſay, it will be plainly uneffectuall, unleſſe it contain at leaſt all points of ſimple beliefe, which are in ordinary courſe, neceſſary to be explicitely known by all men. So that if it be a fault in me to believe this, it muſt be my fault to believe the Apoſtles, wiſe and good men: which I cannot doe if I believe not this. And therefore what *Richardus de ſancto Victore* ſayes of God himſelfe, I make no ſcruple at all to apply to the Apoſtles, and to ſay, *Si error eſt quod credo, à vobis deceptus ſum*: If it be an errour which I believe, it is you, and my reverend eſteem of you and your actions that hath led me into it. For as for your ſuſpition, *That we are led into this perſwaſion, out of a hope that we may the better maintain by it ſome opinions of our own*, It is plainly uncharitable. I know no opinion I haue, which I would not as willingly forſake as keep, if I could ſee ſufficient reaſon to enduce me to believe, that it is

the

the will of God I ſhould forſake it. Neither doe I know any opinion I hold againſt the Church of Rome, but I haue more euident grounds then this whereupon to build it. For let but theſe Truths bee granted: That the authority of the Scripture is independent on your Church, & dependent only in reſpect of us upon vniuerſall Tradition; That Scripture is the only Rule of faith: That all things neceſſary to ſalvation are plainly delivered in Scripture: Let I ſay theſe moſt certain and divine Truths be laid for foundations, and let our ſuperſtructions bee conſequent and coherent to them; and I am confident Peace would be reſtored, and Truth maintained againſt you, though the Apoſtles Creed were not in the world.

CHAP. V.

That Luther, Calvin, their Aſſociates, & all who began, or continue the ſeparation from the externall Communion of the Roman Church, are guilty of the proper, and formall ſinne of Schiſme.

THE Searcher of all Hearts, is witneſſe with how unwilling minds, we Catholiques are drawen to faſten the denomination of Schiſmatiques, or Heretiques, on them, for whoſe ſoules, if they imployed their beſt blood, they judge that it could not be better ſpent: If we reioyce, that they are contriſtated at ſuch titles, our joy riſeth not from their trouble or griefe, but, as that of the Apoſtles did, from the fountaine of Charity, *becauſe they are contriſtated to repentance*; that ſo after unpartiall examination, they finding themſelves to be what we ſay, may by Gods holy grace, begin to diſlike, what themſelves are. For our part, we muſt remember that our obligation is, to keep within the meane, betwixt uncharitable bitterneſſe, and pernicious flattery, not yeelding to worldly reſpects, nor offending Chriſtian Modeſty, but uttering the ſubſtance of truth in ſo *Charitable* manner, that not ſo much we, as Truth, and Charity may ſeeme to ſpeak, according to the wholeſome adviſe of S. *Gregory Nazianzen* in theſe divine words: *We doe not affect peace with* (a) *preiudice of the true doctrine, that ſo we may get a name of being gentle, and mild, and yet we ſeek to conſerue peace, fighting in a lawfull manner, and containing our ſelves within our compaſſe, and the rule of Spirit. And of theſe things my iudgment is, and for my part I preſcribe the ſame law to all that deale with ſoules, and treat of true doctrine, that neither they exaſperate mens minds by harſhneſſe, nor make them haughty or inſolent, by ſubmiſſion; but that in the cauſe of faith they behaue themſelves prudently, and adviſedly, and doe not in either of theſe things exceed the meane.* With whom agreeth S. *Leo* ſaying: *It behoveth us in ſuch cauſes to be* (b) *moſt carefull, that without noiſe of contentions, both Charity be conſerued, and Truth maintained.*

a *Orat.* 32.

b *Epiſt.* 81.

2. For better Methode, we will handle theſe points in order. Firſt we will ſet downe the nature, and eſſence, or as I may call it, the *Quality* of *Schiſme*. In the ſecond place, the greatneſſe and grievouſneſſe, or (ſo to tearme it) the *Quantity* thereof. For the Nature, or Quality will tell us who may without injury be iudged Schiſmatiques: and by the greatneſſe, or quantity, ſuch as finde themſelves guilty thereof, will remaine acquainted with the true ſtate of their ſoule, and and whether they may conceive any hope of ſalvation or no. And becauſe Schiſme will be found to be a diviſion from the Church, which could not happen, unleſſe there were alwaies a viſible Church; we will, Thirdly prove, or rather take it as a point to be granted by all Chriſtians, that in all ages there hath beene ſuch a Viſible Congregation of Faithfull People. Fourthly, we will demonſtrate; that *Luther*, *Calvin*, and the reſt, did ſeparate themſelves from *the* Communion of that alwaies viſible Church of Chriſt, and therefore were guilty of *ſchiſme*. And fifthly we will make it evident, that the viſible true Church of Chriſt, out of which *Luther* and his followers departed, was no other but the *Roman Church*, and conſequently that both they, and all others who perſiſt in the ſame diviſion, are Schiſmatiques by reaſon of their ſeparation from the Church of *Rome*.

3 For the firſt point touching the *Nature*, or *Quality* of Schiſme: As the naturall perfection of man conſiſts in his being the *Image* of God his Creator, by the powers of his ſoule; ſo his ſupernaturall perfection is placed in *ſimilitude* with God, as his laſt End and Felicity; and by having the ſaid ſpirituall faculties, his *Underſtanding* and *Will* linked to him. His Vnderſtanding is united

1. Point. The nature of Schiſme.

to God by *Faith*; his Will, by *Charity*. The former relies upon his infallible *Truth*: The latter carrieth us to his infinite *Goodneſſe*. *Faith* hath a deadly oppoſite, *Hereſie*. Contrary to the Vnion, or Vnity of *Charity*, is Separation and *Diviſion*. Charity is twofold. As it reſpects God, his Oppoſite Vice is *Hatred* againſt God: as it uniteth us to our *Neighbour*, his contrary is *Seperation* or diviſion of affections and will, from our *Neighbour*. Our Neighbour may be conſidered, either as one private perſon hath a ſingle relation to another, or as all concur to make one Company or Congregation, which we call the Church; and this is the moſt principall reference and Vnion of one man with another: becauſe the chiefeſt Vnity is that of the *Whole*, to which the particular Vnity of *Parts* is ſubordinate. This Vnity, or Oneneſſe (if ſo I may call it) is effected by Charity, uniting all the members of the Church in one *Myſticall Body*; contrary to which, is *Schiſme*, from the Greeke word ſignifying *Sciſſure*, or *Diviſion*. Wherefore vpon the whole matter, wee find that *Schiſme*, as the Angellicall Doctor *S. Thomas* defines it, is; *A voluntary ſeparation* (c) *from the Vnity of that Charity, whereby all the members of the Church are united.* From hence he deduceth, that *Schiſme* is a ſpeciall and particular vice, diſtinct from *Hereſy*, becauſe they are oppoſite to two different Vertues: Hereſy, to Faith: Schiſme, to Charity. To which purpoſe hee fitly alleageth *S. Hierome* upon theſe words, (*Tit.* 3.) *A man that is an Heretique after the firſt and ſecond admonition avoide*, ſaying: *I conceive that there is this difference betwixt Schiſme and Hereſy, that Hereſy involves ſome perverſe aſſertion: Schiſme for Epiſcopall diſſention doth ſeperate men from the Church.* The ſame doctrine is delivered by S. *Auſtine* in theſe words: *Heretiques* (d) *and Schiſmatiques call their Congregations, Churches: but Heretiques corrupt the Faith by believing of God falſe things: but Schiſmatiques by wicked diviſions breake from fraternall Charity, although they believe what we believe. Therefore the Heretique belongs not to the Church, becauſe ſhe loves God: nor the Schiſmatique, becauſe ſhe loves her Neighbour.* And in another place he ſaith. *It is wont to be demanded* (e) *How Schiſmatiques be diſtinguiſhed from Heretiques: and this difference is found, that not a divers faith, but the divided Society of Communion doth make Schiſmatiques.* It is then evident that Schiſme is different from Hereſie. Nevertheleſſe (ſaith *S. Thomas* (f) as he who is deprived of faith muſt needs want Charity: ſo every Heretique is a Schiſmatique, but not converſively every Schiſmatique is an Heretique; though becauſe want of Charity diſpoſes and makes way to the deſtruction of faith (according to thoſe words of the Apoſtle, *Which* (a good conſcience) *ſome caſting off, have ſuffered ſhipwrack in their faith*) Schiſme ſpeedily degenerates to Hereſy, as *S. Hierome* after the rehearſed words teacheth, ſaying: *Though Schiſme in the beginning may in ſome ſort be underſtood different from Hereſy; yet there is no Schiſme which doth not faigne ſome hereſy to it ſelfe, that ſo it may ſeeme to have departed from the Church upon good reaſon.* Nevertheleſſe when Schiſme proceeds originally from Hereſy, Hereſy as being in that caſe the predominant quality in theſe two peccant humours, giveth the denomination of an *Heretique*; as on the other ſide we are wont, eſpecially in the beginning, or for a while, to call *Schiſmatiques*, thoſe men who firſt began with only *Schiſme*, though in proceſſe of time they fell into ſome *Hereſy*, and by that meanes are indeed both Schiſmatiques and Heretiques.

c 2.2.q. 39. art. in corp. & ad 3.

d Lib. 1. de fid. & Symb. cap. 10.

e Queſt. Evangel. ex Mat. q. 11.

f Vbi ſupra.

4. The reaſon why both Hereſy and Schiſme are repugnant to the being of a good *Catholique*, is: Becauſe the *Catholique*, or Vniverſall Church ſignifies *One* Congregation, or Company of faithfull people, and therefore implies not only *Faith*, to make them *Faithfull* believers, but alſo *Communion*, or *Common Vnion*, to make them *One* in Charity, which excludes Seperation, and *Diviſion*: and therefore in the Apoſtles Creed, *Communion of Saints* is immediatly joyned to the *Catholique Church*.

5. From this definition of Schiſme may be inferred, that the guilt thereof is contracted, not only by diviſion from the Vniverſall Church; but alſo, by a Separation from a particular Church or Dioceſſe which agrees with the Vniverſall. In this manner *Meletius* was a Schiſmatique, but not an Heretique, becauſe as we read in *S. Epiphanius*, (h) he was *of the right Faith: for his faith was not altered at any time from the holy Catholique Church &c. He made a Sect, but departed not from Faith.* Yet becauſe he made to himſelfe a particular Congregation againſt *S. Peter* Archbiſhop of *Alexandria* his lawfull ſuperiour, and by that meanes brought in a diviſion in that particular Church, he was a Schiſmatique. And it is well worth the noting, that the *Meletians* building new Churches put this title upon them, *The Church of Martyrs*: and upon the antient Churches of thoſe who ſucceeded *Peter*, was inſcribed, *The Catholique Church*. For ſo it is. A new Sect muſt have a new name, which though it be never ſo gay and ſpecious, as *the Church of Martyrs*: *the Reformed Church &c.* yet the Novelty ſheweth that it is not the Catholique, nor a true Church. And that Schiſme may be committed by diviſion from a particular Church, wee read in *Optatus Milevitanus* (i) theſe remarkeable words, (which doe well declare who bee Schiſmatiques) brought by him to prove that not *Cæcilianus* but *Parmenianus* was a Schiſmatique: *For Cæcilianus went not out from Majorinus thy Grand-Father* (he meanes his next predeceſſour but one, in the Biſhopricke,) *but Majorinus from Cæcilianus: neither did Cæcilianus depart from the Chaire of Peter, or of Cyprian* (who was but a particular Biſhop,) *but Majorinus, in whoſe Chaire thou ſitteſt which had no beginning before Majorinus himſelfe. Seeing it is manifeſtly knowne that theſe things were ſo done, it evidently appeareth, that you are heires both of Traditors* (that is, of thoſe who delivered up the holy Bible to be burned) *and of Schiſmatiques.* And it ſeemeth that this kinde of Schiſme muſt principally be admitted by Proteſtants, who acknowledge no one viſible

h Hereſ. 68.

i Lib. 1. cont. Parmen.

ſible Head of the whole Church, but hold that every particular Dioceſſe, Church, or Countrey is governed by it ſelfe independently of any one Perſon, or Generall Councell, to which all Chriſtians have obligation to ſubmit their judgements, and wills.

6. As for the grievouſneſſe or quantity of Schiſme (which was the ſecond point propoſed) *S. Thomas* teacheth, that amongſt ſinnes againſt our Neighbour, *Schiſme* (l) is the moſt grievous; becauſe it is againſt the ſpirituall good of the *multitude, or Community*. And therefore as in a *Kingdome or Common-wealth*, there is as great difference betweene the crime of rebellion or ſedition, and debates among priuate men, as there is inequality betwixt one man, and a whole kingdome; ſo in the Church, *Schiſme* is as much more grievous then *ſedition* in a *Kingdome*, as the ſpirituall good of ſoules ſurpaſſeth the civill and politicall weale. And S. *Thomas* addes further, and they looſe the ſpirituall *Power* of *Iuriſdiction*; and if they goe about to abſolve from ſinnes, or to excommunicate, their actions are invalid; which he proves out of the Canon *Novatianus. Cauſa 7. quæſt.* 1. which ſaith: *He that keepeth neither the Vnity of ſpirit, nor the peace of agreement, and ſeparates himſelfe from the bond of the Church, and the Colledge of Prieſts, can neither have the Power, nor dignity of a Biſhop*. The Power alſo of Order (for example to conſecrate the Euchariſt, to ordaine Prieſts &c.) they cannot lawfully exerciſe.

2. Point. The grievouſneſſe of Schiſme.

l *Supra art. 2. ad 3.*

7. In the judgement of the holy Fathers, Schiſme is a moſt grievous offence. S. *Chriſoſtome* (m) compares theſe Schiſmaticall dividers of Chriſts *myſticall* body, to thoſe who ſacrilegiouſly pierced his *naturall* body, ſaying: *Nothing doth ſo much incenſe God, as that the Church ſhould be divided. Although we ſhould doe innumerable good works, if we divide the full Eccleſiaſtical Congregation, we ſhall be puniſhed no leſſe then they who tore his* (naturall) *body. For that was done to the gaine of the whole world, although not with that intention: but this hath no profit at all, but there ariſeth from it moſt great harme. Theſe things are ſpoken, not only to thoſe who beare office, but alſo to thoſe who are governed by them*. Behold how neither a morall good life (which conceit deceiveth many) nor authority of Magiſtrates, nor any neceſſity of Obeying Superiours can excuſe Schiſme from being a moſt haynous offence. *Optatus Milevitanus* (o) cals Schiſme, *Ingens flagitium: a huge crime*. And ſpeaking to the *Donatiſts*, ſaith; that *Schiſme is evill in the higheſt degree, even you are not able to deny*. No leſſe patheticall is *S. Auguſtine* upon this ſubject. He reckons Schiſmatiques amongſt Pagans, Heretiques, and Iewes, ſaying: *Religion is to be ſought, neither in the confuſion of Pagans, nor* (p) *in the filth of Heretiques, nor in the languiſhing of Schiſmatiques, nor in the Age of the Iewes; but amongſt thoſe alone who are called Chriſtian Catholiques, or Orthodox, that is, lovers of Vnity in the whole body, and followers of truth*. Nay he eſteemes them worſe then Infidels and Idolaters, ſaying: *Thoſe whom the Donatiſts* (q) *heale from the wound of Infidelity and Idolatry, they hurt more grievouſly with the wound of Schiſme*. Let here thoſe men who are pleaſed untruely to call us Idolaters, reflect upon themſelves, and conſider, that this holy Father judgeth Schiſmatiques (as they are) to be worſe then Idolaters, which they abſurdly call us. And this he proveth by the example of *Core*, and *Dathan*, *Abiron* and other rebellious Schiſmatiques of the old Teſtament, who were convayed alive downe into Hell, and puniſhed more openly then Idolaters. *No doubt* (ſaith this holy Father) *but* (r) *that was committed moſt wickedly, which was puniſhed moſt ſeverely*. In another place he yoaketh Schiſme with Hereſy, ſaying upon the Eight Beatitude: *Many* (s) *Heretiques, under the name of Chriſtians, deceiving mens ſoules*, doe ſuffer many ſuch things; but therefore they are excluded from this reward, becauſe it is not only ſaid, Happy are they who ſuffer perſecution, but there is added, for Iuſtice. But where there is not found faith, there cannot be juſtice. Neither can Schiſmatiques promiſe to themſelves any part of this reward, becauſe likewiſe where there is no Charity, there cannot be juſtice. And in another place, yet more effectually he ſaith: *Being out of* (t) *the Church, and divided from the heape of Vnity, and the bond of Charity, thou ſhouldeſt be puniſhed with eternall death, though thou ſhouldeſt be burned alive for the name of Chriſt*. And in another place, he hath theſe words: *If he heare not the Church let him be to* (u) *thee, as an Heathen or Publican; which is more grievous then if he were ſmitten with the ſword, conſumed with flames, or caſt to wild beaſts*. And elſe where: *Out of the Catholique Church* (ſaith he) *one* (w) *may have Faith, Sacraments, Orders, and in ſumme, all things except Salvation*. With *S. Auguſtine*, his Countreyman and ſecond ſelfe in ſympathy of ſpirit, *S. Fulgentius* agreeth, ſaying: *Believe this* (x) *ſtedfaſtly without doubting, that every Heretique, or Schiſmatique, baptized in the name of the Father, the Sonne, and the Holy Ghoſt, if before the end of his life, he be not reconciled to the Catholique Church, what Almes ſoever he give; yea though he ſhould ſhed his bloud for the name of Chriſt, he cannot obtaine Salvation*. Marke againe how no morall honeſty of life, no good deeds, no Martyrdome, can without repentance availe any ſchiſmatique for ſalvation. Let us alſo adde that D. *Potter* ſaith: Schiſme is no leſſe (y) damnable, then Hereſy.

m *Hom. 11. in ep. ad Eph.*

o *Lib. cont. Parmen.*

p *Lib. de vera Relig. cap. 6.*

q *Cont. Donatiſt. l. 1. cap. 8.*

r *Ibid. lib. 2. cap. 6.*

s *De ſerm. Dom. in monte c. 5.*

t *Epiſt. 204.*

u *Cont. adverſ. Leg. & Prophet. l. 2. cap. 17.*

w *De geſt. cum Emerit.*

x *De fide ad Pet.*

y *Pag. 42.*

8. But ô you Holy, Learned, Zealous Fathers, and Doctours of Gods Church; out of theſe premiſes, of the grievouſneſſe of ſchiſme, and of the certain damnation which it bringeth (if unrepented) what concluſion draw you for the inſtruction of Chriſtians? *S. Auguſtine* maketh this wholeſome inference. *There is* (z) *no iuſt neceſſity to divide Vnity. S. Irenæus* concludeth: *They cannot* (a) *make any ſo important reformation, as the evill of the Schiſme is pernicious. S. Denis of Alexandria* ſaith: *Certainly* (b) *all things ſhould rather be indured, then to conſent to the diviſion of the Church of God: thoſe Martyrs being no leſſe glorious, that expoſe themſelves to ſuffer the diſmembring of the Church, then thoſe that ſuffer rather then they will offer ſacrifice to Idols.*

z *Cont. Parm. lib. 2. cap. 62.*

a *Cont. hæreſ. lib. 4. cap. 62.*

b *Apud Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccleſ. lib. 6.*

Idols. Would to God all thoſe who divided themſelves from that viſible Church of Chriſt, which was upon earth when *Luther* appeared, would rightly conſider of theſe things! and thus much of the ſecond Point.

3. Point. Perpetuall viſibility of the Church.

9 We have juſt and neceſſary occaſion, eternally to bleſſe almighty God, who hath vouchſafed to make us members of the Catholique *Roman* Church, from which while men fall, they precipitate themſelves into ſo vaſt abſurdities, or rather ſacrilegious blaſphemies, as is implyed in the doctrine of the totall deficiency of the viſible Church, which yet is maintained by divers chief Proteſtants, as may at large be ſeen in *Brerely*, and others; out of whom I will here name *Iewell* ſaying: *The truth was unknown* (c) *at that time, and unheard of, when Martin Luther, and Vlderick Zuinglius firſt came unto the knowledge and preaching of the Goſpell. Perkins* ſaith: *We ſay, that* (d) *before the daies of Luther for the ſpace of many hundred yeares, an univerſall Apoſtacy overſpread the whole face of the earth, and that our* (Proteſtant) *Church was not then viſible to the world. Napper* upon the *Revelations* teacheth, *that from the yeare of* (e) *Chriſt three hundred and ſixteen, the Antichriſtian and Papiſticall raigne hath begun, raigning univerſally, and without any debatable contradiction, one thouſand two hundred ſixty yeares* (that is, till *Luthers* time:) And that, *from the yeare of* (f) *Chriſt three hundred and ſixteen, God hath withdrawn his viſible Church from open Aſſemblies, to the hearts of particular godly men &c. during the ſpace of one thouſand two hundred threeſcore yeares*: And that, *the* (g) *Pope and Clergy have poſſeſſed the outward viſible Church of Chriſtians, even one thouſand two hundred threeſcore yeares*. And that, *the* (h) *true Church abode latent, and inviſible*. And *Brocard* (i) upon the *Revelations*, profeſſeth to joyne in opinion with Napper. *Fulke* affirmeth, *that in the* (k) *time of Boniface the third*, which was the year 607. *the Church was inviſible, and fled into the wilderneſſe, there to remain a long ſeaſon. Luther* ſaith: *Primò ſolus eram: At the firſt* (l) *I was alone. Jacob Hailbronerus* one of the Diſputants for the Proteſtant Party, in the conferenee at *Ratisbone*, affirmeth (m) that the true Church was interrupted by Apoſtacy from the true Faith. *Calvin* ſaith: *It is abſurd in the very* (n) *beginning to breake one from another, after we have been forced to make a ſeparation from the whole world.* It were over-long to alleage the words of *Ioannes Regius, Daniel Chamierus, Beza, Ochimus, Caſtalio*, and others to the ſame purpoſe. The reaſon which caſt them upon this wicked doctrine, was a deſperate voluntary neceſſity: becauſe they being reſolved not to acknowledge the Roman Church to be Chriſts true Church, and yet being convinced by all manner of evidence, that for divers Ages before *Luther* there was no other Congregation of Chriſtians, which could be the Church of Chriſt; there was no remedy but to affirme, that upon earth Chriſt had no viſible Church: which they would never have avouched, if they had known how to avoid the foreſaid inconvenience (as they apprehended it) of ſubmiting themſelves to the *Roman* Church.

10 Againſt theſe exterminating ſpirits, *D. Potter*, and other more moderate Proteſtants, profeſſe, that Chriſt alwaies had, and alwaies will have upon earth a viſible Church: otherwiſe (ſaith he) *our Lords* (o) *promiſe of her ſtable* (p) *edification ſhould be of no value.* And in another place, having affirmed that Proteſtants have not left the Church of Rome, but her corruptions, and acknowledging her ſtill to be a member of Chriſts body, he ſeeketh to cleere himſelfe and others from *Schiſme*, becauſe (ſaith he) *the property* (q) *of Schiſme is (witneſſe the Donatiſts and Luciferians) to cut off from the Body of Chriſt, and the hope of ſalvation, the Church from which it ſeparates. And if any Zelots amongſt us have proceeded to heavier cenſures, their zeale may be excuſed, but their Charity and wiſdome cannot be iuſtified.* And elſewhere he acknowledgeth, that the Roman Church hath *thoſe main, and* (r) *eſſentiall truths, which give her the name and eſſence of a Church.*

11 It being therefore granted by *D. Potter*, and the chiefeſt and beſt learned Engliſh Proteſtants, that Chriſts viſible Church cannot periſh, it will be needleſſe for me in this occaſion to prove it. *S. Auguſtine* doubted not to ſay: *The Prophets* (s) *ſpoke more obſcurely of Chriſt, then of the Church: becauſe, as I thinke, they did foreſee in ſpirit, that men were to make parties againſt the Church, and that they were not to have ſo great ſtrife concerning Chriſt: therefore that was more plainly foretold, and more openly prophecyed about which greater contentions were to riſe, that it might turne to the condemnation of them, who have ſeene it, and yet gone forth.* And in another place he ſaith: *How doe we confide* (t) *to have received manifeſtly Chriſt himſelfe from holy Scriptures, if we have not alſo manifeſtly received the Church from them?* And indeed to what congregation ſhall a man have recourſe for the affaires of his ſoule, if upon earth there be no viſible Church of Chriſt? Beſides, to imagine a company of men believing one thing in their heart, and with their mouth profeſſing the contrary, (as they muſt be ſuppoſed to doe, for if they had profeſſed what they believed, they would have become viſible) is to dream of a damned crew of diſſembling Sycophants, but not to conceive a right notion of the Church of Chriſt our Lord. And therefore *S. Auguſtine* ſaith: *We cannot be ſaved, unleſſe labouring alſo for the* (u) *ſalvation of others, we profeſſe with our mouthes, the ſame faith which we bear in our hearts.* And if any man hold it lawfull to diſſemble, and deny matters of faith, we cannot be aſſured, but that they actually diſſemble, and hide Anabapriſme, Arianiſme, yea Turciſme, and even Atheiſme, or any other falſe beliefe, under the outward profeſſion of Calviniſme. Doe not Proteſtants teach that preaching of the word, and adminiſtration of Sacraments (which cannot but make a Church viſible) are inſeparable notes of the true Church? And therefore they muſt either grant a viſible

Church,

c *Apolog. part. 4. cap. 4. diviſ. 2.* And in his defence printed Ann. 1571. *Pag.* 426.

d In his expoſition upon the Creed. *Pag.* 400.

e *Propoſ.* 37. *Pag.* 68.

f *Ibid. in cap. 12. Pag.* 161. *col.* 3.

g *Ibid. in. cap. 11. Pag.* 145.

h *Ibid. Pag.* 191.

i *Fol.* 119. & 123.

k Anſwere to a counterfeit Catholique. *Pag.* 16.

l *In præfat. operū ſuorum.*

m *In ſuo Acatholico. volum. a.* 15. *cap.* 9. *p.* 479.

n *Ep.* 141.

o *Pag.* 154.

p *Mat.* 16. 18.

q. *Pag.* 76.

r *Pag* 83.

s In *Pſal.* 30. *Com.* 2.

t *Epiſt.* 48.

u *S. Aug. de fide & Symbolo. c.* 1.

Church, or none at all. No wonder then if *S. Auſtine* account this Hereſy ſo groſſe, that he ſaith againſt thoſe who in his time defended the like errour: *But this Church which* (w) *hath been of all Nations is no more, ſhe hath periſhed; ſo ſay they that are not in her. O impudent ſpeech!* And afterward. *This voice ſo abominable, ſo deteſtable, ſo full of preſumption and falſhood, which is ſuſteined with no truth, enlightned with no wiſdome, ſeaſoned with no ſalt, vaine, raſh, heady, pernitious, the Holy Ghoſt foreſaw &c.* And *Peradventure ſome* (x) *one may ſay, there are other ſheep I know not where, with which I am not acquainted, yet God hath care of them. But he is too abſurd in humane ſenſe, that can imagine ſuch things.* And theſe men doe not conſider, that while they deny the perpetuity of a viſible Church, they deſtroy their own preſent Church, according to the argument which S. *Auguſtine* urged againſt the *Donatiſts* in theſe words: (y) *If the Church were loſt in Cyprians* (we may ſay in Gregories) *time, from whence did Donatus* (Luther) *appeare? From what earth did he ſpring? from what ſea is he come? From what heaven did he drop?* And in another place: *How can they vaunt* (z) *to have any Church, if he have ceaſed ever ſince thoſe times?* And all Divines by defining *Schiſme* to be a diviſion from the true Church, ſuppoſe, that there muſt be a known Church, from which it is poſſible for men to depart. But enough of this in theſe few words.

w *In Pſal.* 101.

x *De ovib. cap.* 1.

y De *Bapt. cont. Donat.*

z *Lib.* 3. *cont. Parm.*

12 Let us now come to the fourth, and chiefeſt point, which was, to examine whether *Luther, Calvin*, and the reſt did not depart from the externall Communion of Chriſts viſible Church, and by that ſeparation became guilty of Schiſme. And that they are properly Schiſmatiques cleerely followeth from the grounds which we have laid, concerning the nature of Schiſme, which conſiſts in leaving the externall Communion of the viſible Church of Chriſt our Lord: and it is cleere by evidence of fact, that *Luther* and his followers forſooke the Communion of that Ancient Church. For they did not ſo much as pretend to joyne with any Congregation, which had a being before their time; for they would needs conceive that no viſible company was free from errours in doctrine, and corruption in practiſe: And therefore they oppoſed the doctrine; they withdrew their obedience from the Prelates; they left participation in Sacraments; they changed the Liturgy of publique ſervice of whatſoever Church then extant. And theſe things they pretended to doe out of a perſvaſion, that they were bound (forſooth) in conſcience ſo to doe, unleſſe they would participate with errors, corruptions, and ſuperſtitions. *We dare not* (ſaith *D. Potter*) *communicate* (a) *with Rome either in her publique Liturgy, which is manifeſtly polluted with groſſe ſuperſtition &c. or in thoſe corrupt and ungrounded opinions, which ſhe hath added to the Faith of Catholiques.* But now let *D. Potter* tell me with what viſible Church extant before *Luther*, he would have adventured to communicate in her publique *Liturgy* and *Doctrine*, ſince he durſt not communicate with *Rome*? He will not be able to aſſigne any, even with any little colour of common ſenſe. If then they departed from all viſible Communities profeſſing Chriſt, it followeth that they alſo left the Communion of the true viſible Church, whichſoever it was, whether that of *Rome*, or any other; of which Point I doe not for the preſent diſpute. Yea this the *Lutherans* doe not only acknowledge, but prove, and brag of. *If* (ſaith a learned *Lutheran*) *there had been right* (b) *believers which went before Luther in his office, there had then been no need of a Lutheran Reformation.* Another affirmeth it to be *ridiculous*, to think that *in the time* (c) *before Luther, any had the purity of Doctrine; and that Luther ſhould receive it from them, and not they from Luther.* Another ſpeaketh roundly, and ſaith it is *impudency* to ſay, that *many learned men* (d) *in Germany before Luther, did hold the Doctrine of the Goſpell.* And I adde: That farre *greater impudency*, it were to affirme, that *Germany* did not agree with the reſt of Europe, and other Chriſtian Catholique Nations, and conſequently, that it is the greateſt *impudency* to deny, that he departed from the Communion of the viſible Catholique Church, ſpread over the whole world. We have heard *Calvin* ſaying of Proteſtants in generall; *We were*, even, *forced (ſe) to make a ſeparation from the whole world.* And, *Luther* of himſelfe in particular: *In the beginning* (ſ) *I was alone. Ergo* (ſay I, by your good leave) you were at leaſt a *Schiſmatique*, divided from the Ancient Church, and a member of no new Church. For no ſole man can conſtitute a Church; and though he could, yet ſuch a Church could not be, that glorious company, of whoſe number, greatneſſe, and amplitude, ſo much hath been ſpoken both in the old Teſtament, and in the New.

4. Point. Luther and all that follow him are Schiſmatiques.

a *Pag.* 68.

b *Georgius Milius in Auguſtan. Confeſs. art.* 7. *de Eccleſ. Pag.* 137.

c *Benedict. Morgenſtern. tract. de Eccleſ. Pag.* 145.

d *Conrad. Schluſſelb. in Theolog. Calviniſt. lib.* 2. *fol.* 130.

13 *D. Potter* endeavours to avoid this evident Argument by divers evaſions; but by the confutation thereof I will (with Gods holy aſſiſtance) take occaſion, even out of his own Anſwers and grounds, to bring unanſwerable reaſons to convince them of *Schiſme*.

e *Ep.* 141.

f *In præfat. operum ſuorum.*

14 His chief Anſwer is: That they have not left the Church, but her *Corruption*.

15 I reply. This anſwer may be given either by thoſe furious people, who teach that thoſe abuſes, and corruptions in the Church were ſo enormous, that they could not ſtand with the nature, or being of a true Church of Chriſt: Or elſe by thoſe other more calme Proteſtants, who affirme, that thoſe errors did not deſtroy the *being*, but only deforme the *beauty* of the Church. Againſt both theſe ſorts of men, I may fitly uſe that unanſwerable Dilemma, which S. *Auguſtine* brings againſt the *Donatiſts* in theſe concluding words: *Tell me whether the* (g) *Church at that time when you ſay ſhe entertained thoſe who were guilty of all crimes, by the contagion of thoſe ſinfull perſons, periſhed, or periſhed not? Anſwere; whether the Church periſhed, or periſhed not? Make choice of what you think. If then ſhe periſhed, what Church brought forth Donatus?* (we may ſay Luther.) *But if ſhe could not periſh, becauſe ſo many were incorporated into her* (without

g *Lib.* 2. *cont. Epiſt. Gaudent. c.* 7.

Bap-

Baptiſme (that is, *without* a ſecond baptiſme, or rebaptization, and I may ſay, without Luthers Reformation) *anſwer me I pray you, what madneſſe did moue the Sect of Donatus to ſeparate themſelues from her upon pretence to avoid the Communion of bad men*! I beſeech the Reader to ponder every one of S. *Auguſtines* words: and to conſider whether any thing could haue been ſpoken more directly againſt *Luther*, and his followers of what ſort ſoever.

16 And now to anſwer more in particular; I ſay to thoſe who teach, that the viſible Church of Chriſt periſhed for many Ages, that I can eaſily afford them the curteſie, to free them from meer *Schiſme:* but all men touched with any ſpark of zeal to vindicate the wiſedome, and Goodneſſe of our Saviour from blaſphemous injurie, cannot chooſe but believe and proclaim them to be ſuperlative Arch-heretiques. Nevertheleſſe, if they will needs haue the honour of Singularity, and deſire to be both *formall Heretiques*, and *properly Schiſmatiques*, I will tell them, that while they dream of an inviſible Church of men, which agreed with them in Faith, they will upon due reflection find themſelves to be Schiſmatiques, from thoſe corporeall Angels, or inviſible men, becauſe *they* held externall Communion with the viſible Church of thoſe times, the outward Communion of which viſible Church *theſe* modern hot-ſpurs forſaking, were thereby divided from the outward Communion of their hidden Brethren, and ſo are Separatiſts from the externall *Communion* of them, with whom they agree in *faith*, which is Schiſme in the moſt formall, and proper ſignification thereof. Moreover according to D. *Potter*, theſe boyſterous Creatures are properly Schiſmatiques. For, the reaſon why he thinks himſelfe, and ſuch as he is, to be cleared from Schiſme, notwithſtanding their diviſion from the *Roman* Church, is becauſe (according to his Divinity) the property of (h) *Schiſme, is (witneſſe the Donatiſts and Luciferians) to cut off from the Body of Chriſt, and the hope of Salvation, the Church from which it ſeparates*: But thoſe Proteſtants of whom we now ſpeak, *cut off from the Body of Chriſt, and the hope of Salvation*, the Church from which they ſeparated themſelues; and they doe it directly as the Donatiſts (in whom you exemplify) did, by affirming that the true Church had periſhed: and therefore they cannot bee cleared from *Schiſme*, if you may be their Iudge. Conſider, I pray you, how many prime Proteſtants both domeſticall and forraign, you haue at one blow ſtruck off from hope of Salvation, and condemned to the loweſt pit, for the grievous ſinne of *Schiſme*. And withall it imports you to conſider, that you alſo involve your ſelfe, and other moderate Proteſtants in the ſelfe ſame crime and puniſhment, while you communicate with thoſe, who, according to your own principles, are properly, & formally *Schiſmatiques*. For if you held your ſelfe obliged under pain of damnation to forſake the Communion of the *Roman* Church, by reaſon of her Errors and Corruptions, which yet you confeſſe were *not fundamentall*; ſhall it not be much more damnable for you, to live in Communion and Confraternity, with thoſe who defend an errour of the fayling of the Church, which in the *Donatiſts* you confeſſe (i) to haue been *properly hereticall againſt the Article of our Creed; I believe the Church*? And I deſire the Reader, here to apply an authority of S. *Cyprian (epiſt. 76.)* which he ſhall finde alleaged in the next number. And this may ſuffice for confutation of the aforeſaid Anſwer, as it might haue relation to the rigid Calviniſts.

h *Pag. 76.*

i *Pag. 126.*

17 For Confutation of theſe Proteſtants, who hold that the Church of Chriſt had alwaies a being, and cannot erre in points fundamentall, and yet teach, that ſhe may erre in matters of leſſe moment, wherein if they forſake her, they would be accounted not to leave the Church, but onely her corruptions; I muſt ſay, that they change the ſtate of our preſent Queſtion, not diſtinguiſhing between *internall* Faith, and *externall Communion*, nor between *Schiſme*, and *Hereſie*. Thus I demonſtrate out of D. *Porter* himſelfe, who in expreſſe words teacheth, that the promiſes which *our Lord hath made* (k) *unto his Church for his aſſiſtance, are intended not to any particular Perſons or Churches, but only to the Church Catholique: and they are to be extended not to every parcel, or particularity of truth, but only to points of Faith, or fundamentall.* And afterwards ſpeaking of the *Univerſall Church*, he ſaith: *It's comfort* (l) *enough for the Church, that the Lord in mercy will ſecure her from all capital dangers, and conſerue her on earth againſt all enemies; but ſhee may not hope to triumph over all ſinne and errour, till ſhe be in heaven.* Out of which words I obſerve, that, according to D. *Potter*, the ſelfe ſame Church, which is the Vniverſall Church, remaining the univerſall true Church of Chriſt, may fall into errors and corruptions: from whence it clearly followeth that it is impoſſible to leave the *Externall communion* of the Church ſo corrupted, and retain *externall* communion with the Catholique Church; ſince the Church Catholique, and the Church ſo corrupted is the ſelfe ſame one Church, or company of men. And the contrary imagination talkes in a dream, as if the errours and infections of the Catholique Church were not inherent in her, but were ſeparate from her, like to *Accidents* without any *Subject*, or rather indeed, as if they were not *Accidents*, but *Hypoſtaſes*, or *Perſons* ſubſiſting by themſelues. For men cannot be ſaid to liue, in, or out of the Communion of any dead creature, but with Perſons, endued with life and reaſon; and much leſſe can men be ſaid to live in the Communion of Accidents, as errors and corruptions are, and therefore it is an abſurd thing to affirm, that Proteſtants divided themſelues from the corruptions of the Church, but not from the Church her ſelfe, ſeeing the corruptions of the Church were inherent in the Church. All this is made more cleer, if we conſider, that when *Luther* appeared, there were not two diſtinct viſible true Catholique Churches, holding contrary Doctrines, and divided in externall Communion; one of the which two Churches did *triumph over all errour*, and corruption in doctrine and practiſe; but the other was ſtained with both. For to faign this diverſity of two Churches cannot ſtand with record of hiſtories, which are

k *Pag. 151.*

l *Pag. 155.*

ſilent

ſilent of any ſuch matter. It is againſt D. *Potters* own grounds, that the Church may erre in points not fundamentall, which were not true, if you will imagine a certain viſible Catholique Church free from errour even in points not fundamentall. It contradicteth the words in which he ſaid, the Church *may not hope to triumph over all errour, till ſhe be in heaven.* It evacuateth the brag of Proteſtants, that *Luther* reformed the whole Church: and laſtly it maketh *Luther* a Schiſmatique, for leaving the Communion of all viſible Churches, ſeeing (upon this ſuppoſition) there was a viſible Church of Chriſt free from all corruption, which therefore could not be forſaken without juſt imputation of *Schiſme*. We muſt therefore truly affirme, that ſince there was but one viſible Church of Chriſt, which was truly Catholique, and yet was (according to Proteſtants) ſtained with corruption; when *Luther* left the externall Communion of that corrupted Church, he could not remain in the Communion of the Catholique Church, no more then it is poſſible to keep company with *D. Chriſtopher Potter*, and not keep company with the Provoſt of Queenes Colledge in Oxford, if D. *Potter* and the Provoſt be one, and the ſelfe ſame man: For ſo one ſhould be, and not be with him at the ſame time. This very argument drawne from the Vnity of God's Church, S. *Cyprian* urgeth to convince, that *Novatianus* was cut off from the Church in theſe words: *The Church is* (m) *One, which being One cannot be both within and without. If ſhe be with Novatianus, ſhe was not with Cornelius; But if ſhe were with Cornelius, who ſucceeded Fabianus, by lawfull ordination, Novatianus is not in the Church.* I purpoſely here ſpeak only of *externall Communion* with the Catholique Church. For in this point there is great difference between *internall acts* of our underſtanding, and will; and of *externall deeds*. Our Vnderſtanding and Will, are faculties (as Philoſophers ſpeak) abſtractive, and able to diſtinguiſh, and as it were, to part things, though in themſelves they be really conjoyned. But reall externall deeds doe take things in groſſe as they find them, not ſeparating things which in reality are joyned together. Thus, one may conſider and loue a ſinner as he is a man, friend, benefactor, or the like; and at the ſame time not conſider him, nor loue him as he is a ſinner; becauſe theſe are acts of our Vnderſtanding and will, which may reſpect their objects under ſome one formality, or conſideration, without reference to other things contained in the ſelfe ſame objects. But if one ſhould ſtrike, or kill a ſinfull man, he will not be excuſed, by alleaging, that he killed him, not as a man, but as a ſinner; becauſe the ſelfe ſame perſon being a man, and the ſinner, the *externall* act of murder fell joyntly upon the man, and the ſinner. And for the ſame reaſon one cannot avoid the company of a ſinner, and at the ſame time be really preſent with that man who is a ſinner. And this is our caſe: and in this our Adverſaries are egregiouſly, & many of them affectedly, miſtaken. For one may in ſome points believe as the Church believeth, and diſagree from her in other. One may loue the truth which ſhe holds, and deteſt her (pretended) corruptions. But it is impoſſible that a man ſhould really ſeparate himſelfe from her externall Communion, as ſhe is corrupted, and be really within the ſame externall Communion as ſhe is ſound; becauſe ſhe is the ſelfe ſame Church which is ſuppoſed to be ſound in ſome things, and to erre in others. Now, our queſtion for the preſent doth concern only this point of *externall Communion*: becauſe *Schiſme*, as it is diſtinguiſhed from *Hereſie*, is committed when one divides himſelfe from the *Externall Communion* of that Church with which he agrees in *Faith*; Whereas Hereſie doth neceſſarily imply a difference in matter of *Faith*, and beliefe: and therefore to ſay, that they left not the viſible Church, but her errours, can only excuſe them from *Hereſie* (which ſhall be tried in the next Chapter) but not from *Schiſme*, as long as they are really divided from the *Externall Communion* of the ſelfe ſame viſible Church, which, notwithſtanding thoſe errours wherein they doe in judgement diſſent from her, doth ſtill remain the true Catholique Church of Chriſt; and therefore while they forſake the corrupted Church, they forſake the Catholique Church. Thus then it remaineth cleer, that their chiefeſt Anſwer changeth the very ſtate of the Queſtion; confoundeth internall acts of the Vnderſtanding with *externall Deeds*; doth not diſtinguiſh between *Schiſme* and *Hereſie*; and leaues this demonſtrated againſt them: That they divided themſelues from the Communion of the viſible Catholique Church, becauſe they conceived that ſhe needed Reformation. But whether this pretence of Reformation will acquit them of *Schiſme*, I referre to the unpartiall judges, heretofore (n) alleaged; as to S. *Irenæus* who plainly ſaith: *They cannot make any ſo important REFORMATION, as the Evill of the Schiſme is pernicious.* To S. *Denis* of *Alexandria*, ſaying: *Certainly all things ſhould be endured rather then to conſent to the diviſion of the Church of God: thoſe Martyrs being no leſſe glorious that expoſe themſelues to hinder the diſmembring of the Church, then thoſe that ſuffer rather then they will offer ſacrifice to Idols.* To S. *Auguſtine*, who tells us: That not to heare the Church, *is a more grievous thing then if he were ſtriken with the ſword, conſumed with flames, expoſed to wild beaſts.* And to conclude all in few words, he giveth this generall preſcription: *There is no juſt neceſſity to divide unity*, And D. *Potter* may remember his own words: *There neither was* (s) *nor can be any juſt cauſe to depart from the Church of Chriſt, no more then from Chriſt himſelfe.* But I haue ſhewed that *Luther*, and the reſt departed from the Church of Chriſt (if Chriſt had any Church upon earth:) Therefore there could be no juſt cauſe (of *Reformation*, or what elſe ſoever) to doe as they did; and therefore they muſt be contented to be held for *Schiſmatiques*.

m *Epiſt.* 76; ad *Mag.*

n *Numb.* 8.

s *Pag.* 75.

18 Moreover; I demand whether thoſe corruptions, which moved them to forſake the Communion of the viſible Church, were in manners, or doctrine? Corruption in manners yeelds no ſufficient cauſe to leave the Church, otherwiſe men muſt goe not only out of the Church, but out of the world, as the Apoſtle (t) ſaith. Our bleſſed Saviour foretold that there would bee in the

t 1. *Cor.* 5. 10.

Church tares with choice corne, and ſinners with juſt men. If then Proteſtants wax zealous, with the *Servants* to pluck up the weeds, let them firſt harken to the wiſdome of the *Maſter*: *Let both grow up*. And they ought to imitate them, who as S. *Auguſtine* ſaith, *tolerate for the good of* u *Ep.* 162. (u) *Vnity, that which they deteſt for the good of equity*. And ſo whom the more frequent, & foule ſuch ſcandals are; by ſo much the more is the merit of their perſeverance in the Communion of the Church, and the Martyrdome of their patience, as the ſame Saint calls it. If they were offended with the life of ſome Eccleſiaſticall perſons, muſt they therefore deny obedience to their Paſtors, and finally break with Gods Church? The Paſtour of Paſtours teacheth us another leſſon: *Vpon* w Mat. 23. *the Chaire of Moyſes* (w) *haue ſitten the Scribes and Phariſees. All things threfore whatſoever they ſhall ſay to you, obſerue yee, and doe yee: but according to their works doe yee not*. Muſt people except againſt lawes, and revolt from Magiſtrats, becauſe ſome are negligent, or corrupt in the execution of the ſame lawes, and performance of their office? If they intended Reformation of manners, they uſed a ſtrange means for the achieving of ſuch an end, by denying the neceſſity of Confeſſion, laughing at auſterity of pennance, condemning the vowes of Chaſtity, poverty, obedience, breaking faſts, &c. And no leſſe unfit were the *Men*, then the *Meanes*. I loue not recrimination. But it is well knowyn to how great crimes, *Luther*, *Calvin*, *Zwinglius*, *Beza*, and other of the prime Reformers were notoriouſly obnoxious; as might bee eaſily demonſtrated by the onely tranſcribing of what others haue delivered upon that ſubject; whereby it would appeare, that they were very farre from being any ſuch Apoſtolicall men as God is wont to uſe in ſo great a work. And whereas they were wont, eſpecially in the beginning of their revolt, malitiouſly to exaggerate the faults of ſome Clergy men, *Eraſmus* ſaid well (*Epiſt. ad fratres inferioris Germaniæ*,) *Let the riot, luſt, ambition, avarice of Prieſts, and whatſoever other crimes be gathered together, Hereſie alone doth exceed all this filthy lake of vices*. Beſides, nothing at all was omitted by the ſacred Councell of *Trent* which might tend to reformation of manners. And finally the vices of others are not hurtfull to any but ſuch as imitate, and conſent to them; according to the ſaying of S. *Auguſtine*: *We conſerve* (y) *innocency, not by knowing the ill deeds of men, but by not yeelding conſent to ſuch* z *Ep.* 116. *as we know, and by not judging raſhly of ſuch faults as we know not*. If you anſwer; that, not corruption in manners, but the approbation of them, doth yeeld ſufficient cauſe to leaue the Church; I reply with S. *Auguſtine*, that the Church doth (as the pretended Reformers ought to haue done) tolerate or beare with ſcandals and corruptions, but neither doth, nor can approue them. *The Church* (ſaith he) *being placed* (z) *betwixt much chaffe and cockle, doth beare with many things* a *Pag.* 75. *but doth not approue, nor diſſemble, nor act thoſe things which are againſt faith, and good life*. But becauſe to approue corruption in manners as lawfull, were an errour againſt Faith, it belongs to corruption in doctrine, which was the ſecond part of my demand.

19 Now then, that corruptions in doctrine (I ſtill ſpeak upon the untrue ſuppoſition of our Adverſaries) could not afford any ſufficient cauſe, or colourable neceſſity to depart from that viſible Church, which was extant when *Luther* roſe, I demonſtrate out of D. *Potters* own confeſſion; that the Catholique Church neither hath, nor can erre in points *fundamentall*, as wee ſhewed out of his own expreſſe words, which he alſo of ſet purpoſe delivereth in divers other places; and all they are obliged to maintain the ſame, who teach that Chriſt had alwaies a viſible Church upon earth: becauſe any one *fundamentall* error overthrowes the *being* of a true Church. Now (as Schoolmen ſpeak) it is, *implicatio in terminis* (a contradiction ſo plain, that one word deſtroyeth the other, as if one ſhould ſay, a living dead man) to affirm, that the Church doth not erre in points neceſſary to ſalvation, or damnably; & yet that it is damnable to remain in her Communion becauſe ſhe teacheth errors which are confeſſed not to be damnable. For if the error be not damnable, nor againſt any fundamentall Article of Faith, the beliefe thereof cannot bee damnable. But D. *Potter* teacheth, that the Catholique Church *cannot*, and that the *Roman Church hath not* erred againſt any fundamentall Article of Faith: Therefore, it cannot bee damnable to remaine in her Communion; and ſo the pretended corruptions in her doctrine could not induce any obligation to depart from her Communion, nor could excuſe them from Schiſme, who upon pretence of neceſſity in point of conſcience, forſook her. And D. *Potter* will never bee able to ſalve a manifeſt contradiction in theſe his words: *To depart from the Church* (a) *of Rome in ſome Doctrine, and practiſes, there might be neceſſary cauſe, though ſhe wanted nothing neceſſary to ſalvation*. For if, notwithſtanding theſe Doctrines and practiſes, *ſhee wanted nothing neceſſary to ſalvation*; how could it be *neceſſary to ſalvation* to forſake her? And therefore wee muſt ſtill conclude that to forſake her, was properly an act of *Schiſme*.

20 From the ſelfe ſame ground of the infallibility of the Church in all fundamentall points, I argue after this manner. The viſible Church cannot be forſaken, without damnation, upon pretence that it is damnable to remain in her Communion, by reaſon of corruption in doctrine; as long as, for the truth of her Faith and beliefe, ſhe performeth the duty which ſhe oweth to God, and her Neighbour: As long as ſhe performeth what our Saviour exacts at her hands: as long as ſhe doth, as much as lies in her power to doe. But (even according to D. *Potters* Aſſertions) the Church performeth all theſe things, as long as ſhe erreth not in points fundamentall, although ſhe were ſuppoſed to erre in other points not fundamentall: Therefore, the Communion of the viſible Church cannot be forſaken without damnation, upon pretence that it *is* damnable to remain in her Communion, by reaſon of corruption in doctrine. The *Major*, or firſt Propoſition of it ſelfe is evident. The *Minor*, or ſecond Propoſition doth neceſſarily follow out of D. *Potters* own

doctrine

doctrine above-rehearſed, that, the *promiſes of our Lord made to his Church for his aſſiſtance, are to be* (b) *extended only to points of faith, or fundamentall*: (Let me note here by the way that by his *(Or,)* he ſeemes to exclude from Faith all points which are not fundamentall, and ſo we may deny innumerable Texts of Scripture:) That *It is* (c) *comfort enough for the Church, that the Lord in mercy will ſecure her from all capitall dangers &c. but ſhe may not hope to triumph over all ſinne and errour, till ſhe be in heaven.* For it is evident, that the Church (for as much as concernes the truth of her doctrines and beliefe) owes no more duty to God and her Neighbour; neither doth our Saviour exact more at her hands, nor is it in her power to doe more then God doth aſſiſt her to doe; which aſſiſtance is promiſed only for points fundamentall; and conſequently as long as ſhe teacheth no fundamentall error, her communion cannot without damnation be forſaken. And we may fitly apply againſt *D. Potter* a Concionatory declamation which he makes againſt us, where he ſaith: *May the Church of after Ages make the narrow way to heaven, narrower then our Saviour left it &c?* ſince he himſelfe obligeth men under pain of damnation to forſake the Church, by reaſon of errours againſt which our Saviour thought it needleſſe to promiſe his aſſiſtance, and for which he neither denieth his grace in this life, or glory in the next. Will *D. Potter* oblige the Church to doe more then ſhe *may* even hope for? or to performe on earth that which is proper to heaven alone?

b *Pag.* 151.

c *Pag.* 155.

d *Pag.* 221.

21 And as from your own doctrine concerning the infallibility of the Church in fundamentall points, we have proved that it was a grievous ſinne to forſake her: ſo doe we take a ſtrong argument from the fallibility of any who dare pretend to reforme the Church, which any man in his wits will believe to be indued with at leaſt as much infallibility as private men can challeng; & *D. Potter* expreſly affirmeth that Chriſts promiſes of his aſſiſtance *are not intended* (c) *to any particular perſons or Churches*: & therefore to leave the Church by reaſon of errours, was at beſt hand but to flit from one erring company to another, without any new *hope* of triumphing over errours, and without neceſſity, or utility to forſake that Communion of which *S. Auguſtine* ſaith, *There is* (f) *no juſt neceſſity to divide Vnity.* Which will appear to be much more evident if we conſider that though the Church had maintained ſome falſe doctrines, yet to leave her Communion to remedy the old, were but to adde a new increaſe of errors, ariſing from the innumerable diſagreements of Sectaries, which muſt needs bring with it a mighty maſſe of falſhoods, becauſe the truth is but one, and indiviſible. And this reaſon is yet ſtronger, if we ſtill remember, that even according to *D. Potter* the viſible Church hath a bleſſing not to erre in points fundamentall, in which any private *Reformer* may faile: and therefore they could not pretend any neceſſity to forſake that Church, out of whoſe communion they were expoſed to danger of falling into many more, and even into damnable errors. Remember I pray you, what your ſelfe affirmes (*pag.* 69.) where ſpeaking of our Church and yours, you ſay; *All the difference is from the weeds, which remain there, and here are taken away; Yet neither here perfectly, nor every where alike.* Behold a fair confeſſion of corruptions, ſtill remaining in your Church, which you can only excuſe by ſaying they are not fundamentall, as likewiſe thoſe in the *Roman* Church are confeſſed to be not fundamentall. What man of judgement will be a Proteſtant, ſince that Church is confeſſedly a corrupt one?

e *Pag.* 151.

f *Ep. cont. Parmen. lib.* 2. *cap.* 1.

22 I ſtill proceed to impugne you expreſly upon your own grounds. You ſay, *that it is comfort enough for the Church, that the Lord in mercy will ſecure her from all capitall dangers: but ſhe may not hope to triumph over all ſinne, and errour till ſhe be in heaven.* Now if it be comfort *enough* to be ſecured from all capitall dangers, which can ariſe only from error in fundamentall points: why were not your firſt reformers content with *enough*, but would needs diſmember the Church, out of a pernitious greedineſſe of more then *enough*? For, this *enough*, which according to you is attained by not erring in points fundamentall, was enjoyed before *Luthers* reformation, unleſſe you will now againſt your ſelfe affirme, that long before *Luther* there was no Church free from error in fundamentall points. Moreover if (as you ſay) no Church may hope *to triumph over all errour till ſhe be in heaven*; You muſt either grant, that errors not fundamentall cannot yeeld ſufficient cauſe to forſake the Church, or elſe you muſt affirme that all community may, and ought to be forſaken, & ſo there will be no end of Schiſmes: or rather indeed there can be no ſuch thing as Schiſme becauſe according to you, all communities are ſubject to errors not fundamentall, for which if they may be lawfully forſaken, it followeth cleerely that it is not Schiſme to forſake them. Laſtly, ſince it is not lawfull to leave the Communion of the Church for abuſes in life and manners, becauſe ſuch miſeries cannot be avoided in this world of temptation: and ſince according to your Aſſertion no *Church may hope to triumph over all ſinne and error*; You muſt grant that as ſhe ought not to be left by reaſon of ſinne; ſo neither by reaſon of errors not fundamentall; becauſe both *ſinne*, and *errour* are (according to you) impoſſible to be avoided till ſhe be in heaven.

23 Furthermore, I aske whether it be the *Quantity* or *Number*; or *Quality*, and *Greatneſſe* of doctrinall errors that may yeild ſufficient cauſe to relinquiſh the Churches Communion? I prove that neither. Not the *Quality*, which is ſuppoſed to be beneath the degree of points fundamentall, or neceſſary to ſalvation. Not the *Quantity* or Number: for the foundation is ſtrong enough to ſupport all ſuch *unneceſſary additions*, as you terme them. And if they once weighed ſo heavy as to overthrow the foundation, they ſhould grow to fundamentall errors, into which your ſelfe teach the Church cannot fall. *Hay and ſtubble* (ſay you) *and ſuch* (g) *unprofitable ſtuff, laid on the roofe, deſtroies not the houſe, whileſt the main pillars are ſtanding on the foundation.* And tell us, I pray you, the preciſe number of errors which cannot be tolerated? I know you can-

g *Pag.* 155.

not doe it; and therefore being *uncertain*, whether or no you have cauſe to leave the Church, you are *certainly* obliged not to forſake her. Our bleſſed Saviour hath declared his will, that we forgive a private offender ſeaventy ſeaven times, that is, without limitation of quantity of time, or quality of treſpaſſes; and why then dare you alleadge his command, that you muſt not pardon his Church for errors, acknowledged to be not fundamentall? What excuſe can you faine to your ſelves; who for points not neceſſary to ſalvation, have been occaſions, cauſes, and authors of ſo many miſchiefes, as could not but unavoidably accompany ſo huge a breach, in kingdomes, in commonwealths, in private perſons, in publique Magiſtrates, in body, in ſoul, in goods, in life, in Church, in the ſtate, by Schiſmes, by rebellions, by war, by famine, by plague, by bloudſhed, by all ſorts of imaginable calamities upon the whole face of the earth, wherein as in a map of Deſolation, the heavineſſe of your crime appeares, under which the world doth pant?

24 To ſay for your excuſe, that you left not the Church, but her errors, doth not extenuate, but aggravate your ſinne. For by this deviſe, you ſow ſeeds of endles Schiſmes, and put into the mouth of all Separatiſts, a ready anſwere how to avoid the note of *Schiſme* from your Proteſtant Church of England, or from any other Church whatſoever. They will, I ſay, anſwer, as you doe prompt, that your Church may be forſaken, if ſhe fall into errors, though they be not fundamentall: and further that no Church muſt hope to be free from ſuch errors; which two grounds being once laid, it will not be hard to infer the conſequence, that ſhe may be forſaken.

25 From ſome other words of *D. Potter* I likewiſe prove, that for Errors not fundamentall, the Church ought not to be forſaken, *There neither was* (ſaith he) *nor can be* (h) *any juſt cauſe*
h *Pag.* 75. *to depart from the Church of Chriſt, no more then from Chriſt himſelfe. To depart from a particular Church, and namely from the Church of Rome, in ſome doctrines and practiſes, there might be juſt and neceſſary cauſe, though the Church of Rome wanted nothing neceſſary to ſalvation.* Marke his doctrine, that there *can be no juſt cauſe to depart from the Church of Chriſt:* and yet he teacheth, that the Church of Chriſt may erre in points not fundamentall; Therefore (ſay I) we cannot forſake the *Roman* Church for points not fundamentall, for then we might alſo forſake the Church of Chriſt, which your ſelfe deny: and I pray you conſider, whether you doe not plainly contradict your ſelfe, while in the words aboue recited, you ſay there can be no *juſt cauſe to forſake* the Catholique Church; and yet that there may be neceſſary cauſe to depart from the Church of Rome, ſince you grant that the Church of Chriſt may erre in points not fundamentall: and that the *Roman* Church hath erred only in ſuch points; as by and by we ſhall ſee more in particular. And thus much be ſaid to diſprove their chiefeſt Anſwer, that they left not the Church, but her *corruptions.*

26 Another evaſion *D. Potter* bringeth, to avoid the imputation of *Schiſme*, and it is, becauſe they ſtill acknowledge the Church of Rome to be a *Member of the body of Chriſt*, and not *cut off*
i *Pag.* 76. *from the hope of ſalvation. And this* (ſaith he) *cleeres us from* (i) *the imputation of Schiſme, whoſe property it is, to cut off from the Body of Chriſt, and the hope of ſalvation, the Church from which it ſeparates.*

27 This is an Anſwere which perhaps you may get ſome one to approve, if firſt you can put him out of his wits. For what prodigious doctrines are theſe? Thoſe Proteſtants who believe that the Church erred in points neceſſary to ſalvation, and for that cauſe left her, cannot be excuſed from damnable *Schiſme*: But others who believed that ſhe had no damnable errors, did very well, yea were obliged to forſake her: and (which is more miraculous, or rather monſtrous) they did well to forſake her formally and preciſely, *becauſe* they *iudged*, that ſhe retained all meanes neceſſary to ſalvation. I ſay, *becauſe* they ſo *iudged*. For the very reaſon for which he acquitteth himſelfe, and condemneth thoſe others as Schiſmatiques, is becauſe he holdeth that the Church which both of them forſooke, is not cut off from the *Body of Chriſt, and the hope of Salvation*; whereas thoſe other Zelots deny her to be a member of Chriſts body, or capable of ſalvation, wherein alone they diſagree from *D. Potter*: for in the effect of ſeparation they agree, only they doe it upon a different motive or reaſon. were it not a ſtrange excuſe, if a man would think to cloak his rebellion, by alledging that he held the perſon againſt whom he rebelled to be his lawfull Soveraign? And yet D. *Potter* thinks himſelfe free from Schiſme, becauſe he forſook the Church of Rome, but yet ſo, as that ſtill he held her to be the true Church, and to have all neceſſary meanes to Salvation. But I will no further urge this moſt ſolemne foppery, and doe much more willingly put all Catholiques in mind, what an unſpeakeable comfort it is, that our Adverſaries are forced to confeſſe, that they cannot cleere themſelves from *Schiſme*, otherwiſe then by acknowledging that they doe not, nor cannot *cut off from the hope of ſalvation* our Church. Which is as much as if they ſhould in plain termes ſay: They muſt be damned, unleſſe we may be ſaved. Moreover this evaſion doth indeed condemne your zealous brethren of *Hereſy*, for denying the Churches perpetuity, but doth not cleere your ſelfe from *Schiſme*, which conſiſts in being divided from that true Church, with which a man agreeth in all points of faith, as you muſt profeſſe your ſelfe to agree with the Church of Rome in all fundamentall Articles. For otherwiſe you ſhould cut her off from the hope of ſalvation, and ſo condemne your ſelfe of *Schiſme*. And laſtly even according to this your own definition of *Schiſme*, you cannot cleere your ſelfe from that crime, unleſſe you be content to acknowledge a manifeſt contradiction in your own Aſſertions. For if you
k *Pag.* 20. doe not cut us off *from the Body of Chriſt, and the hope of Salvation*; how come you to ſay in another place, that you judge a *reconciliation* with us *to be* (k) *damnable?* That to depart *from the*

Church

Church of Rome, there might be iuſt and neceſſary (l) *cauſe?* That, *they that haue the vnderſtanding and meanes to diſcouer their error, and neglect to uſe them* (m) *we dare not flatter them* (ſay you) *with ſo eaſy a cenſure*, of hope of ſalvation? If then it be (as you ſay) a property of *Schiſme*, to cut off from the hope of ſalvation, the Church from which it ſeparates: how will you cleere your ſelfe from *Schiſme*, who dare not flatter us with ſo eaſy a cenſure? and who affirme that a reconciliation with us is *damnable*? But the truth is, there is no conſtancy in your Aſſertions, by reaſon of difficulties which preſſe you on all ſides. For, you are loath to affirme cleerely, that we may be ſaved, leaſt ſuch a grant might be occaſion (as in all reaſon it ought to be) of the converſion of Proteſtants to the *Roman* Church: And on the other ſide, if you affirme, that our Church erred in points fundamentall, or neceſſary to ſalvation, you know not how, nor where, nor among what company of men, to find a perpetuall viſible Church of Chriſt, before *Luther*: And therefore your beſt ſhift is to ſay, and unſay, as your occaſions command. I doe not examine your Aſſertion, that it is the property of Schiſme, *to cut off from the Body of Chriſt, and the hope of ſalvation, the Church from which it ſeparates*: wherein you are mightily miſtaken, as appears by your own example of the *Donatiſts*, who were moſt formall and proper *Heretiques*, and not *Schiſmatiques*, as *Schiſme* is a vice diſtinct from *Hereſy*. Beſides, although the *Donatiſts*, and *Luciferians* (whom you alſo alledge) had been meere Schiſmatiques, yet it were againſt all good Logick, from a particular to inferre a generall Rule, to determine what is the property of *Schiſme*.

l Pag. 75.
m Pag. 79.

28 A third device I find in *D. Potter* to cleere his brethren from Schiſme. *There is* (ſaith he) *great difference between* (n) *a Schiſme from them, and a Reformation of our ſelves.*

n Pag. 75.

29 This I confeſſe is a quaint ſubtilty, by which all Schiſme, & ſinne may be as well excuſed. For what divell incarnate could meerely pretend a ſeparation, and not rather ſome other motive of vertue, truth, profit, or pleaſure? But now ſince their pretended *Reformation* conſiſted, as they gave out, in forſaking the corruptions of the Church: the *Reformation* of themſelves, and their *diviſion* from us, falls out to be one, and the ſelfe ſame thing. Nay we ſee, that although they infinitely diſagree in the particulars of their reformation, yet they ſymbolize, and conſent in the generall point of forſaking our pretended corruptions: An evident ſigne, that the thing, upon which their thoughts firſt pitched, was not any particular Modell, or Idæa of Religion, but a ſetled reſolution to forſake the Church of *Rome*. Wherefore this Metaphyſicall ſpeculation, that they intended only to reforme themſelves, cannot poſſible excuſe them from *Schiſme*, unleſſe firſt they be able to prove, that they were obliged to depart from us. Yet for as much as concernes the fact it ſelfe; it is cleere, that *Luthers* revolt did not proceed from any zeale of reformation. The motives which put him upon ſo wretched, and unfortunate a work, were Coretouſneſſe, Ambition, Luſt, Pride, Envy, and grudging that the promulgation of Indulgences, was not committed to himſelf, or ſuch as he deſired. He himſelf taketh God to witneſſe, that he *fell into theſe troubles caſually, and* (o) *againſt his will* (not upon any intention of Reformation) not ſo much as *dreaming or ſuſpecting any change which might* (p) *happen*. And he *began to preach* (againſt Indulgences) *when he knew not what* (q) *the matter meant. For* (ſaith he) *I ſcarcely underſtood* (r) *then what the name of Indulgences meant*. In ſo much as afterwards *Luther* did much miſlike of his owne undertaken courſe, oftentimes (ſaith he) *wiſhing* (ſ) *that I had never begunne that buſineſſe*. And *Fox* ſaith: *It is apparent that* (t) *Luther promiſed Cardinall Caietan to keep ſilence, provided alſo his adverſaries would doe the like*. *M. Cowper* reporteth further, that *Luther by his letter ſubmitted* (u) *himſelf to the Pope, ſo that he might not be compelled to recant*. With much more, which may be ſeen in (w) *Brereley*. But this is ſufficient to ſhew, that *Luther* was farre enough, from intending any Reformation. And if he judged a *Reformation* to be neceſſary, what a huge wickedneſſe was it in him, to promiſe *ſilence if his adverſaries would doe the like?* Or to ſubmit *himſelf to the Pope, ſo that he might not be compelled to recant?* Or if the Reformation were not indeed *intended* by him, nor judged to be *neceſſary*, how can he be excuſed frō damnable *Schiſme*? And this is the true manner of *Luthers* revolt, taken from his owne acknowledgments, and the words of the more ancient Proteſtants themſelves, whereby D. *Potters* faltring, and mincing the matter, is cleerly diſcovered, and confuted. Vpon what motives our Country was divided from the Roman Church by king *Henry* the Eight, and how the Schiſme was continued by Queene *Elizabeth*, I have no heart to rip up. The world knoweth, it was not upon any zeale of *Reformation*.

o *Caſu non voluntate in has turbas incidi Deum ipſum teſtor.*
p *Act. & mon. pag.* 404.
q *Sleidan. lib.* 16. *fol.* 232.
r *Sleid. lib.* 13. *fol.* 177.
ſ *Luth. in colloq. menſal.*
t *Act. mon. pag.* 404.
u *Comp. in his Chronicle.*
w *Tract.* 2. *cap.* 2. *Sect.* 11. *ſubd.* 2.

30 But you will prove your former evaſion by a couple of ſimilitudes: *If a Monaſtery* (x) *ſhould reforme it ſelfe, and ſhould reduce into practiſe, ancient good diſcipline, when others would not; in this caſe could it in reaſon bee charged with Schiſme from others, or with Apoſtacy from its rule and order? Or as in a ſociety of men univerſally infected with ſome diſeaſe, they that ſhould free themſelves from the common diſeaſe, could not be therefore ſaid to ſeparate from the ſociety: ſo neither can the reformed Churches be truely accuſed for making a Schiſme from the Church, ſeeing all they did, was to reforme themſelves.*

x Pag. 81. 82.

31 I was very glad to find you in a Monaſtery, but ſorry when I perceived that you were inventing wayes how to forſake your Vocation, and to maintaine the lawfulneſſe of Schiſme from the Church, and Apoſtaſie from a Religious Order. Yet before you make your finall reſolution, heare a word of adviſe. Put caſe; That a Monaſtery did confeſſedly obſerve their ſubſtantiall vowes, and all principall Statutes, or Conſtitutions of the Order, though with ſome neglect of leſſer Monaſticall Obſervances: And that a Reformation were undertaken, not by authority of lawfull

lawfull Superiours, but by ſome One, or very few in compariſon of the reſt: And thoſe few knowne to be led, not with any ſpirit of Reformation, but by ſome other ſiniſter intention: And that the Statutes of the houſe were even by thoſe buſie fellowes confeſſed, to have been time out of mind underſtood, and practiſed as now they were: And further that the pretended Reformers acknowledged that themſelves as ſoone as they were gone out of their Monaſtery, muſt not hope to be free from thoſe or the like errors and corruptions, for which they left their Brethren: And (which is more) that they might fall into more enormous crimes then they *did*, or *could* doe in their Monaſtery, which we ſuppoſe to be *ſecured* from all ſubſtantiall corruptions, for the avoyding of which they have an infallible aſſiſtance. Put (I ſay) together all theſe my *And's*, and then come with your *If's*, *If a Monaſtery ſhould reforme it ſelf, &c.* and tell me, if you could excuſe ſuch Reformers from Schiſme, Sedition, Rebellion, Apoſtaſie, &c? what would you ſay of ſuch Reformers in your Colledge? or tumultuous perſons in a kingdome? Remember now your owne Tenets, and then reflect how fit a ſimilitude you have picked out, to prove your ſelf a *Schiſmatique*. You teach that the Church may erre in points not fundamentall, but that for all fundamentall points ſhe is *ſecured* from error: You teach that no particular perſon, or Church hath any promiſe of aſſiſtance in points fundamentall: You, and the whole world can witneſſe that when *Luther* began, he being but only *One*, oppoſed himſelf *to All*, as well ſubjects, as ſuperiours; and that even then, when he himſelf confeſſed that he had no intention of Reformation: You cannot be ignorant but that many chief learned Proteſtants are forced to confeſſe the Antiquity of our doctrine and practice, and doe in ſeverall, and many Controverſies, acknowledge that the Ancient Fathers ſtood on our Side: Conſider I ſay theſe points, and ſee whether your ſimilitude doe not condemne your Progenitors of *Schiſme* from God's viſible *Church*, yea and of *Apoſtaſie* alſo from their Religious *Orders*, if they were vowed Regulars, as *Luther*, and divers of them were.

32 From the Monaſtery you are fled into an Hoſpitall *of perſons vniverſally infected with ſome diſeaſe*, where you find to be true what I ſuppoſed, that after your departure from your Brethren you might fall into greater inconveniences, and more *infectious diſeaſes*, then thoſe for which you left *them*. But you are alſo upon the point to abandon theſe miſerable needy perſons, in whoſe behalf for Charities ſake, let me ſet before you theſe conſiderations. If the diſeaſe neither *were*, nor *could* be mortall, becauſe in that Company of men God had placed a Tree of life: If going thence, the ſick man might by curious taſting the Tree of Knowledge eate poyſon under pretence of bettering his health: If he could not hope thereby to avoid other diſeaſes like thoſe for which he had quitted the company of the firſt infected men: If by his departure innumerable miſchiefs were to enſue; could ſuch a man without ſenſleſneſſe be excuſed by ſaying, that he ſought *to free himſelf from the common diſeaſe*, but not forſooth *to ſeparate from the ſociety?* Now your ſelf compare the Church to a man deformed with (y) *ſuperfluous fingers and toes*, but yet who hath not *loſt* any *vitall part*: you acknowledge that out of her ſociety no man is ſecured from damnable errour, and the world can beare witneſſe what unſpeakable miſchiefs and calamities enſued *Luthers* revolt from the Church. Pronounce then concerning them, the ſame ſentence which even now I have ſhewed them to deſerve, who in the manner aforeſaid ſhould *ſeparate from* perſons *univerſally* infected with ſome diſeaſe.

y *Pag.* 154.

33 But alas, to what paſſe hath Hereſy brought men, who terme themſelves Chriſtians, and yet bluſh not to compare the beloved Spouſe of our Lord, the one Dove, the purchaſe of our Saviours moſt precious blood, the holy Catholique Church, I mean that viſible Church of Chriſt which *Luther* found ſpread over the whole world; to a Monaſtery ſo diſordered that it muſt be forſaken; to the *Gyant in Gath much deformed with ſuperfluous fingers and toes*; to a *ſociety of men univerſally infected with ſome diſeaſe!* And yet all theſe compariſons, and much worſe, are neither injurious, nor undeſerved, if once it be granted, or can be proved, that the viſible Church of Chriſt may erre in any one point of Faith, although not fundamentall.

34 Before I part from theſe ſimilitudes, one thing I muſt obſerve againſt the evaſion of D. *Potter*, that they left not the *Church*, but her Corruptions. For as thoſe Reformers of the Monaſtery, or thoſe other who left the company of men univerſally infected with ſome diſeaſe, would deny themſelves to be *Schiſmatiques*, or any way blame-worthy, but could not deny, but that they left the ſaid Communities: So *Luther* and the reſt cannot ſo much as pretend, not to have left the viſible Church, which according to them was infected with many diſeaſes, but can only pretend that they did not ſinne in leaving her. And you ſpeak very ſtrangly when you ſay: *In a ſociety of men univerſally infected with ſome diſeaſe, they that ſhould free themſelves from the Common diſeaſe, could not be therefore ſaid to ſeparate from the Society*. For if they doe not ſeparate themſelves from the Society of the infected perſons; how doe they free themſelves and depart from the common diſeaſe? Doe they at the ſame time remain *in the company*, and yet depart *from* thoſe infected creatures? We muſt then ſay, that they *ſeparate* themſelves from the perſons, though it be by occaſion of the diſeaſe: Or if you ſay, they free their owne perſons from the common diſeaſe, yet ſo, that they remain ſtill in the Company infected, ſubject to the Superiours and Governours thereof, eating and drinking and keeping publique Aſſemblies with them; you cannot but know, that *Luther* and your Reformers the firſt pretended free perſons from the ſuppoſed common infection of the Roman Church, did not ſo: for they endeavoured to force the Society whereof they were parts, to be healed and reformed as they were: and if it refuſed, they did, when they had forces, drive the away, even their Superiours both ſpirituall and temporall, as is notorious. Or if they

had

had not power to expell that ſuppoſed infected Community, or Church of that place, they departed from them corporally, whom mentally they had forſaken before. So that you cannot deny, but *Luther* forſook the externall Communion, and company of the Catholique Church, for which as your ſelf (z) confeſſe, *There neither was nor can be any juſt cauſe, no more then to depart from Chriſt himſelf*. We doe therefore infer, that *Luther* and the reſt who forſook that viſible Church which they found upon earth, were truely, and *properly Schiſmatiques*. z *Pag.* 75.

35 Moreover, it is evident that there was a diviſion between *Luther* and that Church which was Viſible when he aroſe: but that Church cannot be ſaid to have divided her ſelf from him, before whoſe time ſhe was, and in compariſon of whom ſhe was a *Whole*, and he but a *part*: therefore we muſt ſay, that he divided himſelf and went out of her; which is to be a *Schiſmatique*, or *Heretique*, or both. By this argument, *Optatus Milevitanus* proveth, that not *Cæcilianus*, but *Parmenianus* was a Schiſmatique, ſaying: *For, Cæcilianus went* (a) *not out of Maiorinus thy Grandfather, but Maiorinus from Cæcilianus: neither did Cæcilianus depart from the Chayre of Peter, or Cyprian, but Maiorinus, in whoſe Chayre thou ſitteſt, which had no beginning before Maiorinus. Since it manifeſtly appeareth that theſe things were acted in this manner, it is cleare that you are heyres both of the deliverers up* (of the holy Bible to be burned) *and alſo of Schiſmatiques*. The whole argument of this holy Father makes directly both againſt *Luther*, and all thoſe who continue the diviſion which he begun; and proves, That, *going out*, convinceth thoſe who goe out to be Schiſmatiques; but not thoſe from whom they depart: That to forſake the Chaire of Peter is *Schiſme*; yea, that it is *Schiſme* to erect a Chaire which had no origen, or as it were predeceſſour, before it ſelf: That to continue in a diviſion begun by others, is to be *Heires of Schiſmatiques*; and laſtly; that to depart from the Communion of a particular Church (as that of *S. Cyprian* was) is ſufficient to make a man incur the guilt of *Schiſme*, and conſequently, that although Proteſtants, who deny the Pope to be ſupreme Head of the Church, doe think by that *Hereſy* to cleere *Luther* from Schiſme, in diſobeying the Pope: Yet that will not ſerve to free him from *Schiſme*, as it importeth a diviſion from the obedience, or Communion of the particular Biſhop, Dioceſſe, Church, and Country, where he lived. a *Lib.* 1. *Cont. Parm.*

36 But it is not the Hereſy of Proteſtants, or any other Sectaries, that can deprive *S. Peter*, and his Succeſſours, of the authority which Chriſt our Lord conferred upon them over his whole militant Church: which is a point confeſſed by learned Proteſtants to be of great Antiquity, and for which the judgement of divers moſt ancient holy Fathers is reproved by them, as may be ſeen at large in *Brerely* (b) exactly citing the places of ſuch chiefe Proteſtants. And we muſt ſay with *S. Cyprian*: *Hereſies* (c) *have ſprung, and Schiſmes been bred from no other cauſe then for that the Prieſt of God is not obeyed, nor one Prieſt and Judge is conſidered to be for the time in the Church of God*. Which words doe plainely condemne *Luther*, whether he will underſtand them as ſpoken of the *Univerſall*, or of every *particular* Church. For he withdrew himſelfe both from the obedience of the Pope, and of all particular Biſhops, and Churches. And no leſſe cleere is the ſaid *Optatus Milevitanus*, ſaying: *Thou canſt not deny* (d) *but that thou knoweſt, that in the Citty of Rome, there was firſt an Epiſcopall Chaire placed for Peter, wherein Peter the head of all the Apoſtles ſate, whereof alſo he was called Cephas; in which one Chaire, Vnity was to be kept by all, leaſt the other Apoſtles might attribute to themſelves, each one his particular chaire; and that he ſhould be a Schiſmatique and ſinner, who againſt that one ſingle Chaire ſhould erect another*. Many other Authorities of Fathers might be alleaged to this purpoſe, which I omit; my intention being not to handle particular controverſies. b *Tract.* 1. *Sect.* 3. *ſubd.* 10. c *Ep.* 55. d *Lib.* 2. *Cont. Parm.*

37 Now, the arguments which hitherto I have brought, prove that *Luther*, and his followers were Schiſmatiques, without examining (for as much as belongs to this point) whether or no the Church can erre in any one thing great or ſmall, becauſe it is univerſally true, that there can be no juſt cauſe to forſake the Communion of the Viſible Church of Chriſt, according to *S. Auguſtine*, ſaying: *It is not poſſible* (e) *that any may have juſt cauſe to ſeparate their Communion, from the Communion of the whole world, and call themſelves the Church of Chriſt, as if they had ſeparated themſelves from the Communion of all Nations upon juſt cauſe*. But ſince indeed the Church cannot erre in any one point of doctrine, nor can approve any corruption in manners; they cannot with any colour avoid the juſt imputation of *eminent* Schiſme, according to the verdict of the ſame holy Father in theſe words: *The moſt manifeſt* (f) *ſacriledge of Schiſme is eminent, when there was no cauſe of ſeparation*. e *Ep.* 48. f *De Bapt. lib.* 5. *c.* 1.

38 Laſtly, I prove that Proteſtants cannot avoid the note of Schiſme, at leaſt by reaſon of their mutuall ſeparation from one another. For moſt certain it is that there is very great difference, for the outward face of a Church, and profeſſion of a different faith, between the *Lutherans*, the rigid *Calviniſts*, and the *Proteſtants* of England. So that if *Luther* were in the right, thoſe other Proteſtants who invented Doctrines far different from his, and divided themſelues from him, muſt be reputed *Schiſmatiques*: and the like argument may proportionably be applyed to their further diviſions, & ſubdiviſions. Which reaſon I yet urge more ſtrongly out of D. *Potter*, (g) who affirmes, that to him and to ſuch as are convicted in conſcience of the errors of the *Roman Church*, a reconciliation is *impoſſible*, and *damnable*: And yet he teacheth, that their difference from the *Roman Church*, is not in fundamentall points. Now, ſince among Proteſtants there is ſuch diverſity of beliefe, that one denieth what the other affirmeth, they muſt be convicted in conſcience that one part is in errour (at leaſt not fundamentall,) and, if D. *Potter* will ſpeak conſequently, g *Pag.* 20.

thus

that a reconciliation between them is *impoſſible* & dãnable: & what greater diviſion, or *Schiſme* can there be, then when one part muſt judge a reconciliation with the other to be *impoſſible*, & *dãnable*?

39 Out of all which premiſſes, this *Concluſion* followes: That, *Luther* & his followers were *Schiſmatiques*; from the univerſall viſible Church; from the Pope Chriſts Vicar on earth, & Succeſſour to S. *Peter*; from the particular Dioceſe in which they received Baptiſme; from the Countrey or Nation to which they belonged; from the Biſhop under whom they lived; many of them from the Religious Order in which they were profeſſed; from one another; And laſtly from a mans ſelfe (as much as is poſſible) becauſe the ſelfe ſame Proteſtant to day *is convicted in conſcience*, that his yeſterday's Opinion was an error (as D. *Potter* knows a man in the world who from a Puritan was turned to a moderate Proteſtant) with whom therefore a reconciliation, according to D. *Potters* grounds, is both *impoſſible*, and *damnable*.

40 It ſeemes D. *Potters* laſt refuge to excuſe himſelfe and his Brethren from Schiſme, is becauſe they proceeded according to their conſcience, dictating an obligation under damnation to forſake the errours maintained by the Church of Rome. His words are: *Although we confeſſe the* (h) *Church of Rome to be* (*in ſome ſenſe*) *a true Church, and her errors to ſome men not damnable: yet for us who are convinced in conſcience, that ſhe erres in many things, a neceſſity lies upon us, even under pain of damnation, to forſake her in thoſe errors.*

h *Pag.* 81.

41 I anſwer: It is very ſtrange, that you judge us extreamly Vncharitable, in ſaying, Proteſtants cannot be ſaved; while your ſelfe avouch the ſame of all learned Catholiques, whom ignorance cannot excuſe. If this your pretence of conſcience may ſerue, what Schiſmatique in the Church, what popular ſeditious brain in a kingdome, may not alledge the dictamen of conſcience to free themſelves from *Schiſme*, or *Sedition*? No man wiſhes them to doe any thing againſt their conſcience, but we ſay, that they may, and ought to rectifie, and depoſe ſuch a conſcience, which is *eaſie* for them to doe, even according to your own affirmation; that wee Catholiques want no meanes neceſſary to ſalvation. Eaſie to doe? Nay not to doe ſo, to any man in his right wits muſt ſeem *impoſſible*. For how can theſe two apprehenſions ſtand together: In the Roman Church I enjoy all meanes neceſſary to ſalvation, and yet I cannot hope to be ſaved in that Church? or, who can conjoyn in one brain (not crack't) theſe aſſertions: After due examination I judge the Roman errors not to be in themſelues fundamentall, or damnable; and yet I judge that according to true reaſon, it is damnable to hold them? I ſay *according to true reaſon*. For if you grant your conſcience to be *erroneous*, in judging that you cannot be ſaved in the *Roman* Church, by reaſon of her errours; there is no other remedy, but that you muſt rectifie your erring conſcience, by your other judgement, that her errours are not fundamentall, nor damnable. And this is no more Charity, then you daily afford to ſuch other Proteſtants as you term Brethren, whom you cannot deny to be in ſome errors, (unleſſe you will hold, That of contradictory propoſitions both may be true) and yet you doe not judge it damnable to liue in their Communion, becauſe you hold their errors not to be fundamentall. You ought to know, that according to the Doctrine of all Divines, there is great difference between a ſpeculatiue perſwaſion, and a practicall dictamen of conſcience; and therefore although they had in ſpeculation conceived the viſible Church to erre in ſome doctrines, of themſelves not damnable; yet with that ſpeculatiue judgement they might, and ought to haue entertained this practicall dictamen, that for points not ſubſtantiall to faith, they neither were bound, nor lawfully could break the bond of Charity, by breaking unity in Gods Church. You ſay that, *hay and ſtubble* (i) *and ſuch unprofitable ſtuffe* (as are corruptions in points not fundamentall) *laid on the roofe, deſtroyes not the houſe, whilſt the main pillars are ſtanding on the foundation.* And you would think him a mad man who to be rid of ſuch ſtuffe, would ſet his houſe on fire, that ſo he might walk in the light, as you teach that *Luther* was obliged to forſake the houſe of God, for an unneceſſary light, not without a combuſtion formidable to the whole Chriſtiã world; rather then beare with ſome errours, which did not deſtroy the foundation of faith. And as for others who entred in at the breach firſt made by *Luther*, they might, and ought to haue guided their conſciences by that moſt reaſonable rule of *Vincentius Lyrinenſis*, delivered in theſe words; *Indeed it is a matter of great* (k) *moment, and both moſt profitable to be learned, and neceſſary to be remembred, and which we ought again and again to illuſtrate, and inculcate with weighty heapes of examples, that almoſt all Catholiques may know, that they ought to receiue the Doctors with the Church, and not forſake the faith of the Church with the Doctors:* And much leſſe ſhould they forſake the faith of the Church to follow *Luther*, *Calvin*, and ſuch other Noveliſts. Moreover, though your firſt Reformers had conceived their own opinions to be *true*; yet they might, and ought to haue doubted, whether they were *certain:* becauſe your ſelfe affirm, that infallibility was not promiſed to any particular Perſons, or Churches. And ſince in caſes of *uncertainties*, we are not to leave our Superiour, nor caſt off his obedience, or publiquely oppoſe his decrees; your Reformers might eaſily haue found a ſafe way to ſatisfie their zealous conſcience, without a publique breach; eſpecially if with this their *uncertainty*, we call to mind the peaceable poſſeſſion, & and preſcription which by the confeſſion of your own Brethren, the Church, and Pope of *Rome* did for many ages enjoy. I wiſh you would examine the works of your Brethren, by the words your ſelfe ſets down to free S. *Cyprian* from *Schiſme:* every ſyllable of which words convinceth *Luther*, and his Copartners to be guilty of that crime, and ſheweth in what manner they might with great eaſe, and quietneſſe haue rectified their conſciences about the pretended errours of the Church. S. *Cyprian* (ſay you) *was a peaceable* (l) *and modeſt man, diſſented from others in his iudgement, but without any breach of Charity; condemned no man* (*much leſſe any Church*) *for the contrary*

i *Pag.* 155.

k *Adverſ. hæreſ. c.* 27.

l *Pag.* 124.

trary opinion. He believed his own opinion to be true, but believed not, that it was neceſſary, and therefore did not proceed raſhly and peremptorily to cenſure others, but left them to their liberty. Did your Reformers imitate this manner of proceeding? Did they *cenſure no man, much leſſe any Church? S. Cyprian believed his own Opinion to be true, but believed not that it was neceſſary, and* THEREFORE *did not proceed raſhly, and peremptorily to cenſure others.* You believe the points wherein *Luther* differs from us, not to be fundamentall, or *neceſſary*; and why doe you not thence infer the like THEREFORE, he ſhould not haue *proceeded to cenſure others*? In a word, ſince their diſagreement from us concerned only points which were not fundamentall, they ſhould haue believed that they might haue been deceived, as well as the whole viſible Church, which you ſay may erre in ſuch points; and therefore their doctrines being not certainly *true*, and certainly *not neceſſary*, they could not giue ſufficient cauſe to depart from the Communion of the Church.

42 In other places you write ſo much, as may ſerve us to proue, that *Luther*, and his followers ought to haue depoſed, and rectified their conſciences: As for example, when you ſay: *When the Church* (m) *hath declared her ſelfe in any matter of opinion, or of Rites, her declaration obliges all her children to peace, and externall obedience. Nor is it fit, or lawfull for any private man to oppoſe his judgement to the publique*, (as *Luther* and his fellows did) *He may offer his opinion to be conſidered of, ſo he doe it with evidence, or great probability of Scripture, or reaſon, and very modeſtly, ſtill containing himſelf within the dutifull reſpect which he oweth: but if he will factiouſly advance his own conceits* (his own conceits? & yet grounded upon evidence of Scripture) *& deſpiſe the Church ſo far as to cut of her Cõmunion; he may be juſtly branded & condemned for a Schiſmatique, yea & an Heretique alſo in ſome degree, & in foro exteriori, though his opinion were true, & much more if it be falſe.* Could any man, even for a Fee, haue ſpoken more home to condemn your Predeceſſors of *Schiſme*, or Hereſy? Could they haue ſtronger Motives to oppoſe the doctrine of the Church, and leave her Communion, then evidence of Scripture? And yet, according to your own words, they ſhould haue anſwered, & rectified their conſcience, by your doctrine, that though their opinion *were true*, and grounded upon evidence of *Scripture, or reaſon*; yet it was not lawfull for any *private man to oppoſe his iudgement to the publique*, which obligeth all Chriſtians *to peace & externall obedience*: and if they caſt off the Communion of the Church for maintaining their own *Conceits, they may be branded for Schiſmatiques, and Heretiques in ſome degree, & in foro exteriori*, that is, all other Chriſtians ought ſo *to eſteem* of them, (and why then are we accounted uncharitable for judging ſo of you?) and they alſo are obliged to *behaue* themſelves *in the face of all Chriſtian Churches*, as if indeed they were not Reformers, but *Schiſmatiques*, and *Heretiques*, or as Pagans, & Publicans. I thank you for your ingenuous confeſſion, in recompence whereof, I will doe a deed of Charity, by putting you in mind, into what labyrinths you are brought, by teaching that the Church may erre in ſome points of faith, & yet that it is not lawful for any man to oppoſe his judgement, or leave her Communion, though he haue evidence of Scripture againſt her. Will you haue ſuch a man diſſemble againſt his conſcience, or externally deny a truth, known to be cõtained in holy Scripture? How much more coherently doe Catholiques proceed, who believe the univerſall infallibility of the Church, and from thence are aſſured, that there can be no evidence of Scripture, or reaſon, againſt her definitions, nor any juſt cauſe to forſake her Communion? M. Hooker, eſteemed by many Proteſtants an incomparable man, yeelds as much as we haue alleaged out of you. *The will of God is* (ſaith he) *to haue* (n) *them doe whatſoever the ſentence of judiciall and finall deciſion ſhall determine, yea though it ſeeme in their private opinion, to ſwarve utterly from that which is right.* Doth not this man tell *Luther*, what the will of God was, which he tranſgreſſing, muſt of neceſſity bee guilty of *Schiſme*? And muſt not M. *Hooker* either acknowledge the univerſall infallibility of the Church, or elſe driue men into the perplexities and labyrinths of diſſembling againſt their conſcience, whereof now I ſpeake? Not unlike to this, is your doctrine delivered elſewhere. *Before the Nicene Councell* (ſay you) *many* (o) *good Catholique Biſhops, were of the ſame opinion with the Donatiſts, that the Baptiſme of Heretiques was ineffectuall; and with the Novatians, that the Church ought not to abſolve ſome grievous ſinners. Theſe errours therefore (if they had gone no further) were not in themſelves Hereticall, eſpecially in the proper, and moſt heavy, or bitter ſenſe of that word; neither was it in the Churches intention (or in her power) to make them ſuch by her declaration. Her intention was, to ſilence all diſputes, and to ſettle peace and unitie in her gouernment: to which all wiſe and peaceable men ſubmitted, whatſoever their opinion was. And thoſe factious people, for their unreaſonable and uncharitable oppoſition, were very juſtly branded for Schiſmatiques. For us, the* Miſtaker *will never proue that we oppoſe any declaration of the Catholique Church &c. and therefore hee doth uniuſtlie charge us either with Schiſme, or Hereſie.* Theſe wordes manifeſtly condemne your Reformers, who oppoſed the viſible Church in many of her declarations, Doctrines, and Commands impoſed upon them, for ſilencing all diſputes, *and ſetling peace and Vnity in the gouernment*, and therefore they ſtill remaining obſtinately diſobedient, are juſtly *charged with Schiſme, and Hereſie.* And it is to be obſerved, that you grant the *Donatiſts* to haue been *very juſtly branded for Schiſmatiques*, although their oppoſition againſt the Church, did concern (as you hold) a point not fundamentall to the Faith, and which according to S. *Auguſtine*, cannot be proued

m Pag. 105.

n In his preface to his Bookes of Eccleſiaſticall policy. Sect. 6. p. 28.

o Pag. 133.

out of Scripture alone; and therefore either doth evidently convince that the Church is universally infallible, even in points not fundamentall; or elſe that it is *Schiſme*, to oppoſe her declarations, in thoſe very things wherein ſhe may erre; and conſequently that *Luther*, and his fellowes were *Schiſmatiques*, by oppoſing the viſible Church, for points not fundamentall, though it were (untruely) ſuppoſed that ſhe erred in ſuch points. But by the way, how come you on the ſuddaine to hold the determination of a Generall Councell (of *Nice*) to be the declaration of the Catholique Church, ſeeing you teach, That Generall Councels may erre even fundamentally? And doe you now ſay, with us, that to oppoſe the declaration of the Church, is ſufficient that one may be branded with *Hereſie*, which is a point ſo often impugned by you?

43 It is therefore moſt evident, that no pretended ſcruple of *conſcience* could excuſe *Luther*; which he might, and ought to have rectified by meanes enough, if Pride, Ambition, Obſtinacy &c. had given him leave. I grant he was touched with ſcruple of conſcience, but it was becauſe he had forſaken the viſible Church of Chriſt; and I beſeech all Proteſtants for the loue they beare to that ſacred ranſome of their ſoules, the Blood of our bleſſed Saviour, attentiuely to ponder, and unpartially to apply to *their* owne *Conſcience*, what this Man ſpoke concerning the feelings, and remorſe of his. *How often* (ſaith he) *did my trembling heart* (p) *beat within me, and reprehending me, obiect againſt me that moſt ſtrong argument; Art thou only wiſe? Doe ſo many worlds erre? Were ſo many ages ignorant? What if thou erreſt, and draweſt ſo many into hell to be damned eternally with thee?* And in another place he ſaith: *Deſt thou who art but One, and of no* (q) *account, take upon thee ſo great matters? What, if thou, being but one, offendeſt? If God permit ſuch, ſo many, & all to erre; why may he not permit thee to erre? To this belong thoſe arguments, the Church, the Church, the Fathers, the Fathers, the Councels, the Cuſtomes, the multitudes, and greatnes of wiſe men: Whom doe not theſe Mountaines of arguments, theſe clouds, yea theſe ſeas of Examples overthrow?* And theſe thoughts wrought ſo deep in his ſoule, that he *often wiſhed and deſired that he had* (r) *never begun this buſineſſe*: wiſhing yet further that *his Writings were burned and buried* (s) *in eternall oblivion*. Behold what remorſe *Luther* felt, and how ſhe wanted no ſtrength of malice to croſſe his own conſcience: and therefore it was no ſcruple, or conceived obligation of conſcience, but ſome other motives which induced him to oppoſe the Church. And if yet you doubt of his courage to encounter, and ſtrength to maſter all reluctations of conſcience, heare an example or two for that purpoſe. Of Communion under both kinds, thus he ſaith: *If the Councell* (t) *ſhould in any caſe decree this, leaſt of all would we then uſe both kinds, yea rather in deſpight of the Councell, and the Decree, we would uſe either but one kind only, or neither, or in no caſe both.* Was not *Luther* perſwaded in *Conſcience*, that to uſe, neither kind was againſt our Sauiours command? Is this only to *offer his opinion to be conſidered of*, as you ſaid all men ought to doe? And that you may be ſure that he ſpoke from his heart, and if occaſion had been offered, would have been as good as his word; mark what he ſaith of the Elevation of the Sacrament: *I did know* (u) *the Elevation of the Sacrament to be Idolatricall; yet nevertheleſſe I did retain it in the Church at Wittemberg, to the end I might vexe the divell Caroloſtadius.* Was not this a conſcience large and capacious enough, that could ſwallow Idolatry? Why would he not tolerate Idolatry in the Church of Rome (as theſe men are wont to blaſpheame) if he could retain it in his own Church at Wittemberge? If *Caroloſtadius*, *Luthers* of-ſpring, was the Divell, who but himſelf muſt be his damme? Is Almighty God wont to ſend ſuch furies to preach the Goſpell? And yet further (which makes moſt directly to the point in hand) *Luther* in his Book of abrogating the *Private Maſſe*, exhorts the *Auguſtine* Friers of *Wittemberg*, who firſt abrogated the Maſſe, that, even againſt their conſcience accuſing them, they ſhould perſiſt in what they had begun, acknowledging that in ſome things he himſelf had done the like. And *Ioannes Matheſius* a Lutheran Preacher ſaith: *Antonius Muſa the Pariſh Prieſt* (w) *of Rocklitz, recounted to me that on a time he heartily moaned himſelf to the Doctor* (he meanes *Luther*), *that he himſelf could not believe what he preached to others: And that D. Luther anſwered; praiſe and thanks be to God, that this happens alſo to others, for I had thought it had happened only to me.* Are not theſe conſcionable, and fit Reformers? And can they be excuſed from *Schiſme*, under pretence that they held themſelves obliged to forſake the Roman Church? If then it be damnable to proceed againſt ones conſcience, what will become of *Luther* who againſt his conſcience, perſiſted in his diviſion from the *Roman* Church?

44 Some are ſaid to flatter themſelves with another pernicious conceit, that they (forſooth) are not guilty of ſinne; Becauſe they were not the *firſt Authors*, but only are the *continuers* of the *Schiſme*, which was already begunne.

45 But it is hard to believe, that any man of judgment, can think this excuſe will ſubſiſt, when he ſhall come to give up his finall accompt. For according to this reaſon, no Schiſme will be damnable, but only to the Beginners: Whereas contrarily, the longer it continues the worſe it growes to be, and at length degenerates to *Hereſy*; as wine by long keeping growes to be Vineger, but not by continuance, returnes again to his former nature of wine. Thus S. *Auguſtine* ſaith, that *Hereſy is* (x) *Schiſme inveterate*. And in another place: *We obiect to you only the* (y) *crime of Schiſme, which you have alſo made to become Hereſy, by evill perſevering therein*. And S. *Hierom* ſaith: *Though Schiſme* (z) *in the beginning may be in ſome ſort underſtood to be defferent from hereſy; yet there is no Schiſme, which doth not feigne to it ſelf ſome Hereſy, that it may ſeem to have departed from the Church upon iuſt cauſe.* And ſo indeed it falleth out. For men may begin upō paſſiō, but af-

ter

p *Tom. 2. Germ. Ien. fol. 9. & tom. 2. Witt. of anno 1562. de abrog. Miſſ. priuat. fol. 244.*

q *Tom. 5. Annot. breviſ.*

r *Colloq. menſal. fol. 158.*

ſ *Præfat. in tom. Germ. Ien.*

t *De formula miſſæ.*

u *In parva Confeſſ.*

Vid. Tan. tom. 2. diſput. 1. q. 2 dub. 4. n. 108.

w *In orat. Germ. 12. de Luth.*

x *Lib. 2. cont. Creſc. c. 7.*

y *Ep. 164.*

z Vpon theſe words *ad Tit. 3. Hæreticum hominem &c.*

terward by inſtinct of corrupt nature ſeeking to maintain their Schiſme as lawfull, they fall into ſome Hereſy, without which their Separation could not be juſtified with any colour: as in our preſent caſe the very affirming that it is lawfull to continue a Schiſme unlawfully begun, is an error againſt the main principle of Chriſtianity, that it is not lawfull for any Chriſtian, to live out of Gods Church, within which alone Salvation can be had; Or, that it is not damnable to diſobey her decrees, according to the words of our Saviour: *If he ſhall not hear* (a) *the Church, let him be to thee as a Pagan or Publican.* And, *He* (b) *that deſpiſeth you, deſpiſeth mee.* We heard above *Optatus Milevitanus* ſaying to *Parmenianus*, that both he, and all thoſe other who continued in the Schiſme begun by *Majorinus*, did inherit their Forefathers Schiſme; and yet *Parmenianus* was the third Biſhop after *Majorinus* in his Sea, and did not *begin*, but only *continue* the Schiſme. *For* (ſaith this holy Father) *Cæcilianus* (c) *went not out of Majorinus thy Grand-Father, but Majorinus from Cæcilianus: neither did Cæcilianus depart from the Chaire of Peter, or Cyprian, but Majorinus, in whoſe Chaire thou ſitteſt, which before Majorinus* (Luther) *had no beginning. Seing it is evident that theſe things paſſed in this manner* (that, for example, Luther departed from the Church, and not the Church from Luther) *it is cleere that you be* HEIRES *both of the givers up of the Bible to be burned, and of* SCHISMATIQVES. And the Regall Power, or example of *Henry* the Eight could not excuſe his ſubjects from Schiſme, according to what we have heard out of *S. Cryſoſtome* ſaying: *Nothing doth ſo much provoke* (d) *the wrath of Almighty God, as that the Church ſhould be divided. Although we ſhould doe innumerable good deeds, if we divide the full Eccleſiaſticall Congregation, we ſhall be puniſhed no leſſe, then they who did rend his* (naturall) *Body; for that was done to the gaine of the whole world, though not with that intention: but this hath no good in it at all, but that the greateſt hurt riſeth from it. Theſe things are ſpoken not only to thoſe who bear office, but to ſuch alſo as are governed by them.* Behold therefore, how liable both *Subjects*, and *Superiours* are to the ſinne of *Schiſme*, if they breake the unity of Gods Church. The words of S. *Paul* can in no occaſion be verified more then in this of which we ſpeak. *They who doe ſuch things* (e) *are worthy of death: and not only they that doe them, but they alſo that conſent with the doers.* In things which are indifferent of their own nature, Cuſtome may be occaſion, that ſome act not well begun, may in time come to be lawfully continued. But no length of Time, no Quality of Perſons, no Circumſtance of Neceſſity can legitimate actions which are of their own nature unlawfull: and therefore diviſion from Chriſts myſticall body, being of the number of thoſe Actions, which Divines teach to be *intrinſecè malas, evill of their own nature and eſſence*, no difference of Perſons or Time can ever make it lawfull. *D. Potter* ſaith: *There neither was, nor can be any cauſe to depart from the Church of Chriſt, no more then from Chriſt himſelfe.* And who dares ſay, that it is not damnable to *continue* a Separation from Chriſt? *Preſcription* cannot in conſcience runne, when the firſt beginner, and his Succeſſors are conſcious that the thing to be *preſcribed*, for example goods or lands, were unjuſtly poſſeſſed at the firſt. Chriſtians are not like ſtraies, that after a certain time of wandring from their right home, fall from their owner to the Lord of the Soile; but as long as they retaine the *indelible Character* of Baptiſme, and live upon earth, they are obliged to acknowledge ſubjection to Gods Church. Humane Lawes may come to nothing by diſcontinuance of time, but the Law of God, commanding us to conſerve Vnity in his Church, doth ſtill remain. The continued diſobedience of Children cannot deprive Parents of their paternall right, nor can the Grand-child be undutifull to his Grand-Father, becauſe his Father was unnaturall to his own parent. The longer Gods Church is diſobeyed; the profeſſion of her Doctrine denied; her Sacraments neglected; her Liturgy condemned; her Vnity violated; the more grievous the fault growes to be: as the longer a man with-holds a due debt, or retaines his neighbours goods, the greater injuſtice he commits. Conſtancy in evill doth not extenuate, but aggravate the ſame, which by extenſion of time, receiveth increaſe of ſtrength, and addition of greater malice. If theſe mens conceits were true, the Church might come to be wholly divided by wicked Schiſmes, and yet after ſome ſpace of time, none could be accuſed of Schiſme, nor be obliged to returne to the viſible Church of Chriſt: and ſo there ſhould remaine no *One* true viſible Church. Let therefore theſe men who pretend to honour, reverence, and believe the Doctrine, and practiſe of the viſible Church, and to condemne their forefathers who forſooke her, and ſay they would not have done ſo, if they had lived in the daies of their Fathers, and yet follow their example in remaining divided from her Communion; conſider, how truly theſe words of our Saviour fall upon them. *Woe be to you, becauſe you build* (f) *the Prophets ſepulchers, and garniſh the monuments of juſt men, and ſay: If we had been in our Fathers daies, we had not been their fellowes in the blood of the Prophets. Therefore you are a teſtimony to your own ſelves, that you are the ſonnes of them that killed the Prophets; and fill up the meaſure of your Fathers.*

a Mar. 18.
b Luk. 10. 16.
c Lib. 1. cont. Parm.
d Hom. 11. in epiſt. ad Eph.
e Rom. 1. 32.
f Mat. 23. v. 29. &c.

46 And thus having demonſtrated that *Luther*, his Aſſociates, and all that continue in the Schiſme by them begun, are guilty of *Schiſme*, by departing from the viſible true Church of Chriſt; it remaineth that we examine what in particular was that Viſible true Church, from which they departed, that ſo they may know to what Church in particular they ought to returne: and then we ſhall have performed what was propoſed to be handled in the fift Point. 5. Point. Luther and the reſt departed from the Roman Church.

47 That the *Roman* Church (I ſpeak not for the preſent, of the particular Dioceſſe of *Rome*, but of all viſible Churches diſperſed throughout the whole world, agreeing in Faith with the Chaire of *Peter*, whether that Sea were ſuppoſed to be in the City of *Rome* or in any other place:) That (I ſay) the Church of *Rome*, in this ſenſe, was the viſible Catholique Church our

out of which *Luther* departed, is proved by your own confeſſion, who aſſigne for notes of the Church, the true Preaching of Gods word, and due adminiſtration of Sacraments, both which for the ſubſtance you cannot deny to the *Roman* Church, ſince you confeſſe that ſhe wanted nothing fundamentall, or neceſſary to ſalvation; and for that very cauſe you think to cleare your ſelfe from Schiſme, *whoſe property*, as you ſay, *is to cut off from the* (g) *Body of Chriſt and the hope of Salvation, the Church from which it ſeparates*. Now that *Luther* and his fellowes were born and baptized in the *Roman* Church, and that ſhe was the Church out of which they departed, is notoriouſly known: and therefore you cannot cut her off *from the Body of Chriſt, and hope of Salvation*, unleſſe you will acknowledge your ſelfe to deſerve the juſt imputation of *Schiſme*. Neither can you deny her to be truly Catholique by reaſon of (pretended) corruptions, not fundamentall. For your ſelfe avouch, and endeavour to prove, that the true Catholique Church may erre in ſuch points. Moreover, I hope you will not ſo much as goe about to prove, that when *Luther* roſe, there was any other true viſible Church, *diſagreeing* from the *Roman*, and *agreeing* with Proteſtants in their particular doctrines: and you cannot deny but that England in thoſe daies agreed with *Rome*, and other Nations with England: And therefore either Chriſt had no viſible Church upon Earth, or elſe you muſt grant that it was the Church of *Rome*. A truth ſo manifeſt, that thoſe Proteſtants who affirme the Roman Church to have loſt the nature and being of a true Church, doe by inevitable conſequence grant, that for divers ages Chriſt had no viſible Church on earth: from which error, becauſe *D. Potter* diſclaimeth, he muſt of neceſſity maintaine, that the *Roman* Church is free from fundamentall, and damnable error, and that *ſhe is not cut off from the Body of Chriſt, and the Hope of Salvation: And if* (ſaith he) *any Zelots amongſt us haue proceeded* (h) *to heavier cenſures, their zeale may be excuſed, but their Charity and wiſdome cannot be juſtified.*

g *Pag. 76.*

h *Ibid.*

48 And to touch particulars which perhaps ſome may object. No man is ignorant that the Grecians, even the Schiſmaticall Grecians, doe in moſt points agree with *Roman* Catholiques, and diſagree from the Proteſtant Reformation. They teach Tranſubſtantiation (which point *D. Potter* alſo (i) confeſſeth;) Invocation of Saints and Angels; veneration of Reliques, and Images; Auricular Confeſſion; enjoyned Satisfaction; Confirmation with Chriſme; Extream unction; All the ſeaven Sacraments; Prayer, Sacrifice, Almes for the dead; Monachiſme; That Prieſts may not marry after their Ordination. In which points that the Grecians agree with the Roman Church appeareth by a Treatiſe publiſhed by the Proteſtant Divines of Wittemberg, intituled, *Acta Theologorum Wittembergenſium, & Ieremiæ Patriarchæ Conſtantinop. de Auguſtana confeſſione &c. Wittembergæ anno* 1584. by the Proteſtant (k) *Criſpinus*, and by *Sir Edwin Sands* in the Relation of the State of Religion of the Weſt. And I wonder with what colour of truth (to ſay no worſe) *D. Potter* could affirme that the Doctrines *debated between the Proteſtants* (l) *and Rome, are only the partiall and particular fancies of the Roman Church; unleſſe happily the opinion of Tranſubſtantiation may be excepted, wherein the latter Grecians ſeem to agree with the Romaniſts*. Beſide the Proteſtant Authors already cited, *Petrus Arcudius* a Grecian, and a learned Catholique Writer, hath publiſhed a large Volume, the Argument and Title whereof is: *Of the agreement of the Roman, and Greek Church in the ſeven Sacraments*. As for the Hereſy of the Grecians, that the Holy Ghoſt proceeds not from the Sonne, I ſuppoſe that Proteſtants diſavow them in that error, as we doe.

i *Pag. 225.*

k *De ſtatu Eccleſ. Pag. 253.*

l *Pag. 225.*

49 *D. Potter* will not (I think) ſo much wrong his reputation, as to tell us, that the *Waldenſes, Wiccliffe, Huſſe*, or the like were Proteſtants, becauſe in ſome things they diſagreed from Catholiques. For he well knowes that the example of ſuch men is ſubject to theſe manifeſt exceptions, They were not of all Ages, nor in all Countries, but confined to certain places, and were interrupted in Time, againſt the notion and nature of the word *Catholique*. They had no Eccleſiaſticall Hierarchy, nor Succeſſion of Biſhops, Prieſts, and Paſtors. They differed among themſelues, and from Proteſtants alſo. They agreed in divers things with us againſt Proteſtants. They held doctrines manifeſtly abſurd and damnable hereſies.

50 The *Waldenſes* began not before the year 1218, ſo farre were they from Vniverſality of all Ages. For their doctrine: firſt, they denied all Iudgements which extended to the drawing of bloud, and the Sabbath, for which cauſe they were called In-ſabbatiſts. Secondly, they taught that Lay men, and women might conſecrate the Sacrament, and preach (no doubt but by this meanes to make their Maſter, *Waldo*, a meere lay man, capable of ſuch functions.) Thirdly, that Clergy men ought to have no poſſeſſions, or proprieties. Fourthly, that there ſhould be no diviſion of Pariſhes, nor Churches, for a walled Church they reputed as a barne. Fiftly, that men ought not to take an oath in any caſe. Sixtly, that thoſe perſons ſinned mortally, who accompanied without hope of iſſue. Seaventhly, they held all things done above the girdle, by kiſſing, touching, words, compreſſion of the breaſts, &c. to be done in Charity, and not againſt Continency. Eighthly, that neither Prieſt, nor civill Magiſtrate, being guilty of mortall ſinne did enjoy their dignity, or were to be obeyed. Ninthly, they condemned Princes, and Iudges. Tenthly, they affirmed ſinging in the Church to be an helliſh clamor. Eleaventhly, they taught that men might diſſemble their Religion, & ſo accordingly they went to Catholique Churches, diſſembling their faith, and made Offertories, confeſſions, and communions after a diſſembling manner. *Waldo* was ſo *unlearned*, that (ſaith (m) *Fox*) he gave rewards to certain learned men to tranſlate the holy Scripture for him, and being thus holpen did (as the ſame *Fox* there reporteth) *confer*

m *Act. Mon. Pag. 628.*

the

the forme of religion in his time, to the infallible word of God. A goodly example, for ſuch as muſt needs have the Scripture in Engliſh, to be read by every ſimple body, with ſuch fruit of Godly doctrine, as we have ſeen in the foreſaid groſſe hereſies of *Waldo*. The followers of *Waldo*, were like their Maſter, ſo unlearned, that *ſome of them* (ſaith (n) *Fox*) *expounded the words*, Ioan. 1. *Sui eum non receperunt: Swine did not receive him.* And to conclude, they agreed in divers things with Catholiques againſt Proteſtants, as may be ſeen in (o) *Brerely*. n *Ibid.*

51 Neither can it be pretended, that theſe are ſlanders, forged by Catholiques. For, for beſides that the ſame things are teſtified by Proteſtant writers, as *Illyricus*, *Cowper*, and others, our Authors cannot be ſuſpected of partiality in disfavour of Proteſtants, unleſſe you will ſay perhaps, that they were Prophets, and ſome hundred yeares agoe, did both foreſee that there were to bee Proteſtants in the world, and that ſuch Proteſtants were to be like the *Waldenſes*. Beſides, from whence, but from our Hiſtories are Proteſtants come to know, that there were any ſuch men as the *Waldenſes*? and that in ſome points they agreed with the Proteſtants, & diſagreed from them in others? And upon what ground can they believe our Authors for that part wherein the *Waldenſes* were like to Proteſtants, and imagine they lyed in the reſt? o *Tract. 2. cap. 2. ſect. ſubd. 3.*

52 Neither could *Wiccliffe* continue a Church never interrupted from the time of the *Waldenſes*, after whom he lived more then one hundred and fifty yeares; to wit, the yeare 1371. Hee agreed with Catholiques about the worſhipping of Reliques and Images: and about the Interceſſion of our bleſſed Lady, the ever Immaculate Mother of God, he went ſo far as to ſay, *It ſeemes to me* (p) *impoſſible, that we ſhould be rewarded without the interceſſion of the Virgin Mary*. He held ſeaven Sacraments, Purgatory, and other points. And againſt both Catholiques and Proteſtants he maintained ſundry damnable doctrines, as divers Proteſtant Writers relate. As firſt: If a Biſhop or Prieſt be in deadly ſinne, he doth not indeed either giue Orders, Conſecrate, or Baptize. Secondly, That Eccleſiaſticall Miniſters ought not to haue any temporall poſſeſſions, nor propriety in any thing, but ſhould beg; and yet he himſelfe brake into hereſie becauſe he had been deprived by the Archbiſhop of Canterbury of a certain Benefice; as all Schiſmes, and hereſies beginne upon paſſion, which they ſeek to cover with the cloak of Reformation. Thirdly he condemned lawfull Oathes, like the Anabaptiſts. Fourthly, he taught that all things came to paſſe by abſolute neceſſity. Fiftly, he defended human merits as the wicked *Pelagians* did, namely, as proceeding from naturall forces, without the neceſſary help of God's grace. Sixtly, that no man is a Civill Magiſtrate, while he is in mortall ſinne; and that the people may at their pleaſure correct Princes, when they offend: by which doctrine he proues himſelfe both an Heretique, and a Traytour. p *In ſerm. de Aſſump. Mariæ.*

53 As for *Huſſe*, his chiefeſt Doctrines were: That Lay people muſt receiue in *both kindes* and, That Civill Lords, Prelates and Biſhops looſe all right, and authority, while they are in mortall ſinne. For other things he wholy agreed with Catholiques againſt Proteſtants; and the *Bohemians* his followers being demanded, in what points they diſagreed from the Church of *Rome*, propounded only theſe: *The neceſſity of Communion under both kinds*; That *all Civill Dominion was forbidden to the Clergy*; That *Preaching of the word, was free for all men*, and in all *places*; That *open Crimes were in no wiſe to be permitted for avoiding of greater evill.* By theſe particulars, it is apparant, that *Huſſe* agreed with Proteſtants againſt us, in one only point of *both kindes*, which according to *Luther* is a thing indifferent; becauſe he teacheth that *Chriſt in this matter* (q) *commanded nothing as neceſſary*. And he ſaith further: *If thou come to a place* (r) *where one only kinde is adminiſtred, uſe one kinde only, as others doe.* *Melanthon* likewiſe holds it a thing (s) indifferent: and the ſame is the opinion of ſome other Proteſtants. All which conſidered, it is cleer that Proteſtants cannot challenge the *Waldenſes*, *Wickliffe*, and *Huſſe* for members of their Church: and although they could, yet that would advantage them little towards the finding out a perpetuall viſible Church of theirs, for the reaſons aboue (t) ſpecified. q *In epiſt. ad Bohemos.* r *De utraq; ſpecie Sacram,* s *In Cent. epiſt. Theol. Pag. 225.* t *Numb. 49.*

54 If D *Potter* would goe ſo farre off, as to fetch the *Muſcovites*, *Armenians*, *Georgians*, *Æthiopians*, or *Abiſſines* into his Church, they would proue over deare bought: For they either hold the damnable hereſy of *Eutiches*, or uſe Circumciſion, or agree with the *Greek*, or *Roman* Church. And it is moſt certaine that they have nothing to doe with the doctrine of the Proteſtants.

55 It being therefore granted that Chriſt had a viſible Church in all ages, and that there can be none aſſigned but the Church of *Rome*; it followes that ſhe is the true Cath. Church; and that thoſe pretended Corruptions for which they forſook her, are indeed divine truths, delivered by the viſible Catholique Church of Chriſt: And, that *Luther* and his followers departed from her, and conſequently are guilty of *Schiſme*, by dividing themſelves from the *Communion of the Roman Church*. Which is cleerly convinced out of D. *Potter* himſelf, although the *Roman* Church were but a particular Church. For he ſaith: *Whoſoever profeſſes* (u) *himſelf to forſake the Communion of any one member of the body of Chriſt, muſt confeſſe himſelf conſequently to forſake the whole.* Since therefore in the ſame place he expreſſely acknowledges the *Church of Rome to be a member of the body of Chriſt*, and that it is cleere they have forſaken her; it evidently followes, that they haue forſaken the *whole*, and therefore are moſt properly *Schiſmatiques*. u *Pag. 76.*

56 And laſtly, ſince the crime of *Schiſme* is ſo grievous, that according to the doctrine of holy Fathers rehearſed aboue, no multitude of good works, no morall honeſty of life, no cruel death endured even for the profeſſion of ſome Article of faith can excuſe any one who is guilty of that ſinne from damnation, I leaue it to be conſidered, whether it be not true Charity to ſpeak as wee believe, and to believe as all Antiquity hath taught us, That whoſoever either *beginnes*, or *continues*

nues a diviſion for the *Roman Church*, which we haue proued to be Chriſts true *Militant* Church on earth, cannot without effectuall repentance hope to be a member of his Triumphant Church in heaven. And ſo I conclude with theſe words of bleſſed *S. Auguſtine*: *It is common* (w) *to all Heretiques to be unable to ſee that thing which in the world is the moſt manifeſt, and placed in the light of all Nations, out of whoſe Vnity whatſoeuer they work, though they ſeem to doe it with great care and diligence, can no more auaile them againſt the wrath of God, then the Spiders web againſt the extremity of cold.* But now it is high time that we treat of the other ſort of *Diviſion* from the Church, which is by *Hereſie*.

w *Cont. Parm. lib. 2. c. 3.*

THE ANSVVER TO THE FIFTH CHAPTER.

The ſeparation of Proteſtants from the Roman Church, being upon iuſt and neceſſary cauſes, is not any way guilty of Schiſme.

1 AND § 1.2.3.4.5.6.7. In the ſeaven firſt Sections of this Chapter, there be many things ſaid and many things ſuppoſed by you which are untrue, & deſerue a cenſure. As,

2 Firſt, *That Schiſme could not be a Diviſion from the Church, or that a Diviſion from the Church could not happen, unleſſe there alwaies had been and ſhould be a viſible Church.* Which Aſſertion is a manifeſt falſhood; For although there never had been any Church Viſible or Inviſible before this age, nor ſhould be ever after, yet this could not hinder, but that a Schiſme might now be, and be a Diviſion from the preſent viſible Church. As though in *France* there never had been untill now a lawfull Monarch, nor after him ever ſhould be, yet this hinders not, but that now there might be a Rebellion, and that Rebellion might be an Inſurrection againſt Soueraigne authority.

3 *That it is a point to be granted by all Chriſtians, that in all ages there hath been a viſible Congregation of faithfull people.* Which Propoſition howſoever you underſtand it, is not abſolutely certain. But if you mean by *Faithfull*, (as it is plain you doe) *free from all errour in faith*, then you know all Proteſtants with one conſent affirm it to bee falſe; and therefore without proof to take it for granted is to beg the Queſtion.

4 *That ſuppoſing Luther and they which did firſt ſeparate from the Roman Church were guilty of Schiſme, it is certainly conſequent, that all who perſiſt in this diviſion muſt be ſo likewiſe.* Which is not ſo certaine as you pretend. For they which alter without neceſſary cauſe the preſent government of any ſtate Civill or Eccleſiaſticall, doe commit a great fault; whereof notwithanding they may be innocent who continue this alteration, and to the utmoſt of their power oppoſe a change though to the former ſtate, when continuance of time hath once ſetled the preſent. Thus haue I known ſome of your own Church, condemn the Low-countrey men who firſt revolted from the King of Spain, of the ſin of Rebellion, yet abſolve them from it who now being of your Religion there, are yet faithfull maintainers of the common liberty againſt the pretences of the K. of *Spaine*.

5 *That*

5 Fourthly, *That all thoſe which a Chriſtian is to eſteeme neighbours doe concurre to make one company, which is the Church.* Which is falſe: for a Chriſtian is to eſteeme thoſe his neighbours, who are not members of the true Church.

6 Fiftly, *That all the members of the Viſible Church, are by charity united into one Myſticall body.* Which is manifeſtly untrue; for many of them have no Charity.

7 Sixtly, *That the Catholique Church, ſignifies one company of faithfull people,* which is repugnant to your own grounds. For you require, not true faith, but only the Profeſſion of it, to make men members of the viſible Church.

8 Seaventhly, *That every Heretique is a Schiſmatique.* Which you muſt acknowledge falſe in thoſe, who though they deny, or doubt of ſome point profeſſed by your Church, and ſo are Heretiques; yet continue ſtill in the Communion of the Church.

9 Eightly, *That all the members of the Catholique Church, muſt of neceſſity be united in externall Communion.* Which though it were much to be deſired it were ſo, yet certainly cannot be perpetually true. For a man unjuſtly excommunicated, is not in the Churches Communion, yet he is ſtill a member of the Church: and divers times it hath happened, as in the caſe of *Chriſoſtome* and *Epiphanius*, that particular men, and particular Churches, have upon an overvalued difference, either renounced Communion mutually, or one of them ſeparated from the other, and yet both have continued members of the Catholique Church. Theſe things are in thoſe *ſeven Sections*, either ſaid or ſuppoſed by you untruly, without all ſhewe, or pretence of proofe. The reſt is an impertinent common place, wherein Proteſtants and the cauſe in hand, are abſolutely unconcern'd. And therefore I paſſe to the *eighth Section.*

10 *Ad* §. 8. Wherein you obtrude upon us, a double Fallacie; One, in ſuppoſing and taking for granted, that whatſoever is affirmed by *three Fathers*, muſt be true; whereas your ſelves make no ſcruple of condemning many things of falſehood, which yet are maintained, by more then thrice three Fathers. Another, in pretending their words to be ſpoken abſolutely, which by them are limited and reſtrained to ſome particular caſes. For whereas you ſay S. *Auſtine* c. 62. l. 2. *cont. Parm.* infers out of the former premiſes, *That there is no neceſſity to divide Vnity*: to let paſſe your want of diligence, in quoting the 62. chapter of that Booke, which hath but 23. in it: to paſſe by alſo, that theſe words which are indeed in the 11. Chapt. are not inferred out of any ſuch premiſes as you pretend, this I ſay is evident, that he laies not abſolutely, that there never is, or can be any neceſſity to divide Vnity (which only were for your purpoſe,) but only in ſuch a ſpeciall caſe, as he there ſets down: That is, *When good men tolerate bad men, which can doe thē no ſpirituall hurt, to the intent they may not be ſeperated from thoſe, who are ſpiritually good: Then* (ſaith he) *there is no neceſſity to divide Vnity.* Which very words doe cleerely give us to underſtand, that it may fall out (as it doth in our caſe,) that we cannot keep

Vnity

Vnity with bad men, without ſpirituall hurt, *i. e.* without partaking with them in their impieties, and that then there is a neceſſity to divide Vnity from them: I mean, to break off conjunction with them in their impieties. Which that it was *S. Auſtines* mind, it is moſt evident out of the 21. c. of the ſame book: where to *Parmenian* demanding, *how can a man remain pure, being joyned with thoſe that are corrupted?* He anſwers, *Very true, this is not poſsible, if he be ioyned with them, that is, if he commit any evill with them, or favour them which doe commit it. But if he doe neither of theſe, he is not ioyned with them.* And preſently after, *theſe two things retained, will keep ſuch men pure and uncorrupted; that is, neither doing ill, nor approving it.* And therefore ſeeing you impoſe upon all men of your Communion, a neceſſity of *doing* or at leaſt *approving* many things unlawfull, certainly there lies upon us an unavoidable neceſsity of dividing unity, either with you, or with God; and whether of theſe is rather to be done, be ye judges.

11 *Irenæus* alſo ſaies not ſimply (which only would doe you ſervice,) there cannot poſsibly be any ſo important Reformation, as to juſtify a ſeparation from them who will not reforme: But only, *they cannot make any corruption ſo great, as is the pernitiouſneſſe of a Schiſme*: Now, *They*, here, is a relative, and hath an antecedent expreſſed in *Irenæus*, which if you had been pleaſed to take notice of, you would eaſily have ſeene, that what *Irenæus* ſaies, falls heavy upon the Church of Rome, but toucheth Proteſtants nothing at all. For the men he ſpeaks of, are ſuch as *Propter modicas & quaſlibet cauſas, for trifling or ſmall cauſes, divide the body of Chriſt; ſuch as ſpeak of peace and make warre; ſuch as ſtraine at gnatts, & ſwallow Camels. And theſe* ſaith he, *can make no reformation of any ſuch importance, as to counterpaile the danger of a diviſion.* Now ſeeing the cauſes of our ſeparation from the Church of Rome, are (as we pretend, and are ready to juſtify,) becauſe we will not be partakers with her in Superſtition, Idolatry, Impiety, and moſt cruell Tyranny, both upon the bodies and ſoules of men. Who can ſay, that the cauſes of our ſeparation, may be juſtly eſteemed *Modicæ & qualibet cauſæ*? On the other ſide, ſeeing the Biſhop of Rome, who was contemporary to *Irenæus*, did as much (as in him lay) cut off from the Churches unity, many great Churches, for not conforming to him in an indifferent matter, upon a difference, *Non de Catholico dogmate, ſed de Ritu, vel Ritus potiùs tempore, not about any Catholique doctrine, but only a Ceremony, or rather about the time of obſerving it*; ſo *Petavius* values it: which was juſt all one, as if the Church of France ſhould excommunicate thoſe of their own Religion in England, for not keeping Chriſtmas upon the ſame day with them: And ſeeing he was reprehended ſharpely and bitterly for it, by moſt of the Biſhops of the world, as *Euſebius* teſtifies, and (as Cardinall *Perron* though mincing the matter, yet confeſſeth) by this very *Ierenæus* himſelfe in particular admoniſhed, that for ſo ſmall a cauſe (*propter tam modicam cauſam,*) he ſhould not have cut off ſo many Provinces from the body of the Church: and laſtly, ſeeing the Eccleſiaſticall ſtory of thoſe times, mentions no other notable exam-

Euſeb. hiſt. l. 5. c. 24.
Perron. Replic. 3. l. 2. c.

ple

ple of any ſuch Schiſmaticall preſumption, but this of *Victor*: certainly we have great inducement to imagine, that *Irenæus* in this place by you quoted, had a ſpeciall aime at the Biſhop and Church of Rome. Once, this I am ſure of, that the place fits him, and many of his ſucceſſors, as well as if it had been made purpoſely for them. And this alſo, that he which finds fault with them *who ſeparate upon ſmall cauſes*, implies cleerely, that he conceived, there might be ſuch cauſes as were great and ſufficient: And that then a Reformation was to be made, notwithſtanding any danger of diviſion that might inſue upon it.

12 Laſtly, S. *Denis* of *Alexandria*, ſaies indeed and very well, *that all things ſhould be rather indured, then we ſhould conſent to the diviſion of the Church*: I would adde, Rather then conſent to the continuation of the diviſion, if it might be remedied. But then, I am to tell you, that he ſaies not All things ſhould rather *be done*, but only, All things ſhould rather *be indured or ſuffered*: wherein he ſpeaks not of the evill of ſinne, but of Pain and Miſery: Not of tolerating either Error or Sinne in others (though that may be lawfull,) much leſſe of joyning with others for quietneſſe ſake, (which only were to your purpoſe) in the profeſſion of Errour and practiſe of ſinne: but of ſuffering any affliction, nay even martyrdome in our own perſons, rather then conſent to the diviſion of the Church. *Omnia incommoda*, ſo your own *Chriſtophorſon*, enforced by the circumſtances of the place, tranſlates *Dionyſius* his words, All *miſeries ſhould rather be endured, then we ſhould conſent to the Churches diviſion.*

13 *Ad* §. 9. In the next Paragraph you affirme two things, but prove neither, unleſſe a vehement Aſſeveration, may paſſe for a weake proofe. You tell us firſt, *that the Doctrine of the totall deficiency of the viſible Church, which is maintained by divers chiefe Proteſtants, implies in it vaſt abſurdity, or rather ſacrilegious Blaſphemy.* But neither doe the Proteſtants alleaged by you, maintain the deficiency of the Viſible Church, but only of the Churches viſibility, or of the Church as it is Viſible, which ſo acute a man as you, now that you are minded of it, I hope will eaſily diſtinguiſh: Neither doe they hold, that the viſible Church hath failed totally and from its eſſence, but only from its purity: and that it fell into many corruptions, but yet not to nothing. And yet if they had held, that there was not only no pure viſible Church, but none at all: ſurely they had ſaid more then they could juſtify, but yet you doe not ſhew, neither can I diſcover any ſuch *Vaſt abſurdity or Sacrilegious Blaſphemy* in this Aſſertion. You ſay ſecondly, that the *Reaſon which caſt them upon this wicked Doctrine, was a deſperate voluntary neceſſity, becauſe they were reſolved not to acknowledge the Roman to be the true Church, and were convinced by all manner of evidence, that for diverſe ages before Luther there was no other.* But this is not to diſpute but to divine, and take upon you the property of God which is to know the hearts of men. For why I pray, might not the Reaſon hereof rather be, becauſe they were convinced by all manner of evidence, as Scripture, Reaſon, Antiquity, that all the viſible Churches in the world, but aboue all the Roman, had degenerated

from the purity of the Goſpell of Chriſt, and thereupon did conclude there was no viſible Church, meaning by *no Church, none free from corruption*, and conformable in all things to the doctrine of Chriſt.

14 *Ad* §. 10. Neither is there any repugnance (but in words only) between theſe (as you are pleaſed to ſtile them) *exterminating Spirits*, and thoſe other, (whom out of Curteſy you intitle, in your 10. §. *more moderate Proteſtants*. For theſe affirming the Perpetuall Viſibility of the Church, yet neither deny, nor doubt of her being ſubject to manifold and grievous corruptions, and thoſe of ſuch a nature, as were they not mitigated by invincible, or at leaſt a very probable ignorance, none ſubject to them could be ſaved. And they on the other ſide, denying the Churches Viſibility, yet plainly affirme, that they conceive very good hope of the Salvation of many, of their ignorant and honeſt Fore-fathers. Thus declaring plainly, though in words they denyed the Viſibility of the true Church, yet their meaning was not to deny the perpetuity, but the perpetuall purity and incorruption of the Viſible Church.

15 *Ad* §. 11. Let us proceed therefore to your 11. Sect. where though *D. Potter* and other Proteſtants granting the Churches perpetuall Viſibility, make it needleſſe for you to prove it, yet you will needs be doing that which is needleſſe. But you doe it ſo coldly and negligently, that it is very happy for you, that *D. Potter* did grant it.

16 For *what if the Prophets ſpake more obſcurely of Chriſt, then of the Church? What if they had foreſeen, that greater contentions would ariſe about the Church then Chriſt?* Which yet, he that is not a meere ſtranger in the ſtory of the Church, muſt needs know to be untrue, and therefore not to be fore-ſeene by the Prophets. What *if we have manifeſtly received the Church from the Scriptures?* Does it follow from any, or all theſe things, that the Church of Chriſt muſt be alwaies Viſible?

17 Beſides, what Proteſtant ever granted (that which you preſume upon ſo confidently,) that *every man for all the affaires of his ſoule muſt have recourſe to ſome congregation?* If ſome one Chriſtian lived alone among Pagans in ſome country, remote from Chriſtendome, ſhall we conceive it impoſsible for this man to be ſaved, becauſe he cannot have recourſe to any congregation, for the affaires of his ſoule? Will it not be ſufficient, for ſuch a ones Salvation, to know the doctrine of Chriſt, and live according to it? Such fancies as theſe, you doe very wiſely to take for granted, becauſe you know well, tis hard to prove them.

18 Let it *be as unlawfull as you pleaſe, to deny and diſſemble matters of faith. Let them that doe ſo, not be a Church, but a damned Crew of Sycophants*: What is this to the Viſibility of the Church? May not the Church be Inviſible, and yet theſe that are of it profeſſe their faith? No, ſay you: Their profeſsion will make them viſible. Very true, viſible in the places where, and in the times when they live, and to thoſe perſons, unto whom they have neceſſary occaſion, to make their profeſsion: But not viſible to all, or any great, or conſiderable part of the world

world while they live, much leſſe conſpicuous to all Ages after them. Now it is a Church thus illuſtriouſly and conſpicuouſly viſible that you require: by whoſe ſplendour, all men may be directed & drawn to repaire to her, for the affaires of their ſoules: Neither is it the Viſibility of the Church abſolutely, but this degree of it, which the moſt rigid Proteſtants deny: which is plaine enough out of the places of *Napper*, cited by you in your 9. Part. of this chapt. Where his words are, *God hath withdrawne his viſible Church from open Aſſemblies, to the hearts of particular godly men.* And this Church which had not open Aſſemblies, he calls *The latent and Inviſible Church.* Now I hope Papiſts in England will be very apt to grant, men may be ſo farre Latent and Inviſible, as not to profeſſe their faith in open Aſſemblies, nor to proclaime it to all the world, & yet not deny, nor diſſemble it; nor deſerve to be eſteemed a *damned crew of diſſembling Sycophants.*

19 But *preaching of the word, and adminiſtration of the Sacraments, cannot but make a Church viſible: and theſe are inſeparable notes of the Church.* I anſwer, they are ſo far inſeparable, that whereſoever they are, there a Church is: But not ſo, but that in ſome caſes there may bee a Church, where theſe notes are not. Againe, theſe notes will make the Church viſible: But to whom? certainly not to all men, nor to moſt mē: But to them only to whom the word is preached, and the Sacraments are adminiſtred. They make the Church viſible to whom themſelves are viſible, but not to others. As where your Sacraments are adminiſtred, and your doctrine preached, it is viſible, that there is a Popiſh Church. But this may perhaps be viſible to them only, who are preſent at theſe performances, and to others as ſecret, as if they had never beene performed.

20 But *S. Auſtine ſaith, it is an impudent, abominable, deteſtable ſpeech, and ſo forth, to ſay the Church hath periſhed.* I anſwer; 1. All that *S. Auſtine* ſayes, is not true. 2. Though this were true, it were nothing to your purpoſe, unleſſe you will conceive it all one not to be, & not to be conſpicuouſly viſible. 3. This very ſpeech that the Church periſhed, might be falſe and impudent in the *Donatiſts*, and yet not ſo in the Proteſtants. For there is no incongruity, that what hath lived 500. yeares, may periſh in 1600. But *S. Auſtin denyed not only the Actuall periſhing*, but *the poſſibility of it: and not only of it's falling* to nothing, *but of it's falling into corruption.* I anſwer: though no ſuch thing appeares out of thoſe places, yet I believe heate of diſputation againſt the *Donatiſts*, and a deſire to over-confute them, tranſported him ſo farre, as to urge againſt them more then was neceſſary, and perhaps more then was true. But were he now revived, & did but confront the doctrine of after-ages, with that, his owne experience would enforce him to change his opinion. As concerning the laſt ſpeech of *S. Auſtine*, I cannot but wonder very much, why he ſhould thinke it abſurd for any man to ſay, *There are ſheepe which he knowes not, but God knowes*: and no leſſe at you, for obtruding this ſentence upon us as pertinent proofe of the Churches viſibility.

21 Neither doe I ſee, *how the Truth of any preſent Church depends*

upon the Perpetuall Viſibility, nay nor upō the perpetuity of that which is paſt or future. For what ſenſe is there, that it ſhould not be in the power of God Almighty, to reſtore to a flouriſhing eſtate, a Church which oppreſſion hath made Inviſible? to repaire that which is ruined; to reforme that which was corrupted, or to reviue that which was dead? Nay what Reaſon is there, but that by ordinary meanes this may be done, ſo long as the Scriptures by Divine Providence are preſerved in their integrity and Authority? As a Common-wealth though never ſo farre collapſed and overrunne with diſorders, is yet in poſſibility of being reduc'd unto its Originall ſtate, ſo long as the Ancient Lawes, and Fundamentall Conſtitutions are extant, and remain inviolate, from whence men may be directed how to make ſuch a Reformation. *But S. Auſtine urges this very Argument againſt the Donatiſts, and therefore it is good.* I anſwer, that I doubt much of the Conſequence, and my Reaſon is, becauſe you your ſelves acknowledge, that even generall Councels (and therefore much more particular Doctors) though infallible in their determinations, are yet in their Reaſons and Arguments, where upon they ground them, ſubject to like Paſſions and Errours with other men.

22 Laſtly, whereas you ſay, *That all Divines define Schiſme a Diviſion from the true Church*, and from thence collect, That *there muſt be a known Church from which it is poſſible for men to depart*: I might very juſtly queſtion your Antecedent, and deſire you to conſider, whether Schiſme be not rather, or at leaſt be not as well a diviſion of the Church, as from it? A ſeparation not of a part from the whole, but of ſome parts from the other. And if you liked not this definition, I might deſire you to inform me in thoſe many Schiſmes, which haue hapned in the Church of Rome, which of the parts was the Church, & which was divided from it. But to let this paſſe, certainly your conſequence is moſt unreaſonable. For though whenſoever there is a Schiſme, it muſt neceſſarily ſuppoſe a Church exiſtent there, yet ſure wee may define a Schiſme, that is, declare what the word ſignifies (for Defining is no more) though at this preſēt there were neither Schiſme nor Church in the world. Vnleſſe you will ſay, that we cannot tell what a Roſe is, or what the word Roſe ſignifies, but only in the Summer when wee haue Roſes: or that in the world to come, when men ſhall not marry, it is impoſſible to know, what it is to marry: or that the Plague is not a diſeaſe, but only when ſome body is infected: or that Adultery is not a ſin, unleſſe there be Adulterers: or that before *Adam* had a Child, hee knew not, & God could not haue told him, what it was to be a Father. Certainly S^r, you haue forgot your Metaphyſicks, which you ſo much glory in, if you know not, that the connexions of eſſentiall predicates with their ſubjects, are eternall, & depend not at all upō the actuall exiſtence of the thing defined. This Definition therefore of Schiſme, concludes not the exiſtence of a Church, even when it is defined: much leſſe the perpetuall continuance of it, and leaſt of all the continuance of it in perpetuall viſibility and purity, which is the only thing that we deny, & you are to proue. By this time, you perceive I hope, that I had reaſon

to

to ſay, that it was well for you, that D. *Potter* granted the Churches Perpetuall Viſibility: for, for ought I can perceive, this Conceſſion of his, is the beſt ſtake in your hedge, the beſt piller upon which this Concluſion ſtands; which yet is the only ground-work of your whole Accuſation.

23 *Ad* § 12. 47. 48. 49. 50. 51. 52. 53. 54. 55. The remainder of this Chapter, to convince *Luther* and all that follow him to be Schiſmatiques, affords us Arguments of two ſorts: The firſt drawn from the nature of the thing: the ſecond from D. *Potters* words & acknowledgments. So that the former if they be good, muſt bee good againſt all Proteſtants: the latter only againſt D. *Potter*. I will examine them all, & doubt not to make it appeare even to your ſelfe, if you haue any indifference, that there is not any ſound & concluding reaſon amongſt them, but that they are all poore and miſerable Sophiſmes.

24 Firſt then to proue us Schiſmatiques, you urge from the nature of Schiſme this only Argument.

Whoſoever leaue the externall Communion of the viſible Church, are Schiſmatiques: But Luther and his followers left the externall Communion of the viſible Church of Chriſt: Therefore they are Schiſmatiques.

The Major of this Syllogiſme you leaue naked without proofe; and conceiue it, as it ſhould ſeem, able enough to ſhift for it ſelfe. The Minor or ſecond Propoſition of this Argument, you prove by two other. The firſt is this.

They which forſook the externall Communion of all viſible Churches, muſt needs forſake the externall Communion of the true viſible Church of Chriſt: But Luther and his followers forſook the externall Communion of all viſible Churches: Therefore they forſook the externall Communion of the true viſible Church.

The *Major* of this Syllogiſme you take for granted (as you haue reaſon:) The *Minor* you proſecute with great pomp of words, & proue with plenty of Reaſons, built upon the Confeſſions of D. *Potter*, *Luther*, *Calvin*, and other Proteſtants; and this you doe in the 12 § of this Chapter.

The ſecond Argument to prove the Aſſumption of your firſt Syllogiſme, ſtands thus.

The Roman Church, when Luther and his followers made the ſeparation, was the true viſible Church of Chriſt: But Luther and his followers forſook the externall Communion of the Roman Church: Therefore they forſook the externall Communion of the true viſible Church of Chriſt.

The Aſſumption of this Syllogiſme needs no proof: The Propoſition which needs it very much, you endeavour to confirme by theſe Reaſons.

1 *The Roman Church had the notes of the Church aſſigned by Proteſtants, 1. The true preaching of the Word, and due adminiſtration of the Sacraments: Therefore ſhe was the true Church.*

The Antecedent is proved: *Becauſe D. Potter confeſſes, ſhee wanted no-*

thing Fundamentall or neceſſary to ſalvation: Therefore for the Subſtance of the matter ſhe had theſe notes.

2 *Either the Roman Church was the true viſible Church, or Proteſtants can name and proue ſome other diſagreeing from the Roman, and agreeing with Proteſtants, in their particular Doctrine: or elſe they muſt ſay, there was no viſible Church: But they will not ſay there was no Church: They cannot name and proue any other diſagreeing from the Roman, and agreeing with Proteſtants in their particular Doctrines; becauſe this cannot be the Greek Church, nor that of the Waldenſes, Wicklifites, Huſsites, nor that of the Muſcovites, Armenians, Georgians, Æthiopians, which you confirme by ſeverall Arguments: Therefore they muſt grant, that the Roman Church was the true viſible Church.*

And this is the buſineſſe of your 47.48.49.50.51,52.53.54. and 55. Sections of this Chapter.

25 Now to all this, I anſwer very briefly thus: That you have played the unwiſe builder, and erected a ſtately ſtructure upon a falſe foundation. For whereas you take for granted as an undoubted Truth, *That whoſoever leave the externall communion of the viſible Church, are Schiſmaticall*, I tell you Sir, you preſume too much upon us, and would have us grant, that which is the main point in Queſtion. For either you ſuppoſe the externall Communion of the Church corrupted, and that there was a neceſſity for them, that would communicate with this Church, to communicate in her corruptions: Or you ſuppoſe her Communion uncorrupted. If the former, and yet will take for granted, that all are Schiſmatiques, that leave her Communion though it bee corrupted, you beg the Queſtion in your propoſition. If the latter, you beg the Queſtion in your ſuppoſition, for Proteſtants, you know, are Peremptory and Vnanimous in the Deniall of both theſe things: Both that the Communion of the Viſible Church, was then uncorrupted; And that they are truly Schiſmatiques, who leave the Communion of the Viſible Church, if corrupted; eſpecially, if the caſe be ſo (and *Luthers* was ſo) that they muſt either leave her Communion, or of neceſſiity Communicate with her in her corruptions. You will ſay perhaps, *that you have already proved it impoſsible, that the Church, or her Communion ſhould be corrupted.* And therefore that they are Schiſmatiques, who leave the externall Communion of the Viſible Church, becauſe ſhe cannot be corrupted. And that *hereafter you will prove, that corruptions in the Churches communion, though the belief and profeſsion of them be made the condition of her communion, cannot juſtify a ſeparation from it:* And therefore that they are Schiſmatiques, who leave the Churches communion though corrupted. I Anſwer, that I have examined your proofes of the former, & found that a veine of Sophiſtry runs cleane through them: And for the latter, it is ſo plain and palpable a falſehood, that I cannot but be confident, whatſoever you bring in proofe of it, will like the Apples of Sodom, fall to Aſhes upon the firſt touch. And this is my firſt and main exception againſt your former diſcourſe; that accuſing Proteſtants

ſtants of a very great and horrible crime, you have proved your accuſation only with a fallacy.

26 Another is, that although it were granted Schiſme, to leave the externall Communion of the viſible Church in what ſtate or caſe ſo ever it be, and that *Luther* & his followers were Schiſmatiques, for leaving the externall Communion of all viſible Churches: yet you faile exceedingly of cleering the other neceſſary point undertaken by you, *That the Roman Church was then the Viſible Church.* For neither doe *Proteſtants* (as you miſtake) *make the true preaching of the word, and due adminiſtration of the Sacraments, the notes of the viſible Church,* but only of a viſible Church: now theſe you know are very different things, the former ſignifying *the Church Catholique*, or the whole Church: the Latter a *Particular Church*, or a part of the Catholique. And therefore ſuppoſe out of curteſy, we ſhould grant, what by argument you can never evince, that your Church had theſe notes, yet would it by no meanes follow, that your Church were *the Viſible Church*, but only *a Viſible Church*: not the whole Catholique, but only a part of it. But then beſides, where doth *D. Potter* acknowledge any ſuch matter as you pretend? Where doth he ſay, that you had for the ſubſtance *the true Preaching of the word*, or *due Adminiſtration of the Sacraments?* Or where does he ſay, that (from which you collect this) *you wanted nothing Fundamentall, or neceſſary to Salvation?* He ſaies indeed, that though your *Errors were in themſelves damnable, and full of great impiety, yet he hopes, that thoſe amongſt you, who were invincibly ignorant of the truth, might by Gods great mercy, have their errors pardoned, and their ſoules ſaved*: And this is all he ſaies, and this you confeſſe to be all he ſaies, in diverſe places of your book: which is no more, then you your ſelfe doe, and muſt affirme of Proteſtants: and yet I believe, you will not ſuffer us to inferre from hence, that you grant Proteſtants to have, for the ſubſtance, the true preaching of the word, and due adminiſtration of the Sacraments, and want nothing fundamentall, or neceſſary to ſalvation. And if we ſhould draw this conſequence from your conceſſion, certainly we ſhould doe you injury, in regard many things may in themſelves, and in ordinary courſe be neceſſary to ſalvation, to thoſe that have meanes to attain them, as your Church generally hath: which yet, by accident, to theſe which were by ſome impregnable impediment, debarred of theſe meanes, may by Gods mercy be made unneceſſary. See c. 1. §. 3.

27 Laſtly, whereas *you ſay, that Proteſtants muſt either grant that your Church then was the viſible Church, or name ſome other, diſagreeing from yours & agreeing with Proteſtants in their particular doctrine, or acknowledge there was no viſible Church.* It is all one as if (to uſe *S. Pauls* ſimilitude) the head ſhould ſay to the foot, either you muſt grant that I am the whole body, or name ſome other member that is ſo, or confeſſe that there is no body. To which the foot might anſwer; I acknowledge there is a body: and yet, that no member beſide you is this body: nor yet that you are it, but only a part of it. And in like manner ſay we. We acknowledge a Church there was, corrupted indeed univerſally,

verſally, but yet ſuch a one as we hope by Gods gratious acceptance, was ſtill a Church. We pretend not to name any one Society that was this Church, and yet we ſee no reaſon, that can inforce us to confeſſe that yours was the Church, but only a part of it, and that one of the worſt then extant in the World. In vain therefore have you troubled your ſelfe in proving, that we *cannot pretend, that either the Greekes, Waldenſes, Wickliffites, Huſſites, Muſcovites, Armenians, Georgians, Abyſſines, were then the Viſible Church.* For all this dicourſe proceeds from a falſe and vain ſuppoſition, and beggs another point in Queſtion between us, which is, that *ſome Church of one denomination and one Communion* (as the Roman, the Greeke &c.) *muſt be alwaies,* excluſively to all other Communions, *the whole viſible Church.* And though perhaps ſome weak Proteſtant having this falſe principle ſetled in him, that there was to be alwaies ſome Viſible Church of one denomination, pure from all error in doctrine, might be wrought upon, and prevailed with by it, to forſake the Church of Proteſtants: yet why it ſhould induce him to goe to yours, rather then the Greeke Church, or any other, which pretends to perpetuall ſucceſſion as well as yours, that I doe not underſtand; Vnleſſe it be for the reaſon which *Æneas Syluius* gave, why more held the Pope above a Councell, then a Councell above the Pope: which was becauſe *Popes did give Biſhopricks, and Archbiſhopricks, but Councells gave none,* and therefore ſuing in *Forma Pauperis*, were not like to have their cauſe very well maintained. For put the caſe, I ſhould grant of meere favour, that there muſt be alwaies ſome Church of one Denomination and Communion, free from all errors in doctrine, and that Proteſtants had not alwaies ſuch a Church: it would follow indeed from thence, that I muſt not be a Proteſtant: But that I muſt be a Papiſt, certainly it would follow by no better conſequence then this; If you will leave England, you muſt of neceſſity goe to Rome. And yet with this wretched fallacy, have I been ſometimes abuſed my ſelfe, and known many other poore ſoules ſeduced, not only from their own Church, and Religion, but unto yours. I beſeech God to open the eyes of all that love the truth, that they may not alwaies be held captive, under ſuch miſerable deluſions.

28 We ſee then, how unſucceſſefull you have been in making good your accuſation, with reaſons drawn from the nature of the thing, and which may be urged in common againſt all Proteſtants. Let us come now to the Arguments of the other kinde, which you build upon *D. Potters* own words, out of which you promiſe unanſwerable reaſons to convince Proteſtants of Schiſme.

29 But let the underſtanding Reader, take with him but three or foure ſhort remembrances, and I dare ſay he ſhall find them upon examination, not only anſwerable, but already anſwered. The memorandums I would commend to him, are theſe.

30 That not every ſeparation, but only a cauſeleſſe ſeparation from the externall Communion of any Church, is the Sinne of Schiſme.

31 That impoſing upon men under pain of Excommunication a neceſſity of profeſſing known errours, and practiſing known corruptions, is a ſufficient and neceſſary cauſe of ſeparation: and that this is the cauſe which Proteſtants alleage to juſtifie their ſeparation from the Church of Rome.

32 That to leave the Church, and to leave the externall Communion of a Church, at leaſt as D. *Potter* underſtands the words, is not the ſame thing: That being done by ceaſing to be a member of it, by ceaſing to haue thoſe requiſites which conſtitute a man a member of it, as faith and obedience: This by refuſing to communicate with any Church in her Liturgies and publike worſhip of God. This little Armour if it be rightly placed, I am perſwaded, will repell all thoſe Batteries which you threaten ſhall be ſo furious.

33 *Ad* § 13.14.15. The firſt is a ſentence of S. *Auſtine* againſt *Donatus*, applied to *Luther* thus. *If the Church periſhed, what Church brought forth Donatus, (you ſay Luther?) If ſhe could not periſh, what madneſſe moved the ſect of Donatus to ſeparate, upon pretence to avoid the Communion of bad men?* Whereunto, one faire anſwer (to let paſſe many others) is obvious out of the ſecond obſervation: That this ſentence though it were Goſpell, as it is not, is impertinently applied to *Luther* and Lutherans. Whoſe pretence of ſeparation (be it true or be it falſe,) was not (as that of the Donatiſts,) only to avoid the Communion of bad men: but to free themſelves from a neceſſity (which but by ſeparating was unavoidable,) of joyning with bad men in their impieties. And your not ſubſtituting *Luther* in ſtead of *Donatus* in the latter part of the Dilemma as well as in the former, would make a ſuſpicious man conjecture that you your ſelfe took notice of this exception of diſparitie between *Donatus* and *Luther*.

34 *Ad* § 16. Your ſecond onſet drives only at thoſe Proteſtants, who *hold the true Church was inviſible for many ages*. Which Doctrine (if by the *true Church* be underſtood, the *pure Church*, as you doe underſtand it) is a certain truth, and it is eaſier for you to declaime (as you doe) then to diſpute againſt it. But *theſe men you ſay muſt bee Heretiques becauſe they ſeparated from the Communion of the viſible Church: and therefore alſo from the Communion of that which they ſay was inviſible: In as much as the inviſible Church communicated with the viſible.*

35 Anſ. I might very juſtly deſire ſome proofe of that which ſo confidently you take for granted: That, there were no perſecuted and oppreſſed maintainers of the Truth in the daies of our Fore-fathers, but only ſuch as diſſembled their opinions, & lived in your Communion. And truly if I ſhould ſay there were many of this condition, I ſuppoſe I could make my Affirmative much more probable, then you can make your Negatiue. We read in Scripture, that *Elias* conceived *There was none left beſides himſelfe in the whole kingdome of Iſraell*, who had not revolted from God: and yet God himſelfe aſſures us that he was deceived. And if ſuch a man, a Prophet, and one of the greateſt, erred in his judgement touching his own time, and his own countrey;

why may not you, who are certainly but a man, and ſubject to the ſame paſſions as *Elias* was, miſtake in thinking, that in former ages, in ſome countrey or other, there were not alwaies ſome good Chriſtians, which did not ſo much as externally bow their knees to your *Baal*? But this anſwer I am content you ſhall take no notice of, and thinke it ſufficient to tell you, that if it bee true, that this ſuppoſed inviſible Church did hypocritically communicate with the viſible Church, in her corruptions, then Proteſtants had cauſe, nay neceſſity, to forſake their Communion alſo, for otherwiſe they muſt haue joyn'd with thē in the practiſe of impieties: and ſeeing they had ſuch cauſe to ſeparate, they preſume their ſeparation cannot be ſchiſmaticall.

36 Yes, you reply, *to forſake the externall Communion of them with whom they agree in faith, is the moſt formall & proper ſin of Schiſme.* Anſ. Very true, but I would fain know *wherein.* I would gladly be informed, whether I bee bound for feare of Schiſme, to communicate with thoſe that believe as I doe, only in lawfull things, or abſolutely in every thing: whether I am to joyn with them in ſuperſtition and Idolatry, and not only in a common profeſſion of the faith wherein we agree, but in a common diſſimulation or abjuration of it. This is that which you would haue them do, or elſe, forſooth, they muſt be Schiſmatiques. But hereafter I pray remember, that there is no neceſſity of communicating even with true Beleevers in wicked actions. Nay, that there is a neceſſity herein to ſeparate from them. And then I dare ſay, even you being their judge, the reaſonableneſſe of their cauſe to ſeparate ſhall, according to my firſt obſervation, juſtifie their ſeparation from being ſchiſmaticall.

37 Arg: *But the property of Schiſme according to D.* Potter *is to cut off from the hope of ſalvation, the Church from which it ſeparates: And theſe Proteſtants haue this property, Therefore they are Schiſmatiques.*

38 Anſ. I deny the Syllogiſme, it is no better then this:

One Symptome of the Plague is a Feaver,
But ſuch a man hath a Feaver,
Therefore he hath the Plague.

The true concluſiō which iſſues out of theſe Premiſſes, ſhould be this. Therefore he hath one Symptome of the plague. And ſo likewiſe in the former, therefore they haue one property or one quality of Schiſmatiques. And as in the former inſtance, The man that hath one ſigne of the plague, may by reaſon of the abſence of other requiſites, not haue the plague: So theſe Proteſtants may haue ſomething of Schiſmatiques, and yet not be Schiſmatiques. A Tyrant ſentencing a man to death for his pleaſure, and a juſt judge that condemnes a malefactor, doe both ſentence a man to death, and ſo for the matter doe both the ſame thing: yet the one does wickedly, the other juſtly. What's the reaſon? becauſe the one hath cauſe, the other hath not. In like manner Schiſmatiques, either alwaies or generally denounce damnation to them from whom they ſeparate. The ſame doe theſe Proteſtants, & yet are not Schiſmatiques. The Reaſon: becauſe Schiſmatiques doe it, and doe it without cauſe, and Proteſtants haue cauſe for what they doe.

doe. The impieties of your Church, being, generally ſpeaking, damnable, unleſſe where they are excus'd by ignorance, and expiated at leaſt by a generall repentance. In fine, though perhaps it may be true, that all Schiſmatiques doe ſo: yet univerſall affirmatiues are not converted, and therefore it followes not by any good Logick, that all that doe ſo, when there is juſt cauſe for it, muſt be Schiſmatiques. The cauſe in this matter of ſeparation is all in all, and that for ought I ſee, you never think of. But *if theſe rigid Proteſtants haue iuſt cauſe to cut off your Church from the hope of ſalvation: How can the milder ſort allow hope of ſalvation to the Members of this Church?* Anſ. Diſtinguiſh the quality of the Perſons cenſur'd, and this ſeeming repugnance of their cenſures will vaniſh into nothing. For your Church may be conſidered either in regard of thoſe, in whom, either negligence, or pride, or worldly feare, or hopes, or ſome other voluntary ſinne, is the cauſe of their ignorance, which I feare is the caſe of the generality of men amongſt you: or in regard of thoſe who owe their Errours from Truth, to want of capacity, or default of inſtruction; either in reſpect of thoſe that might know the truth and will not, or of thoſe who would know the truth but (all things conſidered) cannot: In reſpect of thoſe that haue eyes to ſee, and will not ſee, or thoſe that would gladly ſee, but want eyes, or light. Conſider the former ſort of men, (which your more rigid cenſurers ſeem eſpecially to reflect upon,) and the heavieſt ſentence will not be too heavy. Conſider the latter, and the mildeſt will not be too milde. So that here is no difference but in words only, neither are you flattered by the one, nor uncharitably cenſur'd by the other.

39 Your next blow is directed againſt the milder ſort of Proteſtants, *who you ſay involve themſelves in the ſinne of Schiſme by communicating with thoſe (as you call them) exterminating Spirits, whom you conceiue your ſelfe to haue proved Schiſmatiques*: And now load them further with the crime of Hereſie. For, ſay you, *if you held your ſelves obliged under pain of damnation, to forſake the Communion of the Roman Church by reaſon of her Errours, which yet you confeſſe were not fundamentall: ſhall it not be much more damnable, to liue in confraternity with theſe, who defend an Errour of the fayling of the Church, which in the Donatiſts you confeſſe to haue been properly Hereticall?*

40 Anſw: You miſtake in thinking that Proteſtants hold themſelves obliged not to communicate with you, onely or principally by reaſon of your Errours and Corruption. For the true reaſon according to my third obſervation, is not ſo much becauſe you *maintaine* Errours and Corruptions, as becauſe you *impoſe* them: and will allow your Communion to none but to thoſe that will hold them with you; and haue ſo ordered your Communion, that either we muſt communicate with you in theſe things, or nothing. And for this very reaſon, though it were granted, that theſe Proteſtants held this doctrine which you impute to them; And though this Errour were as damnable and as much againſt the Creed as you pretend: Yet after all this, this diſparity between you and them, might make it more lawfull for us to

communicate with them then you: becauſe what they hold, they hold to themſelues, and refuſe not (as you doe) to communicate with them that hold the contrary.

41 Thus we may anſwer your Argument, though both your former Suppoſitions were granted. But then for a ſecond anſwer, I am to tell you that there is no neceſſity of granting either of them. For neither doe theſe Proteſtants hold the fayling of the Church from its being, but only from its viſibility: which if you conceive all one, then muſt you conceive that the ſtarres fayle every day, and the Sunne every night. Neither is it certain that the doctrine of the Churches fayling is repugnant to the Creed. For as the truth of the Article of the Remiſſion of ſinnes, depends not upon the actuall remiſſion of any mans ſinnes, but upon Gods readineſſe and reſolution to forgive the ſins of all that believe and repent; ſo that, although unbeleef or impenitence ſhould be univerſall, and *the Faithfull ſhould* abſolutely *fayle from the children of men*, and *the ſonne of man ſhould finde no faith on the earth*, yet ſhould the Article ſtill continue true, that God would forgive the ſinnes of all that repent: In like manner, it is not certain that the truth of the Article of the Catholique Church depends upon the actuall exiſtence of a Catholique Church, but rather upon the right, that the Church of Chriſt, or rather (to ſpeak properly) the Goſpell of Chriſt hath to be univerſally believed. And therefore the Article may bee true, though there were no Church in the world. In regard, this notwithſtanding, it remaines ſtill true that there ought to be a Church, & this Church ought to be Catholique. For as, of theſe two Propoſitions, There is a Church in *America*, and, There ſhould bee a Church in *America*, The truth of the latter depends not upon the truth of the former, ſo neither does it in theſe two: There is a Church diffuſed all the world over, and, There ſhould be a Church diffuſed all the world over.

42 Thirdly, if you underſtand by Errours *not fundamentall*, ſuch as are *not damnable*, it is not true, as I haue often told you, that we confeſſe your errours not fundamentall.

43 Laſtly, for your deſire that I ſhould here apply an authority of S. *Cyprian* alleaged in your next number, I would haue done ſo very willingly, but indeed I know not how to doe it: for in my apprehenſiō it hath no more to doe with your preſent buſineſſe of proving it unlawfull, to communicate with theſe men, who hold the Church was not alwaies viſible, then *In noua fert animus*. Beſides, I am here again to remember you, that S. *Cyprians* words, were they never ſo pertinent yet are by neither of the parts litigant eſteemed any *rule of faith*. And therefore the urging of them and ſuch like authorities, ſerves onely to make Books great, and Controverſies endleſſe.

44 *Ad* § 17. The next Section in three long leaues delivers us this ſhort ſenſe. *That thoſe Proteſtants which ſay they haue not left the Churches externall Communion, but only her corruptions pretend to doe that which is impoſſible. Becauſe theſe corruptions were inherent in the Churches externall Communion: and therefore he that forſakes them cannot but forſake this.*

45 Anſw:

45 Anſ. But who are they that pretend, they forſooke the Churches corruptions, and not her externall communion? Some there be that ſay, they have not left the Church, that is, not ceaſed to be members of the Church, but only left her corruptions: ſome, that they have not left the communion, but the corruptions of it; meaning the internall communion of it, and conjunction with it by faith and obedience: which diſagree from the former only in the manner of ſpeaking: for he that is in the Church, is in this kinde of communion with it: and he that is not in this internall communion, is not in the Church. Some perhaps, that they left not your externall communion in all things; meaning, that they left it not voluntarily being not *fugitivi* but *fugati*, as being willing to joyne with you in any act of piety; but were by you neceſſitated and conſtrained to doe ſo, becauſe you would not ſuffer them to doe well with you, unleſſe they would doe ill with you. Now to doe ill that you may doe well, is againſt the will of God, which to every good man is a high degree of neceſſity. But for ſuch Proteſtants, as pretend that *de facto, they forſook your corruptions only and not your externall communion*, that is, ſuch as pretend to communicate with you in your confeſſions and Liturgies, and participation of Sacraments, I cannot but doubt very much, that neither you nor I have ever met with any of this condition. And if perhaps you were led into error, by thinking that to leave the Church, and to leave the externall communion of it, was all one in ſenſe & ſignification, I hope by this time you are diſabus'd, and beginne to underſtand, that as a man may leave any faſhion or cuſtome of a Colledge, and yet remain ſtill a member of the Colledge; ſo a man may poſſibly leave ſome opinion or practiſe of a Church formerly common to himſelfe & others, and continue ſtill a member of that Church: Provided that what he forſakes be not one of thoſe things wherein the eſſence of the Church conſiſts. Whereas peradventure this practiſe may be ſo involved with the externall communion of this Church, that it may be ſimply impoſſible, for him to leave this practiſe, and not to leave the Churches externall communion.

Caſaubon. in Ep. ad Card. Perron.

46 You will reply perhaps, *That the difficulty lies as well againſt thoſe who pretend to forſake the Churches corruptions & not the Church: as againſt thoſe who ſay, they forſook the Churches corruptions, and not her externall communion. And that the reaſon is ſtill the ſame: becauſe theſe ſuppoſed corruptions, were inherent in the whole Church, and therefore by like reaſon with the former, could not be forſaken, but if the whole Church were forſaken.*

47 Anſ. A pretty Sophiſme, and very fit to perſwade men that it is impoſſible for them, to forſake any error they hold, or any vice they are ſubject to, either peculiar to themſelves, or in common with others: Becauſe forſooth, they cannot forſake themſelves, and Vices and Errors are things inherent in themſelves. The deceit lies, in not diſtinguiſhing between a Locall and a Morall forſaking of any thing. For as it were an abſurdity, fit for the maintainers of Tranſubſtantiation to defend, that a man may Locally and properly depart from the

Accidents of a ſubject, and not from the ſubject it ſelfe: So is it alſo againſt reaſon to deny, that a man may (by an uſuall phraſe of ſpeech) forſake any cuſtome, or quality, good or bad, either proper to himſelf, or common to himſelfe with any company, and yet never truly or properly forſake either his company or himſelfe. Thus if all the Ieſuits in the Society, were given to write Sophiſtically, yet you might leave this ill cuſtome, and yet not leave your Society. If all the Citizens of a City, were addicted to any vanity, they might either, all, or ſome of them forſake it, and yet not forſake the city. If all the parts of a mans body were dirty or filthy, nothing hinders but that all or ſome of them might clenſe themſelves, and yet continue parts of the body. And what reaſon then in the world is there, if the whole Viſible Church were overcome with tares and weeds of ſuperſtitions, and corruptions, but that ſome members of it might reforme themſelves, and yet continue ſtill true members of the body of the Church, and not be made no members, but the better by their Reformation? Certainly it is ſo obvious & ſenſible a Truth, that this thing is poſſible, that no man in his wits, will be perſwaded out of it, with all the Quirks and Metaphyſicks in the World. Neither is this to ſay, *that a man may keep company with Chriſtopher Potter, and not keep company with the Provoſt of Q. Colledge: Nor that a man can avoid the company of a ſinner, and at the ſame time, be really preſent with the man who is the ſinner*: which we leave to thoſe Proteſtants of your invention, who are ſo fooliſh, as to pretend, that a man, may really ſeparate himſelfe from the Churches externall Communion, as ſhe is corrupted, and yet continue in that Churches externall Communion, which in this externall Communion is corrupted. But we that ſay only the whole Church being corrupted, ſome parts of it might and did reforme themſelves, and yet might and did continue parts of the Church, though ſeparated from the externall communion of the other parts, which would not reforme, need not trouble our ſelves to reconcile any ſuch repugnance. For the caſe put by you, of keeping D. *Potters* company, and leaving the company of the *Provoſt of Queens Colledge*; & of leaving a ſinners company, and not the mans: are nothing at all like ours. But if you would ſpeak to the point, you muſt ſhew, that *D. Potter* cannot leave being *Provoſt of Q. Colledge*, without ceaſing to be himſelfe: or, that a ſinner cannot leave his ſinne, without ceaſing to be a man: or that he that is part of any ſociety, cannot renounce any Vice of that ſociety, but he muſt relinquiſh the ſociety. If you would ſhew any of theſe things, then indeed (I dare promiſe) you ſhould find us apt enough to believe, that the particular parts of the viſible Church, could not reforme themſelves, but they muſt of neceſſity become no parts of it. But untill we ſee this done, you muſt pardon us, if we chooſe to believe ſenſe rather then Sophiſtry.

48 In this Paragraph you bring in the ſentence of S. *Cyprian*, whereto you refer'd us in the former: but why in a cõtroverſy of faith, dõe you cite any thing, which is confeſſed on all hands, not to be a rule of faith? Beſides, in my apprehenſion, this ſentence of S. *Cyprian*, is in this

this place, and to this purpoſe, meerely impertinent. S. *Cyprians* words are, *The Church* (he ſpeaks of the particular Church, or Dioceſſe of Rome) *being one, cannot be within and without: If ſhe be with Novatianus, ſhe was not with Cornelius: But if ſhe were with Cornelius who ſucceeded Fabianus by lawfull Ordination, Novatianus is not in the Church.* And now having related the words, I am only to remember the Reader, that your buſineſſe was to prove it *impoſſible, For a man to forſake the Churches corruptions and not the Church*, and then to requeſt him to tell me whether, as I ſaid, *In nova fert animus*, had not been as much to the purpoſe?

49 Toward the concluſion of this Section, you *number up your Victories, and tell us, That out of your diſcourſe it remaineth cleere, that this our chiefeſt Anſwer changeth the very ſtate of the Queſtion: confoundeth internall Acts of the underſtanding, with externall deeds: doth not diſtinguiſh between Schiſme and Hereſy, and leaves this demonſtrated againſt us, that they (Proteſtants) divided themſelves from the communion of the Viſible Catholique Church, becauſe they conceived that ſhe needed Reformation.* To which Triumphs, if any reply be needfull, then briefly thus: We doe not change the ſtate of the Queſtion, but you miſtake it. For the Queſtion was not whether they might forſake the corruptions of the Church, and continue in her externall communion, which we confeſſe impoſſible, becauſe theſe corruptions were in her communion: But the Queſtion was, whether they might forſake the corruptions of the Church, and not the Church, but continue ſtill the Members of it. And to this Queſtion, there is not in your whole diſcourſe one pertinent ſyllable.

50 We *doe not confound internall Acts of underſtanding with externall deeds*, but acknowledge (as you would have us) that *we cannot* (as matters now ſtand) *ſeparate from your corruptions, but we muſt depart from your Externall communion.* For you have ſo ordered things, that whoſoever will Communicate with you at all, muſt communicate with you, in your corruptions. But it is you that will not perceive the difference, between, being a part of the Church, and being in externall Communion with all the other parts of it: taking for granted, that which is certainly falſe, that no two men or Churches, divided in externall communion, can be both true parts of the Catholique Church.

51 We are not *to learn the difference between Schiſme & Hereſy*, for Hereſy we conceive, an obſtinate defence of any Errour, againſt any neceſſary Article of the Chriſtian faith: And Schiſme, a cauſeleſſe ſeparation of one part of the Church from another. But this we ſay, That if we convince you of errors and corruptions, profeſſed and practiſed in your Communion, then we cannot be Schiſmatiques, for refuſing to joyne with you in the profeſſion of theſe Errors, and the practiſe of theſe corruptions. And therefore you muſt free your ſelves from Error, or us from Schiſme.

52 Laſtly, whereas you ſay, *That you have demonſtrated againſt us, that Proteſtants divided themſelves from the externall communion*

of

of the Viſible Church, adde, *which externall communion was corrupted*, and we ſhall confeſſe the accuſation, and glory in it. But this is not that *Quod erat demonſtrandum*, but that we divided our ſelves from the Church, that is, made our ſelves out-lawes from it, and no members of it. And moreover, in the Reaſon of your ſeparation from the externall communion of your Church you are miſtaken: for it was not ſo much becauſe ſhe, your Church, as becauſe your Churches externall communion was corrupted, and needed Reformation.

53 *That a pretence of Reformation will acquit no man from Schiſme*, we grant very willingly, and therefore ſay, that it concernes every man who ſeparates from any Churches communion, even as much as his Salvation is worth, to looke moſt carefully to it, that the cauſe of his ſeparation be juſt and neceſſary: For unleſſe it be neceſſary, it can very hardly be ſufficient. But whether a true Reformation of our ſelves from Errors, ſuperſtitions and impieties, will not juſtify our ſeparation in theſe things; our ſeparation, I ſay, from them who will not reforme themſelves, and as much as in them lies, hinder others from doing ſo: This is the point you ſhould have ſpoken to, but have not. As for the ſentences of the Fathers to which you referre us, for the determination of this Queſtion, I ſuppoſe by what I have ſaid above, the Reader underſtands, by alleaging them you have gain'd little credit to your cauſe or perſon. And that, if they were competent Iudges of this controverſy, their ſentence is againſt you much rather then for you.

54 Laſtly, *whereas you deſire D. Potter to remember his own words: There neither was nor can be any juſt cauſe to depart from the Church of Chriſt, no more then from Chriſt himſelfe, and pretend that you have ſhewed that Luther did ſo*: The Doctor remembers his words very well, and hath no reaſon to be aſhamed of them. Only he deſires you to remember that hereafter you doe not confound, as hitherto you have done, departing from the Church (*i.e.* ceaſing to be a member of it,) with departing from the Churches externall communion; and then he is perſwaded it will appeare to you, that againſt *Luther* and his followers you have ſaid many things, but ſhewed nothing.

55 But *the Church Vniverſall, remaining the Church Vniverſall, according to D. Potter may fall into error: And from hence it cleerely followes, that it is impoſſible to leave the externall communion of the Church ſo corrupted, and retain externall communion with the Catholique Church.* Anſ. The reaſon of this conſequence which you ſay is ſo cleere, truly I cannot poſſibly diſcern; But the concluſion inferr'd, methinkes is evident of it ſelfe, and therefore without proofe I grant it. I meane, that it is impoſſible to leave the externall communion of the Catholique Church corrupted, and to retain externall communion with the Catholique Church. But what uſe you can make of it, I doe not underſtand: Vnleſſe you will pretend, that to ſay a man may forſake the Churches corruptions, and not the Church, is all one as to ſay, he may forſake the Churches externall Communion and not forſake it. If you mean ſo, ſure you miſtake the meaning of Proteſtants when

when they ſay, They forſook not the Church but her corruptions. For in ſaying ſo, they neither affirme, nor deny that they forſooke the externall communion of the Church, nor ſpeake at all of it: But they mean only, that they ceaſed not to be ſtill members of the Church, though they ceaſed to believe and practiſe ſome things which the whole Church formerly did believe and practiſe. And as for the externall Communion of the Viſible Church, we have without ſcruple formerly granted, that Proteſtants did forſake it, that is, renounce the practiſe of ſome obſervances, in which the whole viſible Church before thē did communicate. But this we ſay they did without Schiſme, becauſe they had cauſe to doe ſo, and no man can have cauſe to be a Schiſmatique.

56 But your Argument you conceive, will bee more convincing, *if we conſider that when Luther appeared, there were not two diſtinct Viſible true Churches, one Pure, the other Corrupted, but one Church only.* Anſ. The ground of this is no way certain, nor here ſufficiently proved. For, whereas you ſay, Hiſtories are ſilent of any ſuch matter; I anſwer, there is no neceſſity, that you or I ſhould have read all Hiſtories, that may be extant of this matter; nor that all ſhould be extant that were written, much leſſe extant uncorrupted: eſpecially conſidering your Church, which had lately all power in her hands, hath been ſo pernitiouſly induſtrious, in corrupting the monuments of Antiquity that made againſt her; nor that all Records ſhould remain which were written; nor that all ſhould be recorded which was done. Neither ſecondly, to ſuppoſe a Viſible Church before *Luther*, which did not erre, is it to contradict this ground of *D. Potters*, that the Church may erre. Vnleſſe you will have us believe, that *May be*, and *Muſt be* is all one, and that all which may be true, is true: which rule if it were true, then ſure all men would be honeſt, becauſe all men may be ſo, and you would not make ſo bad Arguments, unleſſe you will pretend you cannot make better. Nor thirdly, is it to contradict theſe words, *The Church may not hope to triumph over all error, till ſhe be in Heaven*: For to triumph over error, is to be ſecure from it, to be out of danger of it, not to be obnoxious to it. Now a Church may be free from error, and yet not ſecure from it, and conſequently in this ſenſe, not triumph over it. Fourthly, whereas you ſay, *it evacuateth the bragge of Proteſtants, that Luther reformed the whole Church*; perhaps (though I know not who they be that ſay ſo,) by a frequent ſynecdoche, they may mean by the whole, the greateſt, and moſt illuſtrious part of it, the luſtre whereof did much obſcure the other, though it were not wholly inviſible. Beſides, if their bragge be evacuated, (as you call it) let it be ſo, I ſee no harme will come of it. Laſtly whereas you ſay, that ſuppoſing a viſible pure Church, *Luther* muſt be a Schiſmatique, who ſeparated from all viſible Churches: I tell you, if you will ſuppoſe a viſible Church extant before and when *Luther* aroſe, conformable to him in all points of Doctrine, neceſſary and profitable, then *Luther* ſeparated not from this Church, but adjoyned himſelfe to it: Not indeed in place, wich was not neceſſary,

not in externall communion which was impoſſible, but by the Vnion of faith and charity. Vpon theſe grounds I ſay, that the ground of this Argument is no way made certaine, yet becauſe it is not manifeſtly falſe, I am content to let it paſſe. And for ought I ſee, it is very ſafe for me to doe ſo: for you build nothing upon it, which I may not fairely grant. For what doe you conclude from hence, but that ſeeing there was no Viſible Church but corrupted, *Luther* forſaking the externall communion of the corrupted Church, could not but forſake the externall communion of the Catholique Church? Well, let this alſo be granted, what will come of it? What, that *Luther* muſt be a Schiſmatique? By no meanes: For not every ſeparation, but only a cauſeles ſeparation from the communion of the Church we maintain to be Schiſmaticall. Hereunto may be added, that though the whole Church were corrupted, yet properly ſpeaking, it is not true, that *Luther* & his Followers forſook the whole corrupted Church, or the externall communion of it: But only that he forſook that Part of it which was corrupted, and ſtill would be ſo, and forſook not, but only reformed another Part, which Part they themſelves were, and I ſuppoſe you will not goe about to perſwade us, that they forſook themſelves or their own communion. And if you urge that they joyned themſelves to no other part, therefore they ſeparated from the whole: I ſay it followes not, in as much as themſelves were a part of it, and ſtill continued ſo: and therefore could no more ſeparate from the whole then from themſelves. Thus though there were no part of the people of Rome, to whom the *Plebeians* joyned themſelves, when they made their Seceſſion into the Aventine Hill, yet they divided themſelves from the *Patricians* only, and not from the whole people, becauſe themſelves were a part of this people, and they divided not from themſelves.

57 *Ad* §. 18. In the 18. §. you prove that which no man denies, that *corruption in manners yeelds no ſufficient cauſe to leave the Church*: yet ſure it yeelds ſufficient cauſe to caſt them out of the Church, that are after the Churches publique admonition obſtinate in notorious impieties. Neither doth the cutting off ſuch men from the Church, lay any neceſſity upon us, either to goe out of the world, or out of the Church, but rather puts theſe men out of the Church into the world, where we may converſe with them freely, without ſcandall to the Church. *Our Bleſſed Saviour foretold*, you ſay, *that there ſhould be in the Church tares with choice corne.* Look again I pray, and you ſhall ſee, that the field he ſpeaks of, is not the Church, but *the world:* and therefore neither doe You obey our Saviours command, *Let both grow up till the harveſt*, who teach it to be lawfull to roote theſe tares (ſuch are Heretiques) out of the world: neither doe Proteſtants diſobey it, if they eject manifeſt Hereſies and notorious ſinners out of the Church.

58 *Ad* §. 19. In the 19. you are ſo curteous as to ſuppoſe *corruptions in your doctrine*, and yet undertake to prove that, *neither could they afford us any ſufficient cauſe, or colourable neceſſity to depart from them*

them. Your reaſon is, *becauſe damnable errors there were none in your Church, by D. Potters confeſſion, neither can it be damnable in reſpect of errour, to remain in any Churches communion, whoſe errors are not damnable. For if the error be not damnable, the belief thereof cannot. Anſ. D. Potter* confeſſeth no ſuch matter: but only that *he hopes that your errors, though in themſelves ſufficiently damnable, yet by accident did not damne all that held them*: ſuch he meanes and ſaies, as were excuſably ignorant of the Truth, and amongſt the number of their unknown ſinnes, repented daily of their unknown errors. The truth is, he thinks as ill of your errors and their deſert, as you doe of ours: only he is not ſo peremptory and preſumptuous in judging your perſons, as you are in judging ours, but leaves them to ſtand or fall to their own Maſter, who is infinitely mercifull, and therefore will not damne them for meere errors, who deſire to find the truth and cannot: and withall infinitely juſt, and therefore (is it to be feared) will not pardon them, who might eaſily have come to the knowledge of the truth, and either through Pride, or obſtinacy, or negligence would not.

59 To your minor alſo, I anſwer almoſt in your own words, §.42. of this Chap. I thank you for your curteous ſuppoſall, that your Church may erre, and in recompence thereof, will doe you a charity, by putting you in mind, into what Labyrinths you caſt your ſelfe, by ſuppoſing that the Church may erre in ſome of her Propoſalls, and yet denying it lawfull for any man though he know this, which you ſuppoſe, to oppoſe her judgement, or leave her communion. Will you have ſuch a man diſſemble againſt his conſcience, or externally deny that which he knowes true? No, that you will not, for them that doe ſo, you your ſelfe have pronounced *A damned Crew of diſſembling Sycophants*. Or would you have him continue in your Communion, and yet profeſſe your Church to erre? This you your ſelves have made to him impoſſible. Or would you have him beleeve thoſe things true, which together with him you have ſuppoſed to be Errors? This in ſuch a one, as is aſſur'd or perſwaded of that, which you here ſuppoſe, that your Church doth erre, (and ſuch only we ſay, are obliged to forſake your communion,) is, as Schoolemen ſpeak, *Implicatio in terminis*, a contradiction ſo plain, that one word deſtroieth another; as if one ſhould ſay, a living dead man. For it is to require that they which believe ſome part of your Doctrine falſe, ſhould withall believe it all true. Seeing therefore, for any man to believe your Church in error, and profeſſe the contrary, is damnable Hypocriſie; to believe it and not believe it, a manifeſt repugnancy; and thirdly, to profeſſe it and to continue in your Communion (as matters now ſtand) a plain impoſſibility; what remaines, but that whoſoever is ſuppoſed to have juſt reaſon to disbelieve any doctrine of your Church, muſt of neceſſity forſake her Communion? Vnleſſe you would remit ſo farre from your preſent rigour, as to allow them your Churches communion, who publiquely profeſſe that they doe not believe every article of her eſtabliſhed Doctrine. Indeed, if you would doe ſo, you might with ſome coherence ſuppoſe your Church in error, and yet finde fault

with men for abandoning her communion, becauſe they might continue in it, and ſuppoſe her in error. But to ſuppoſe your Church in error, and to excommunicate all thoſe that believe your own ſuppoſition, and then to complain that they continue not in your communion, is the moſt ridiculous incongruity that can be imagined. And therefore though your corruptions in doctrine, in themſelves (which yet is falſe) did not, yet your obliging us, to profeſſe your doctrine uncorrupted againſt knowledge and conſcience, may induce an obligation to depart from your communion. As if there were any ſociety of Chriſtians, that held there were no Antipodes; notwithſtanding this error I might communicate with them. But if I could not doe ſo, without profeſſing my ſelfe of their beleefe in this matter, then I ſuppoſe I ſhould be excus'd from Schiſme, if I ſhould forſake their communion, rather then profeſſe my ſelfe to believe that which I doe not believe. Neither is there any contradiction, or ſhadow of contradiction, that it may be neceſſary for my Salvation to depart from this Churches communion: And that this Church (though erring in this matter) wants nothing neceſſary to Salvation. And yet this is that manifeſt contradiction, which *D. Potter* (you ſay) will never be able to ſalve, *viz. That there might be neceſſary cauſe to depart from the Church of Rome in ſome Doctrines and practices, though ſhe wanted nothing neceſſary to Salvation.*

60 And your Reaſon wherewith you prove, that there is in theſe words ſuch a plain contradiction, is very notable. *For* (ſay you) *if ſhe wanted nothing neceſſary to Salvation, how could it be neceſſary to Salvation to forſake her?* Truly Sir, if this be a good manner of proving, it is a very ready way to prove any thing; for what is there that may not be proved, if it be proofe enough to aske how it can be otherwiſe? Me thinkes if you would convince *D. Potter's* words of manifeſt contradiction, you ſhould ſhew, that he affirmes and denies the ſame of the ſame. From which fault me thinkes he ſhould be very innocent, who ſaies only, that that may be damnable to one, which is not ſo to another: and that may be neceſſary for one, which is not neceſſary for another. And this is all that *D. Potter* ſaies here: *viz.* That the profeſſion of a falſehood to him that believes it, may be not damnable: and yet damnable to him that believes the contrary. Or that, not to profeſſe a falſehood in him that knowes it to be ſo, is neceſſary to Salvation: and yet not ſo, in him that by error conceives it to be a truth. The words by you cited, and charged with unſalvable contradiction are in the 75. pag. But in the progreſſe of the ſame particular diſcourſe, in the next page but one, he gives ſuch evident reaſon of them, (which can hardly be done to prove implicancy true) that whereas you ſay, *he will never be able to ſalve them from contradiction*, I believe any indifferent reader, having conſidered the place, will be very apt to think, that you (whatſoever you pretend) were very able to have done this curteſy for him, if your will had been anſwerable to your ability. I will ſet down the words, and leave the Reader to condemne or abſolve them. *To forſake the errors of that Church, and not to joyne with her*

her in thoſe practices which we account erroneous, wee are enforced by neceſsity. For though in themſelues they are not damnable to them which believe as they profeſſe, yet for us to profeſſe & avow by oath (as the Church of Rome enioynes) what we believe not, were without queſtion damnable. And they with their errours, by the grace of God might goe to Heaven, when we for our hypocriſie and diſſimulation (he might haue added, and Perjury) *ſhould certainly be condemned to Hell.*

61 *Ad §20. But a Church not erring in Fundamentalls, though erring in other matters, doth what our Saviour exacts at her hands, doth as much as lies in her power to doe: Therefore the Communion of ſuch a Church is not upon pretence of Errour to be forſaken.* The conſequence is manifeſt. The Antecedent is proved, becauſe *God, by D. Potters confeſſion, hath promiſed his aſſiſtance no further, nor is it in her power to doe more then God doth aſſiſt her to doe.* Anſ. The promiſe of Divine Aſſiſtance is two fold: Abſolute, or Conditionall. That there ſhall be by Divine providence preſeru'd in the world to the worlds end, ſuch a company of Chriſtians, who hold all things preciſely and indiſpenſably neceſſary to ſalvation, and nothing inevitably deſtructive of it: This and no more the Doctor affirmes that God hath promiſed abſolutely. Yet he neither doubts nor denies, but that a farther aſſiſtance is conditionally promiſed us, even ſuch an aſſiſtance as ſhall lead us, if we be not wanting to it and our ſelves, into all not only neceſſary, but very profitable truth, and guard us from all not only deſtructive, but alſo hurtfull Errours. This, I ſay, he neither denies nor queſtions. And ſhould he haue done ſo, hee might haue been confuted by evident and expreſſe Text of Scripture. When therefore you ſay, That *a Church not erring in Fundamentalls, doth as much as by Gods aſſiſtance lies in her power to doe*; This is manifeſtly untrue. For Gods aſſiſtance is alwaies ready to promote her farther. It is ready, I ſay, but on condition the Church does implore it: on condition, that when it is offered in the divine directions of Scripture and reaſon, the Church be not negligent to follow it. If therefore there be any Church, which retaining the foundation, builds *hay and ſtubble* upon it: which believing what is preciſely neceſſary, erres ſhamefully and dangerouſly in other things very profitable: This by no meanes argues defect of divine aſſiſtance in God, but neglect of this aſſiſtance in the Church. Neither is there any reaſon, why ſuch a Church ſhould pleaſe her ſelfe too much, for retaining Fundamentall truths, while ſhee remaines ſo regardleſſe of others. For though the ſimple defect of ſome truths profitable onely and not ſimply neceſſary, may conſiſt with ſalvation; Yet who is there that can giue her ſufficient aſſurance, that the neglect of ſuch truths is not damnable? Beſides, who is there that can put her in ſufficient caution, that theſe Errours about profitable matters may not according to the uſuall fecunditie of errour, bring forth others of a higher qualitie, ſuch as are pernicious and peſtilent, and undermine by ſecret conſequences the very foundations of Religion and piety? Laſtly, who can ſay that ſhe hath ſufficiently diſcharged her duty to God and man by avoiding only Fundamentall Hereſies, if in the mean time ſhee bee

Pag. 151. 155.

negligent of others, which though they doe not plainly deſtroy ſalvation, yet obſcure and hinder, and only not block up the way to it? Which though of themſelves and immediatly they damne no man, yet are cauſes and occaſions that many men run the race of Chriſtian piety more remiſly then they ſhould, many defer their repentance, many goe on ſecurely in their ſinnes, & ſo at length are damn'd by means and occaſion of theſe Errours, though not for them. Such Errours as theſe (though thoſe of the Roman Church be much worſe, even *in themſelves damnable, and by accident only pardonable*) yet I ſay ſuch Errours as theſe, if any Church ſhould tolerate, diſſemble and ſuffer them to raign, and neglect to reforme them, and not permit them to be freely, yet peaceably, oppoſed and impugned; will any wiſe man ſay, that ſhe hath ſufficiently diſcharged her duty to God and man? That ſhee hath with due fidelity diſpenſed the Goſpell of Chriſt? That ſhee hath done what ſhe could, and what ſhe ought? What ſhall we ſay then, if theſe errours be taught by her, and commanded to be taught? What if ſhe thunder out her curſes againſt thoſe that will not believe them? What if ſhe rave and rage againſt them, and perſecute them with fire & ſword, and all kinds of moſt exquiſite torments? Truly I doe much feare, that frō ſuch a Church (though it hold no errour abſolutely unconſiſtent with ſalvation,) the candleſtick of God, either is already removed, or will be very ſhortly, and becauſe ſhe is negligent of profitable truths, that ſhe will loſe thoſe that are Neceſſary, and becauſe ſhe will not be led into all truths, that in ſhort time ſhee ſhall bee led into none. And although this ſhould not happen, yet what mortall man can ſecure us, that not only a probable unaffected ignorance, nor onely a meere neglect of profitable truths, but alſo a retchleſſe ſupine negligence, manifeſt contempt, Diſſimulation, Oppoſition, Oppreſſion of them, may conſiſt with ſalvation? I truly for my part, though I hope very well of all ſuch as ſeeking all truth, finde that which is neceſſary; who endeavouring to free themſelves from all Errours, any way contrary to the purity of Chriſtianity, yet fayle of performance & remain in ſome: yet if I did not finde in my ſelfe a loue and deſire of all profitable truth; If I did not put away idleneſſe, and prejudice, and worldly affections, and ſo examine to the bottome all my opinions of divine matters, being prepar'd in minde to follow God, and God only which way ſoever he ſhall lead me; If I did not hope, that I either doe, or endeavour to doe theſe things, certainly I ſhould haue little hope of obtaining ſalvation.

62 *But to oblige any man under pain of damnation to forſake a Church by reaſon of ſuch errours, againſt which Chriſt thought it ſuperfluous to promiſe his aſſiſtance, and for which he neither denies his grace here, nor his glory hereafter, what is it but to make the narrow way to heaven, narrower then Chriſt left it?* Anſ. It is not: For Chriſt himſelfe hath obliged us hereunto: He hath forbad us under pain of damnation to profeſſe what we believe not, & conſequently under the ſame penalty, to leaue that Communion, in which we cannot remain without this hypocriticall profeſſion of thoſe things, which we are convinc'd to be erroneous.

roneous. But then beſides, it is here falſely ſuppoſed, (as hath been ſhewed already) that Chriſt hath not promiſed aſſiſtance to thoſe that ſeeke it, but only in matters ſimply neceſſary. Neither is there any reaſon, why any Church, even in this world, ſhould deſpaire of victory over all errors pernitious or noxious; provided ſhe humbly and earneſtly implore divine aſſiſtance, depend wholy upon it, and be not wanting to it. Though a *Triumph over all ſinne and error*, that is, ſecurity that ſhe neither doth nor can erre, be rather to be deſired then hoped for on earth, being a felicity reſerved for heaven.

63 *Ad* §. 21. *But at leaſt the Roman Church is as infallible as Proteſtants, and Proteſtants as fallible as the Roman Church: therefore to forſake the Roman Church for errors, what is it but to flit from one erring Society to another?* Anſ. The inconſequence of this Argument is too apparent: Proteſtants may erre as well as the Church of Rome, therefore they did ſo! Boyes in the Schooles know, that *a Poſſe ad Eſſe*, the Argument followes not. He is equally fallible who believes twiſe two to be foure, as he that believes them to be twenty: yet in this, he is not equally deceived, and he may be certain that he is not ſo. One Architect is no more infallible then another, and yet he is more ſecure that his work is right and ſtreight who hath made it by the levell, then he which hath made it by gueſſe and by chance. So he that forſakes the errors of the Church of Rome, and therefore renounceth her communion, that he may renounce the profeſſion of her errors, though he knowes himſelfe fallible, as well as thoſe whom he hath forſaken, yet he may be certain (as certain as the nature of the thing will beare) that he is not herein deceived: becauſe he may ſee the Doctrine forſaken by him repugnant to Scripture, and the doctrine embraced by him conſonant to it. At leaſt, this he may know, that the doctrine which he hath choſen to him ſeemes true, and the contrary which he hath forſaken, ſeemes falſe: And therefore without remorſe of conſcience, he may profeſſe that, but this he cannot.

64 But *we are to remember, that according to D. Potter the viſible Church hath a bleſſing not to erre in Fundamentalls, in which any private Reformer may faile, therefore there was no neceſſity of forſaking the Church, out of whoſe communion they were expoſed to danger of falling into many more, and even into damnable errors.* Anſ. The viſible Church is free indeed from all errors abſolutely deſtructive and unpardonable, but not from all errour which in it ſelfe is damnable: not from all which will actually bring damnation upon them, that keep themſelves in them, by their own voluntary and avoidable fault. From ſuch errors which are thus damnable D. *Potter* doth no where ſay, that the viſible Church hath any priviledge or exemption. Nay you your ſelfe teach, that he plainly teacheth the contrary, and thereupon will allow him to be no more charitable to Papiſts, then Papiſts are to Proteſtants: and yet upon this affected miſtake your diſcourſe is founded in almoſt forty places of your Book. Beſides, any private man who truly believes the Scripture, and ſeriouſly endeavours to know the will of God, and to doe it, is as ſecure as the viſible Church,

more

more ſecure then your Church from the danger of erring in fundamentalls: for it is impoſſible, that any man ſo qualified ſhould fall into any error which to him will prove damnable. For God requires no more of any man to his ſalvation, but his true endeavour to be ſaved. Laſtly, abiding in your Churches Communion is ſo farre from ſecuring me or any man from damnable error, that if I ſhould abide in it, I am certain I could not be ſaved. For abide in it I cannot, without profeſſing to believe your entire doctrine true: profeſſe this I cannot, but I muſt lye perpetually, and exulcerate my conſcience. And though your errors were not in themſelves damnable, yet to reſiſt the known Truth, and to continue in the profeſſion of known errors and falſehoods, is certainly a capitall ſinne, and of great affinity with the ſinne which ſhall never be forgiven.

95 But *neither is the Church of Proteſtants perfectly free from errors and corruptions: ſo the Doctor confeſſes p. 69. which he can only excuſe, by ſaying, they are not fundamentall, as likewiſe thoſe in the Roman Church, are confeſſed not to be fundamentall. And what man of Iudgement will be a Proteſtant, ſince that Church is confeſſedly a corrupted one?* Anſ. And yet you your ſelfe make large diſcourſes in this very Chapter, to perſwade Proteſtants to continue in the Church of Rome, though ſuppoſed to have ſome corruptions. And why I pray, may not a man of judgement continue in the Communion of a Church confeſſedly corrupted, as well as in a Church ſuppoſed to be corrupted? Eſpecially when this Church ſuppoſed to be corrupted, requires the beliefe and profeſſion of her ſuppoſed corruptions, as the condition of her Communion: which this Church confeſſedly corrupted, doth not. What man of judgement will think it any diſparagement, to his judgement to preferre the better, though not ſimply the beſt, before that which is ſtarke naught? To preferre indifferent good health, before a diſeaſed and corrupted ſtate of Body? To preferre a field not perfectly weeded, before a field that is quite over-runne with weeds and thornes? And therefore though Proteſtants have ſome Errors, yet ſeeing they are neither ſo great as yours, nor impos'd with ſuch tyranny, nor maintained with ſuch obſtinacy; he that conceives it any diſparagement to his judgement, to change your Communion for theirs, though confeſſed to have ſome corruptions, it may well be preſum'd that he hath but little judgement. For, as for your pretence that yours are confeſſed not to be fundamentall, it is an affected miſtake, as already I have often told you.

66 *Ad §. 22. But D. Potter ſaies it is comfort enough for the Church, that the Lord in mercy will ſecure her from all capitall dangers: but ſhe may not hope to triumph over all ſinne and error, till ſhe be in heaven. Now if it be comfort enough, to be ſecur'd from all capitall dangers, which can ariſe only from error in fundamentall points, Why were not our firſt Reformers content with enough, but would needs diſmember the Church, out of a pernitious greedineſſe of more then enough?* Anſ. I have already ſhewed ſufficiently, how capitall danger may ariſe from errors, though not fundamentall. I adde now, that what may be enough for

men

men in ignorance, may be to knowing men not enough: according to that of the Goſpell, *to whom much is given, of him much ſhall be required:* That the ſame error may be not capitall to thoſe who want meanes of finding the truth, and capitall to others who have meanes, and neglect to uſe them: That to continue in the profeſſion of error diſcovered to be ſo, may be damnable, though the error be not ſo. Theſe I preſume are reaſons enough, and enough why the firſt Reformers might think, and juſtly, that not enough for themſelves, which yet to ſome of their Predeceſſors they hope might be enough. This very Argument was objected to [a] S. *Cyprian* upon another occaſion, and alſo by the [b] Britiſh *Quartodecimans*, to the maintainers of the Doctrine of your Church; and [c] by both this very anſwer was returned; and therefore I cannot but hope that for their ſakes you will approve it.

a *S. Cyprian: Ep.* 63. In theſe words, *Si quis de anteceſſoribus noſtris, vel ignorantes vel ſimpliciter non hoc obſervavit, & tenuit quod nos Dominus facere exemplo & Magiſterio ſuo docuit, poteſt ſimplicitati ejus de indulgentia Domini, venia concedi: nobis verò non poteſt ignoſci, qui nunc à Domino admoniti & inſtructi ſumus.*

b *Wilfridus*, to Abbat Colman alleaging that he followed the example of his predeceſſors famous for holineſſe, and famous for miracles, in theſe words, *De Patre veſtro Columba & ſequacibus eius, quorum ſanctitatem vos imitari & regulam ac præcepta cæleſtibus ſignis confirmata ſequi perhibetis, poſſum reſpondere; Quia multis in judicio dicentibus Domino quòd in nomine eius prophetaverint & dæmonia ejecerint, & virtutes multas fecerint, reſponſurus ſit Dominus, quia nunquam eos noverit. Sed abſit ut de patribus veſtris hoc dicam, quia iuſtius multo eſt de incognitis bonum credere quam malum. Vnde & illos Dei famulos & Deo dilectos eſſe non nego, qui ſimplicitate ruſticâ, ſed intentione piâ Deum dilexerunt: Neq; illis multum obeſſe Paſchæ talem reor obſervantiam, quandiu nullus advenerat qui eis inſtituti perfectioris decreta quæ ſequerentur, oſtenderet. Quos utiq; credo, ſi qui tunc ad eos Catholicus calculator adveniret, ſic eius monitâ fuiſſe ſecuturos, quomodo ea quæ noverant ac didicerunt Dei mandata, probantur fuiſſe ſecuti. Tu autem & ſocij tui ſi audita decreta ſedis Apoſtolicæ, imo univerſalis Eccleſiæ & hæc literis ſacris confirmata contemnitis, abſq; ulla dubietate peccatis.*

c Beda: *lib.* 3. *Eccl. Hiſt. c.* 25.

67 But *if (as the Doctor ſaies) no Church may hope to triumph over all error till ſhe be in heaven, then we muſt either grant, that errors not fundamentall cannot yeeld ſufficient cauſe to forſake the Church, or you muſt affirme that all Communities may and ought to be forſaken.* Anſw. The Doctor does not ſay, that no Church may hope to be free from all error, either pernitious, or any way noxious: But that *no Church may hope to be ſecure from all error ſimply*, for this were indeed truly to triumph over all. But then we ſay not, that the communion of any Church is to be forſaken for errors unfundamentall, unleſſe it exact withall either a diſſimulation of th̄e being noxious; or a Profeſſion of them againſt the dictate of conſcience, if they be meere errors. This if the Church does (as certainly yours doth,) then her communion is to be forſaken, rather then the ſinne of hypocriſy to be committed. Whereas to forſake the Churches of Proteſtants for ſuch errors, there is no neceſſity, becauſe they erre to themſelves, & doe not under pain of Excommunication exact the profeſſion of their errors.

68 But *the Church may not be left by reaſon of ſinne, therefore neither by reaſon of errors not fundamentall: in as much as both ſinne and error are impoſſible to be avoided till ſhe be in heaven.* Anſ. The reaſon of the conſequence does not appear to mee: But I anſwer to the Antecedent: Neither for ſinne nor errors, ought a Church to be forſaken, if ſhe does not impoſe and injoyne them: but if ſhe doe, (as the Roman does,) then we muſt forſake men rather then God; leave the Churches communion rather then commit ſinne, or profeſſe known errors, to be divine truths. For the Prophet *Ezechiel* hath aſſured us, that to

ſay, *the Lord hath ſaid ſo, when the Lord hath not ſaid ſo,* is a great ſinne, and a high preſumption, be the matter never ſo ſmall.

69 *Ad* §. 23. But *neither the Quality nor the number of your Churches errors, could warrant our forſaking of it. Not the Quality, becauſe we ſuppoſe them not Fundamentall. Not the number, becauſe the foundation is ſtrong enough to ſupport them.* Anſ. Here againe you vainely ſuppoſe, that we conceive your errors in themſelves not damnable: Though we hope they are not abſolutely unpardonable: but to ſay they are pardonable, is indeed to ſuppoſe them damnable. Secondly, though the errors of your Church did not warrant our departure, yet your Tyrannous impoſition of them, would be our ſufficient juſtification. For this laies neceſſity on us, either to forſake your company, or to profeſſe what we know to be falſe.

70 Our *Bleſſed Saviour hath declared his will, that we forgive a private offender ſeventy ſeven times, that is, without limitation of quantity of time, or quality of Treſpaſes; and then how dare we alleage his command, that we muſt not pardon his Church for errors acknowledged to be not fundamentall?* Anſ. He that commands us to pardon our Brother ſinning againſt us ſo often, will not allow us for his ſake to ſinne with him, ſo much as once. He will have us doe any thing but ſinne, rather then offend any man. But his will is alſo, that we offend all the World, rather then ſinne in the leaſt matter. And therefore though his will were, and it were in our power (which yet is falſe) to pardon the errors of an erring Church; yet certainly it is not his will, that we ſhould erre with the Church, or if we doe not, that we ſhould againſt conſcience profeſſe the errors of it.

71 *Ad* §. 24. But *Schiſmatiques from the Church of England or any other Church, with this very Anſwer, that they forſake not the Church but the errors of it, may caſt off from themſelves the imputation of Schiſme.* Anſ. True, they may make the ſame Anſwer, and the ſame defence as we doe, as a murtherer can cry not guilty, as well as an innocent perſon, but not ſo truly nor ſo juſtly. The queſtion is, not what may be pretended, but what can bee proved by Schiſmatiques. They may object errors to other Churches, as well as we doe to yours, but that they prove their accuſation ſo ſtrongly as we can, that appeares not. To the Prieſts and elders of the Iewes, impoſing that ſacred ſilence mentioned in the Acts of the Apoſtles, S. *Peter* and S. *Iohn* anſwered *they muſt obey God rather then men.* The three Children to the King of Babylon, gave in effect the ſame anſwer. Give me now any factious Hypocrite, who makes religion the pretence and cloke of his Rebellion, and who ſees not that ſuch a one may anſwer for himſelfe, in thoſe very formall words, which the holy Apoſtles and Martyrs made uſe of. And yet I preſume no Chriſtian will deny, but this anſwer was good, in the mouth of the Apoſtles and Martyrs, though it were obnoxious to be abuſed, by Traitors and Rebels. Certainly therefore, it is no good conſequence to ſay, Schiſmatiques may make uſe of this Anſwer, therefore all that doe make uſe of it are Schiſmatiques. But moreover, it is to be obſerved, that the chiefe part of our defence

defence, that you deny your communion to all that deny or doubt of any part of your doctrine, cannot with any colour be imployed againſt Proteſtants: who grant their Communion to all who hold with them, not all things, but things neceſſary, that is, ſuch as are in Scripture plainly delivered.

72 *But the forſaking the Roman Church opens a way to innumerable Sects and Schiſmes, and therefore it muſt not be forſaken.* Anſ. We muſt not doe evill to avoid evill: neither are all courſes preſently lawfull, by which inconveniences may be avoided. If all men would ſubmit themſelves to the chiefe Mufty of the Turkes, it is appparent, there would be no diviſions; yet unity is not to be purchaſed at ſo deare a rate. It were a thing much to be deſired, that there were no diviſions: yet difference of opinions touching points controverted, is rather to be choſen, then unanimous concord in damned errors: As it is better for men to goe to heaven by diverſe waies, or rather by divers paths of the ſame way, then in the ſame path to goe on peaceably to hell. *Amica Pax, magis amica Veritas!*

73 But there *can be no iuſt cauſe to forſake the Church, ſo the Doctor grants: who notwithſtanding teacheth that the Church may erre in points not fundamentall; therefore neither is the Roman Church to be forſaken for ſuch errors.* Anſ. There can be no juſt cauſe to forſake the Church abſolutely and ſimply in all things, that is, to ceaſe being a member of the Church: This I grant, if it will doe you any ſervice. But that there can be no juſt cauſe to forſake the Church in ſome things, or (to ſpeak more properly) to forſake ſome opinions and practices, which ſome true Church retaines and defends; this I deny, and you miſtake the Doctor if you think he affirmes it.

74 *Ad* § 26.27. What *prodigious doctrines* (ſay you) *are theſe? Thoſe Proteſtants who believe that your Church erred in points neceſſary to ſalvation, and for that cauſe left her, cannot be excuſed from damnable Schiſme: But others, &c.* Prodigious doctrines indeed! But who I pray are they that teach them? Where does D. *Potter* accuſe thoſe Proteſtants of *damnable Schiſme*, who left your Church becauſe they hold it erroneous in neceſſary points? What Proteſtant is there that holds not that you taught things contrary to the plaine precepts of Chriſt; both Ceremoniall, in mutilating the Communion; and Morall, in points of ſuperſtition & Idolatry, and moſt bloody tyranny? which is without queſtion to erre in neceſſary matters. Neither does D. *Potter* accuſe any man of Schiſme for holding ſo: if he ſhould, he ſhould call himſelfe a Schiſmatique. Only he ſaies, ſuch (if there be any ſuch) as affirm, that ignorant ſoules among you, who had no means to know the truth, cannot poſſibly be ſaved, that their wiſdome and charity cannot be juſtified. Now you your ſelfe haue plainly affirmed, That *ignorant Proteſtants dying with contrition may bee ſaved*; and yet would be unwilling to be thought to ſay, that Proteſtants erre in no points neceſſary to ſalvation. For that may be in it ſelfe, and in ordinary courſe, where there are meanes of knowledge, neceſſary, which to a man invincibly ignorant, will proue not neceſſary. Again, where doth D. *Potter*

ſuppoſe (as you make him) that there were other Proteſtants, who believed that your Church had no errours? Or, where does hee ſay they did well to forſake her, upon this ridiculous reaſon, becauſe they judged that ſhe retained all means neceſſary to ſalvation? Doe you think us ſo ſtupid, as that wee cannot diſtinguiſh between that which D. *Potter* ſayes, and that which you make him ſay? He vindicates Proteſtants from Schiſme two waies: The one is, becauſe they had juſt and great and neceſſary cauſe to ſeparate, which Schiſmatiques never haue; becauſe they that haue it are no Schiſmatiques: For ſchiſme is alwaies a cauſeleſſe ſeparation. The other is, becauſe they did not joyn with their ſeparation, an uncharitable damning of all thoſe from whom they did divide themſelves, as the manner of Schiſmatiques is. Now that which he intends for a circumſtance of our ſeparation, you make him, make the cauſe of it, and the motiue to it. And whereas he ſaies, *though we ſeparate from you in ſome things, yet we acknowledge your Church a member of the body of Chriſt, and therefore are not Schiſmatiques*: You make him ſay moſt abſurdly, *we did well to forſake you, becauſe we iudged you a member of the body of Chriſt*. Iuſt as if a brother ſhould leaue his Brothers company in ſome ill courſes, and ſhould ſay to him, Herein I forſake you, yet I leave you not abſolutely, for I acknowledge you ſtill to be my brother, and ſhall uſe you as a brother: And you perverting his ſpeech, ſhould pretend that he had ſaid, I leaue your company in theſe ill courſes, and I doe well to doe ſo, becauſe you are my Brother: ſo making that the cauſe of his leaving him, which indeed is the cauſe that he left him no farther.

75 But you ſay, *The very reaſon for which hee acquitteth himſelfe from Schiſme, is becauſe he holds that the Church which they forſook, is not cut off from the Body of Chriſt*. Anſ. This is true: But can you not perceive a difference between juſtifying his ſeparation from Schiſme by this reaſon, and making this the reaſon of his ſeparation? If a man denying obedience in ſome unlawfull matter to his lawfull Soveraign, ſhould ſay to him, herein I diſobey you, but yet I am no Rebell, becauſe I acknowledge you my Soveraign Lord, and am ready to obey you in all things lawfull, ſhould not he be an egregious ſycophant, that ſhould accuſe him as if he had ſaid, I doe well to diſobey you, becauſe I acknowledge you my lawfull Soveraign? Certainly hee that joynes this acknowledgment with his neceſſitated diſobedience, does well; but he that makes this conſideration the reaſon of his diſobedience, doth ill. Vrge therefore this (as you call it) moſt ſolemn foppery as far as you pleaſe: For every underſtanding Reader will eaſily perceiue that this is no foppery of D. *Potters*, but a calumny of yours; from which he is as far, as he is from holding yours to bee the true Church: whereas it is a ſign of a great deal of Charity in him, that he allowes you to be a Part of it.

76 And *whereas you pretend to finde ſuch unſpeakable comfort herein, that we cannot cleare our ſelues from Schiſme, otherwiſe then by acknowledging that they doe not, nor cannot cut off your Church from the hope of ſalvation*: I beſeech you to take care that this falſe comfort coſt

you

you not too deare. For why this good opinion of God Almighty, that he will not damne men for errour, who were without their owne fault ignorant of the truth, ſhould be any conſolation to them, who having the key of knowledge, will neither uſe it themſelves, nor permit others to uſe it; who haue eyes to ſee and will not ſee, who haue eares to heare and will not heare! this I aſſure you paſſeth my capacity to apprehend. Neither *is this to make our ſalvation depend on yours*, but only ours and yours not deſperatly inconſiſtent. Nor to ſay wee *muſt be damn'd unleſſe you may be ſaved*; but that we aſſure our ſelues, if our lives be anſwerable, we ſhall be ſaved by our knowledge. And that wee hope (and I tell you again *Spes eſt rei incertæ nomen*,) that ſome of you may poſſibly bee the rather ſaved by occaſion of their unaffected Ignorance.

77 For our Brethren whom you ſay *we condemn of hereſie for denying the Churches perpetuity*, we know none that doe ſo: unleſſe you conceive a corrupted Church to be none at all; and if you doe, then for ought I know, in your account we muſt be all Heretiques; for all of us acknowledge that the Church might be corrupted even with errors in themſelves damnable, and not only might, but hath been.

78 *But Schiſme conſiſts in being divided from that true Church, with which a man agreeth in all points of faith: Now we muſt profeſſe you agree with the Church of Rome in all Fundamentall Articles; Therefore* we *are Schiſmatiques*. Anſ. Either in your Major, by *all points of faith*, you mean *all fundamentall points only*, or *all ſimply and abſolutely*. If the former, I deny your Major: for I may without all ſchiſme divide from that Church which erres in any point of faith Fundamentall or otherwiſe, if ſhe require the profeſſion of this Errour among the conditions of her Communion. Now this is our caſe. If the latter, I deny the ſyllogiſme, as having manifeſtly foure termes, and being coſen German to this,

He that obeys God in all things, is innocent;
Titius obeys God in ſome things;
Therefore he is innocent.

79 *But they who judge a reconciliation with the Church of Rome to be damnable, they that ſay there might be iuſt and neceſſary cauſe to depart from it, and that they of that Church which haue underſtanding & meanes to diſcover their Errour, and neglect to uſe them, are not to bee flattered with hope of ſalvatiõ; they doe cut off that Church from the body of Chriſt and the hope of ſalvation, and ſo are Schiſmatiques: But D. Potter doth the former; therefore is a Schiſmatique.* Anſ. No, he doth not: not cut off that whole Church from the hope of ſalvation, not thoſe members of it who were invincibly, or excuſably ignorant of the truth; but thoſe only who having underſtanding and meanes to diſcover their errour, neglect to uſe them. Now theſe are not the whole Church; & therefore he that, ſuppoſing their impenitence, cuts theſe off from hope of ſalvation, cannot be juſtly ſaid to cut off that whole Church from the Body of Chriſt, and the hope of ſalvation.

80 *Ad* § 28.29. Whereas D. *Potter ſaies, There is a great difference between a Schiſme from them, and a Reformation of our ſelves: this*

you ſay *is a quaint ſubtilty by which all Schiſme and ſinne may be as well excuſed.* It ſeems then in your judgement, that theeves and adulterers, and murtherers, and traytors may ſay with as much probability as Proteſtants, that they did no hurt to others, but only reforme themſelves. But then me thinks it is very ſtrange, that all Proteſtants ſhould agree with one conſent in this defence of themſelves from the imputation of Schiſme: and that to this day, never any Theefe or Murtherer ſhould haue been heard of to make uſe of this Apologie! And then for Schiſmatiques I would know, whether *Victor* Biſhop of Rome, who excommunicated the Churches of *Aſia* for not conforming to his Church in keeping Eaſter; whether *Novatian* that divided from *Cornelius*, upon pretence that himſelfe was elected Biſhop of Rome, when indeed he was not; whether *Feliciſſimus* and his Crew, that went out of the Church of *Carthage*, and ſet up altar againſt altar, becauſe having fallen in perſecutiō, they might not be reſtored to the peace of the Church preſently, upon the interceſſion of the Confeſſours; whether the *Donatiſts*, who divided from, and damned all the world, becauſe all the world would not excommunicate them who were accuſed onely and not convicted to haue been Traditors of the ſacred Books; whether they which for the ſlips & infirmity of others, which they might and ought to tolerate, or upon ſome difference in matters of Order & Ceremony, or for ſome errour in doctrine, neither pernitious nor hurtfull to faith or piety, ſeparate themſelves from others, or others from themſelves; or laſtly, whether they that put themſelves out of the Churches unity and obedience, becauſe their opinions are not approved there, but reprehended and confuted, or becauſe being of impious converſation, they are impatient of their Churches cenſure: I would know I ſay, whether all, or any of theſe, may with any face or without extreme impudency, put in this plea of Proteſtants, and pretend with as much likelihood as they, that they did not ſeparate from others, but only reforme themſelves? But ſuppoſe they were ſo impudent as to ſay ſo in their own defence falſely, doth it follow by any good Logick, that therefore this Apology is not to be imployed by Proteſtants, who may ſay ſo truly? *We make* (ſay they) *no Schiſme from you, but only a reformation of our ſelves: This*, you reply, *is no good juſtification, becauſe it may be pretended by any Schiſmatique.* Very true, any Schiſmatique that can ſpeak may ſay the ſame words, (as any Rebell that makes conſcience the cloake of his impious diſobedience, may ſay with S. *Peter* and S. *Iohn*, *we muſt obey God rather then men*;) But then the queſtion is, whether any Schiſmatique may ſay ſo truly? And to this queſtion you ſay juſt nothing: but conclude, becauſe this defence may be abuſed by ſome, it muſt be uſed by none. As if you ſhould haue ſaid, S. *Peter* and S. *Iohn* did ill to make ſuch an anſwer as they made, becauſe impious Hypocrites might make uſe of the ſame to palliate their diſobedience and Rebellion againſt the lawfull commands of lawfull Authority.

81 *But ſeeing their pretended Reformation conſiſted in forſaking the Churches corruptions, their Reformation of themſelves, and their diviſion*

diviſion from you, falls out to be one and the ſame thing.) Iuſt as if two men having been a long while companions in drunkeneſſe, one of them ſhould turne ſober; this Reformation of himſelfe, and diſertion of his companion, in this ill cuſtome, would be one and the ſame thing, and yet there is no neceſſity that he ſhould leave his love to him at all, or his ſociety in other things. So Proteſtants forſaking their own former corruptions, which were common to them with you, could not chooſe but withall forſake you in the practice of theſe corruptions: yet this they might, and would have done without breach of Charity towards you; and without a renunciation of your company in any act of piety and devotion, confeſſedly lawfull. And therefore though both theſe were by accident joyned together, yet this hinders not but that the end they aimed at, was not a ſeparation from you, but a reformation of themſelves.

82 Neither *doth their diſagreement in the particulars of the Reformation,* (which yet when you meaſure it without partiality, you will find to be farre ſhort of infinite) *nor their ſymboliſing in the generall of forſaking your corruptions,* prove any thing to the contrary, or any way advantage your deſigne or make for your purpoſe. For it is not any ſigne at all, much leſſe an evident ſigne, that they had no ſetled deſigne, but only to forſake the Church of Rome: for nothing but malice can deny, that their intent at leaſt was, to reduce Religion to that originall purity from which it was fallen. The declination from which, ſome conceiving to have begunne (though ſecretly) in the Apoſtles times, (*the myſtery of iniquity being then in worke;*) and after their departure to have ſhewed it ſelfe more openly: others again believing, that the Church continued pure for ſome Ages after the Apoſtles, & then declined: And conſequently ſome aiming at an exact conformity with the Apoſtolique times: Others thinking they ſhould doe God and men good ſervice, could they reduce the Church to the condicion of the fourth & fifth ages: Some taking their direction in this work of Reformation, only from Scripture; others from the writings of Fathers, and the Decrees of Councells of the firſt five Ages: certainly it is no great marveile, that there was, as you ſay, diſagreement between them, in the particulars of their Reformation; nay morally ſpeaking, it was impoſſible it ſhould be otherwiſe. Yet let me tell you, the difference between them (eſpecially in compariſon of your Church and Religion,) is not the difference between good and bad, but between good and better: And they did beſt that followed Scripture, interpreted by Catholique written Tradition: which rule the reformers of the Church of England, propoſed to themſelves to follow.

83 *Ad* §. 30.31.32. To this effect *D. Potter*, p. 81.82. of his book, ſpeaks thus. *If a Monaſtery ſhould reforme it ſelfe, and ſhould reduce into practice ancient good diſcipline, when others would not: In this caſe could it be charged with Schiſme from others, or with Apoſtacy from its rule and order? So in a ſociety of men univerſally infected with ſome diſeaſe, they that ſhould free themſelves from it, could they be*

therefore

therefore ſaid to ſeparate from the ſociety? He preſumes they could not, and from hence concludes, *that neither can the Reformed Churches be truly accuſed for making a Schiſme, (that is ſeparating from the Church, and making themſelves no members of it) if all they did was (as indeed it was) to reforme themſelves.* Which caſes I believe any underſtanding man will plainly ſee to have in them an exact parity of Reaſon, and that therefore the Argument drawn from them is preſſing and un-anſwerable. And it may well be ſuſpected, that you were partly of this mind, otherwiſe you would not have ſo preſum'd upon the ſimplicity of your Reader as, pretending to anſwer it, to put another of your own making in place of it, and then to anſwere that.

84 This you doe §. 31. 32. of this Chapter, in theſe words, *I was very glad to find you in a Monaſtery, &c.* Where I beſeech the Reader to obſerve theſe things to detect the cunning of your tergiverſation: Firſt, That you have no Reaſon to ſay, *That you found D. Potter in a Monaſtery*: and as little, *that you find him inventing waies how to forſake his vocation, and to maintaine the lawfulneſſe of Schiſme from the Church, and Apoſtacy from a Religious Order.* Certainly the innocent caſe put by the Doctor, of a Monaſtery reforming it ſelfe, hath not deſerved ſuch grievous accuſations. Vnleſſe Reformation with you be all one with Apoſtacy: and to forſake ſinne and diſorder, be to forſake ones vocation. And ſurely if it be ſo, your vocations are not very lawfull, and your Religious orders not very religious. Secondly, that you quite pervert and change *D. Potters* caſes, and in ſtead of the caſe, of a *whole Monaſtery reforming it ſelfe, when other Monaſteries of their Order would not*; and of *ſome men freeing themſelves from the common diſeaſe of their ſociety, when others would not*: you ſubſtitute two others, which you thinke you can better deale with; of *ſome particular Monkes, upon pretence of the neglect of leſſer monaſticall obſervances, going out of their Monaſtery, which Monaſtery yet did confeſſedly obſerve their ſubſtantiall Vowes, and all Principall Statutes: And of a diſeaſed Perſon, quitting the company of thoſe that were infected with the ſame diſeaſe: though in their company, there was no danger from his diſeaſe, it being impoſſible that ſhould be mortall: and out of it, no hope of eſcaping others like that for which he forſook the firſt infected Company.* I appeale now to any indifferent judge, whether theſe caſes be the ſame or neere the ſame with D. *Potters?* Whether this be faire and ingenuous dealing, in ſtead of his two inſtances, which plainly ſhewed it poſſible in other ſocieties, and conſequently in that of the Church, to leave the faults of a ſociety, and not leave being of it, to foiſt in two others, clean croſſe to the Doctors purpoſe, of men under colour of faults, abandoning the ſociety wherein they lived? I know not what others may think of this dealing, but to me, this declining D. *Potters* caſes and conveying others into their place, is a great aſſurance, that as they were put by him, you could ſay nothing to them.

85 But that no ſuſpicion of tergiverſation may be faſtned upon me, I am content to deale with you a little, at your own weapons. Put the caſe then, though not juſt as you would have it, yet with as much favour

favour to you, as in reaſon you can expect, That a Monaſtery did obſerve her ſubſtantiall vowes, and all Principall ſtatutes, but yet did generally practiſe, and alſo enjoyne the violation of ſome leſſer, yet obliging obſervances, and had done ſo time out of mind. And that ſome inferiour Monkes more conſcientious then the reſt, diſcovering this abuſe, ſhould firſt with all earneſtneſſe ſollicite their Superiours for a generall and orderly reformation of theſe, though ſmall and veniall corruptions, yet corruptions: But finding they hop'd and labour'd in vain to effect this, ſhould reforme theſe faults in themſelves, and refuſe to joyne in the practice of them, with the reſt of their Confraternity, and perſiſting reſolutely in ſuch a refuſall, ſhould by their Superiours be caſt out of their Monaſtery, and being not to be re-admitted without a promiſe of remitting from their ſtiffeneſſe in theſe things, and of condeſcending to others in the practice of their ſmall faults; ſhould chooſe rather to continue exiles, then to re-enter upon ſuch conditions: I would know whether you would condemne ſuch men of Apoſtacy from the Order? Without doubt if you ſhould, you would finde the ſtreame of your Caſuiſts againſt you, and beſides, involve S. *Paul* in the ſame condemnation, who plainly tels, that *we may not doe the leaſt evill, that we may doe the greateſt good.* Put caſe again, you ſhould be part of a Society univerſally infected with ſome diſeaſe, and diſcovering a certain remedy for this diſeaſe, ſhould perſwade the whole company to make uſe of it, but finde the greateſt part of them ſo farre in love with their diſeaſe, that they were reſolved to keepe it; and beſides, ſhould make a decree, that whoſoever would leave it, ſhould leave their company. Suppoſe now that your ſelfe and ſome few others, ſhould notwithſtanding their injunction to the contrary, free your ſelves from this diſeaſe, and thereupon they ſhould abſolutely forſake and reject you: I would know in this caſe who deſerves to be condemned, whether you of uncharitable deſertion of your company, or they of a tyrannicall peeviſhneſſe? And if in theſe caſes you will (as I verily believe you will,) acquit the inferiors and condemne the ſuperiors, abſolve the minor part and condemne the maior, then can you with no reaſon condemne Proteſtants, for chooſing rather to be ejected from the communion of the Roman Church, then with her to perſiſt (as of neceſſity they were to doe, if they would continue in her communion) in the profeſſion of Errors, though not deſtructive of ſalvation, yet hindering edification, and in the Practice, or at leaſt approbation of many, (ſuppoſe not mortall) but veniall corruptions.

86 Thirdly, that you cenſure too partially the corrupt eſtate of your *Church, in comparing it to a Monaſtery, which did confeſſedly obſerve their ſubſtantiall vowes, and all Principall Statutes of their order, and moreover was ſecured by an infallible aſſiſtance, for the avoiding of all ſubſtantiall corruptions*: for of your Church we confeſſe no ſuch matter, but ſay plainly, That ſhe not only might fall into ſubſtantiall corruptions, but did ſo; that ſhe did not only generally violate, but of all the members of her communion, either in act or approbation, re-

quire and exact the violation of many ſubſtantiall lawes of Chriſt, both Ceremoniall and Morall, which though we hope it was pardonable in them, who had not meanes to know their errour, yet of its own nature, and to them who did or might have known their errour, was certainly damnable. And that it was not the *tything of Mint, and Anniſe, and Cummin*, the neglect whereof we impute unto you, but *the neglect of judgement, juſtice, and the weightier matters of the Law.*

87 Fourthly, I am to repreſent unto you, that you uſe Proteſtants very ſtrangely, in comparing them to a company, who all were *known to be led to their pretended reformation, not with an intent of Reformation, but with ſome other ſiniſter intention*; which is impoſſible to be known of you, and therefore to judge ſo, is againſt Chriſtian Charity, and common equity: and to ſuch *a Company as acknowledge that themſelves, as ſoone as they were gone out from the Monaſtery that deferred to reforme, muſt not hope to be free from thoſe or the like Errors, and Corruptions for which they left their Brethren*: ſeeing this very hope and nothing elſe, moved them to leave your Communion: and this ſpeech of yours, ſo farre as it concernes the ſame errors, plainly deſtroies it ſelfe. For how can they poſſibly fall into the ſame errors by forſaking your Communion, which that they may forſake they doe forſake your Communion? And then for other errors of the like nature and quality, or more enormous then yours, though they deny it not poſſible, but by their negligence and wickedneſſe they may fall into them, yet they are ſo farre from acknowledging that they have no hope to avoid this miſchiefe, that they proclaime to all the world, that it is moſt prone and eaſy to doe ſo, to all thoſe that feare God and love the truth; and hardly poſſible for them to doe otherwiſe, without ſupine negligence and extream impiety.

88 To fit the reddition of your perverted Simile, to the Propoſition of it, you tell *us that we teach that for all fundamentall points, the Church is ſecured from errour.* I Anſwer, Fundamentall errors may ſignify, either ſuch as are repugnant to Gods command, and ſo in their own nature damnable, though to thoſe which out of invincible ignorance practiſe them, not unpardonable: or ſuch as are not only meritoriouſly, but remedileſſely pernitious and deſtructive of Salvation. We hope that yours and the Greeke & other Churches before the Reformation, had not ſo farre apoſtated from Chriſt, as to be guilty of errors of the latter ſort. We ſay that not only the Catholique Church, but every Particular true Church, ſo long as it continues a Church, is ſecur'd from Fundamentall errors of this kind, but ſecur'd not abſolutely by any promiſe of divine aſſiſtance, which being not ordinarily irreſiſtible, but temper'd to the nature of the Receivers, may be neglected, and therefore withdrawn: but by the Repugnance of any errour in this ſenſe fundamentall to the eſſence and nature of a Church. So that to ſpeak properly, not any ſet known company of men is ſecur'd, that, though they neglect the meanes of avoiding error, yet certainly they ſhall not erre, which were neceſſary for the conſtitution of an infallible guide of faith: But rather they which

which know what is meant by a Church, are ſecur'd or rather certain that a Church remaining a Church, cannot fall into fundamentall error, becauſe when it does ſo, it is no longer a Church. As they are certain that men cannot become unreaſonable creatures, becauſe when they doe ſo, they are no longer men. But for fundamentall errors of the former ſort, which yet I hope will warrant our departure from any Communion infected with them, and requiring the Profeſſion of them, from ſuch fundamentall errors, we doe not teach ſo much as that the Church Catholique, much leſſe, (which only were for your purpoſe,) that your Church hath any protection or ſecurity, but know for a certain, that many errors of this nature, had prevailed againſt you; and that a vain preſumption of an abſolute divine aſſiſtance (which yet is promiſed but upon conditions,) made both your preſent errors incurable, and expoſed you to the imminent danger of more & greater. This therefore is either to abuſe what we ſay, or to impoſe falſely upon us what we ſay not. And to this you preſently adde another manifeſt falſeſhood, *viz.* that we ſay, *that no particular perſon or Church, hath any promiſe of aſſiſtance in points fundamentall.* Whereas croſſe to this in diameter, there is no Proteſtant but holds, and muſt hold, that there is no particular Church, no nor perſon, but hath promiſe of divine aſſiſtance to lead them into all neceſſary truth; if they ſeeke it as they ſhould, by the meanes which God hath appointed. And ſhould we ſay otherwiſe, we ſhould contrary plain Scripture, which aſſures us plainly, that *every one that ſeeketh findeth, and every one that asketh receiveth*: and that *if we being evill, can give good gifts to our children, much more ſhall our heavenly Father, give his ſpirit to them that aske it*: and that *if any man want wiſdome* (eſpecially ſpirituall wiſdome) *he is to aske of God, who giveth to all men, and upbraideth not.*

89 You obtrude upon us thirdly, *That when Luther began, he being but one, oppoſed himſelfe to all, as well Subjects as Superiors.* Anſ. If he did ſo in the cauſe of God, it was heroically done of him. This had been without hyperbolizing, *Mundus contra Athanaſium*, and *Athanaſius contra Mundum*: neither is it impoſſible, that *the whole world ſhould ſo farre lye in wickedneſſe* (as *S. Iohn* ſpeakes) that it may be lawfull and noble for one man to oppoſe the world. But yet were we put to our oathes, we ſhould ſurely not teſtify any ſuch thing for you; for how can we ſay properly and without ſtreining, that *he oppoſed himſelfe to All*, unleſſe we could ſay alſo, that All oppoſed themſelves to him? And how can we ſay ſo, ſeeing the world can witneſſe, that ſo many thouſands, nay millions followed his ſtandard as ſoone as it was advanced?

90 But, *none that lived immediatly before him thought or ſpake as he did.* This is firſt nothing to the purpoſe. The Church was then corrupted, and ſure it was no diſhonour to him to beginne the Reformation. In the Chriſtian warfare, every man ought to ſtrive to be foremoſt. Secondly, it is more then you can juſtify. For though no man before him lifted up his voice like a trumpet, as *Luther* did, yet

who can aſſure us, but that many before him, both thought and ſpake in lower voice of petitions and remonſtrances, in many points, as he did?

91 Fourthly and laſtly, whereas you ſay that *many chiefe learned Proteſtants, are forced to confeſſe the Antiquity of your Doctrine and Practiſe:* I Anſwer, of many Doctrines and Practiſes of yours, this is not true, nor pretended to be true by thoſe that have dealt in this Argument. Search your ſtorehouſe M. *Brerely*, who hath travailed as farre in this Northweſt diſcovery, as it was poſſible for humane induſtry, and when you have done ſo, I pray informe me, what confeſſions of Proteſtants have you, for the Antiquity of the Doctrine of the Communion in one kinde: the lawfulneſſe and expedience of the Latine ſervice: For the preſent uſe of Indulgences: For the Popes power in Temporalties over Princes: For the picturing of the Trinity: For the lawfulneſſe of the worſhip of Pictures: For your Beades and Roſary, and Ladies Pſalter; and in a word, for your whole worſhip of the B. Virgin: For your oblations by way of conſumption, & therefore in the quality of Sacrifices to the Virgin Mary & other Saints: For your ſaying of *Pater-noſters*, & Creeds to the honour of Saints, and of *Ave-Maries* to the honour of other Saints beſides the Bleſſed Virgin: For infallibility of the Biſhop or Church of Rome: For your prohibiting the Scripture to be read publikely in the Church, in ſuch languages as all may underſtand: For your Doctrine of the Bleſſed Virgins immunity from actuall ſinne; and for your doctrine and worſhip of her immaculate conception: For the neceſſity of Auricular Confeſsion: For the neceſsity of the Prieſts Intention to obtain benefit by any of your Sacraments: And laſtly (not to trouble my ſelfe with finding out more) for this very doctrine of Licentiouſneſſe, That though a man live and dye without the practiſe of Chriſtian vertues, and with the habits of many damnable ſinnes unmortified, yet if he in the laſt moment of life, have any ſorrow for his ſinnes, and joyne confeſsion with it, certainly he ſhall be ſaved? Secondly, they that confeſſe ſome of your doctrines to have been the Doctrine of the Fathers, may be miſtaken, being abuſed by many words and phraſes of the Fathers, which have the Roman ſound, when they are farre from the ſenſe. Some of them I am ſure are ſo, I will name *Goularius*, who in his Commentaries on S. *Cyprian's* 35. *Ep.* grants that the ſentence *Hereſies haue ſprung, &c.* quoted by you §. 36. of this Chapter, was meant of *Cornelius*: whereas it will be very plain to any attentive reader, that S. *Cyprian* ſpeaks there of himſelfe. Thirdly, though ſome Proteſtants confeſſe ſome of your doctrine to be Ancient, yet this is nothing, ſo long as it is evident, even by the confeſsion of all ſides, that many errors, I inſtance in that of the *Millenaries*, and the communicating of Infants, were more ancient. Not any antiquity therefore, unleſſe it be abſolute and primitive, is a certain ſigne of true Doctrine. For if the Church were obnoxious to corruption (as we pretend it was,) who can poſsibly warrant us that part of this corruption, might not get in and prevaile in the 5. or 4. or 3. or 2. age? Eſpecially ſeeing the Apoſtles

Apoſtles aſſure us that the *myſtery of iniquity was working*, though more ſecretly evē in their times. If any man aske how could it become univerſall in ſo ſhort a time? Let him tell me how the Error of the Millenaries, and the communicating of Infants, became ſo ſoone univerſall, and then he ſhall acknowledge, what was done in ſome, was poſſible in others. Laſtly, to cry quittance with you: As there are Proteſtants who confeſſe the antiquity, but alwaies poſt-nate to Apoſtolique, of ſome points of your Doctrine: ſo there want not Papiſts who acknowledge as freely, the novelty of many of them, and the Antiquity of ours. A collection of whoſe teſtimony, we have (without thankes to you) in your *Indices expurgatorij*: The divine Providence, bleſſedly abuſing for the readier manifeſtation of the Truth this engine intended by you for the ſubverſion and ſuppreſſion of it. Here is no place to ſtand upon particulars: onely one generall ingenuous confeſſion of that great *Eraſmus*, may not be paſſ'd over in ſilence. *Non deſunt magni Theologi, qui non verentur affirmare, nihil eſſe in Luthero, quin per probatos authores defendi poſſit.* There want not great Divines, which ſtick not to affirme, that there is nothing in Luther, which may not be defended by good and allowed authors. Whereas therefore you cloſe up this Simile with, *conſider theſe points, and ſee whether your ſimilitude doe not condemne your Progenitors of Schiſme from Gods viſible Church*: I aſſure you, I have well conſidered them, and doe plainly ſee that this is not *D. Potters* ſimilitude, but your owne, and beſides, that it is wholly made up of miſtakes and falſehoods, and is at no hand a ſufficient proofe of this great Accuſation.

Eraſm. Ep. lib. 15. Ep. ad Godeſchalcum. Roſ.

92 Let us come now to the ſecond ſimilitude of your making, in the entrance whereunto you tell us, that from the *Monaſtery D. Potter is fled to an Hoſpitall of perſons Vniverſally infected with ſome diſeaſe, where he findes to be true, what you ſuppoſed, that after his departure from his Brethren, he might fall into greater inconveniences, and more infectious diſeaſes then thoſe for which he left them.* Thus you. But to deale truly with you, I finde nothing of all this, nor how it is conſequent from any thing ſaid by you, or done by D. *Potter*. But this I finde, that you haue compoſed this your ſimilitude as you did the former, of a heap of vaine ſuppoſitions, pretended to be grounded on our confeſſions. As firſt, that *your diſeaſes which we forſook, neither were nor could be mortall*: whereas we aſſure our ſelves, and are ready to juſtifie, that they are and were mortall in themſelves, and would haue been ſo to us, if when light came to us we had loved darkneſſe more then light. And D. *Potter* though he hope your Church wanted no neceſſary vitall part, that is, that ſome in your Church by ignorance might bee ſaved; yet he nothing doubts but that it is full of ulcers without, and diſeaſes within, and is ſo far from extenuating your errours as to make them only like the ſuperfluous fingers of the gyant of Gath. Secondly, *that we had no hope to avoid other diſeaſes like thoſe for which wee forſook your company, nor to be ſecure out of it from damnable errors*: whereas the hope hereof was the only motive of our departure; and we aſſure our ſelves that the meanes to be ſecured from damnable errour, is not

to be ſecure as you are, but carefully to uſe thoſe means of avoiding it, to which God hath promiſed, and will never fayle to giue a bleſſing. Thirdly, that *thoſe innumerable miſchiefes which followed upon the departure of Proteſtants, were cauſed by it as by a proper cauſe*: whereas their doctrine was no otherwiſe the occaſion of them, then the Goſpell of Chriſt of the diuiſion of the world. The only fountaine of all theſe miſchiefes, being indeed no other then your powring out a flood of perſecutions againſt Proteſtants, only becauſe they would not ſin & be damn'd with you for company. Vnleſſe wee may adde the impatience of ſome Proteſtants, who not enduring to be torne in peeces like ſheep by a company of wolves without reſiſtance, choſe rather to dye like ſouldiers then Martyrs.

93 But you proceed, and falling into a fit of admiration, cry out & ſay thus, *To what paſſe hath Hereſie brought men, who bluſh not to compare the beloved Spouſe of the Lord, the only Doue, &c. to a Monaſtery that muſt be forſaken; to the gyant in Gath with ſuperfluous fingers!* but this *Spouſe of Chriſt*, this *onely Doue*, this *purchaſe of our Saviours blood*, this *Catholique Church*, which you thus almoſt deifie, what is it but a Society of men, whereof every particular, and by conſequence, the whole company is or may be guilty of many ſinnes daily committed againſt knowledge & conſcience? Now I would faine underſtand why one errour in faith, eſpecially if not fundamentall, ſhould not conſiſt with the holineſſe of this Spouſe, this Dove, this Church, as well as many and great ſinnes committed againſt knowledge and conſcience? If this be not to ſtrain at gnats and ſwallow camels, I would fain underſtand what it is! And here by the way I deſire you to conſider whether as it were with one ſtroke of a ſponge you doe not wipe out all that you haue ſaid, to proue Proteſtants Schiſmatiques for ſeparating from your Church, though ſuppoſed to bee in ſome errours not fundamentall! *For if any ſuch errour may make her deſerue to be compared to a Monaſtery ſo diſordered that it muſt be forſaken*; then if you ſuppoſe (as here you doe) your Church in ſuch errours, your Church is ſo diſordered that it muſt, and therefore without queſtion may be forſaken, I mean in thoſe her diſorders and corruptions, and no farther.

94 And yet you haue not done with thoſe ſimilitudes, *But muſt obſerve* (you ſay) *one thing, and that is, that as theſe Reformers of the Monaſtery, and others who left the diſeaſed company, could not deny but that they left the ſaid communities: So Luther and the reſt cannot pretend, not to haue left the viſible Church. And that D. Potter ſpeaks very ſtrangely whē he ſaies, In a ſociety of men vniverſally infected with ſome diſeaſe, they that ſhould free themſelues from the common diſeaſe, could not be therefore ſaid to ſeparate from the ſociety. For if they doe not ſeparate themſelues from the ſociety of the infected perſons, how doe they free themſelves from the common diſeaſe?* To which I anſwer: That indeed if you ſpeak of the Reformers of a Monaſtery and of the Deſerors of the diſeaſed company, as you put the caſes, that is, of thoſe which left theſe communities, then is it as true as Goſpell, that they cannot deny but

but that they left the ſaid communities. But it appeares not to me how it will enſue hereupon: that *Luther* and the reſt cannot pretend not to haue left the viſible Church. For to my apprehenſion this Argument is very weak,

> They which left ſome communities cannot truly deny but that they left them; Therefore *Luther* and his followers cannot deny but that they left the viſible Church.

Where me thinks you prove little, but take for granted that which is one of the greateſt Queſtions amongſt us, that is, That the Company which *Luther* left, was the whole Viſible Church: whereas you know we ſay, it was but a part of it, and that corrupted, and obſtinate in her corruptions. Indeed that *Luther* and his followers left off the Practice of thoſe Corruptions wherein the whole Viſible Church did communicate formerly, (which I meant when I acknowledg'd aboue that they forſook the externall Communion of the Viſible Church,) or that they left that part of the Viſible Church in her corruptions which would not be reformed: Theſe things, if you deſire, I ſhall be willing to grant; and that by a *Synecdoche* of the whole for the part, he might be ſaid to forſake the Viſible Church, that is, a part of it, and the greater part. But that properly ſpeaking, he forſook the whole Viſible Church, I hope you will excuſe me if I grant not this, untill you bring better proofe of it, then your former ſimilitude. And my Reaſon is his, becauſe he and his Followers were a part of this Church, and ceaſed not to be ſo by their Reformation. Now he and his followers certainly forſook not themſelves, Therefore not every part of the Church, therefore not the whole Church. But then if you ſpeak of D. *Potters* caſes, according as he put them, and anſwer not your owne Arguments, when you make ſhew of anſwering his: me thinks it ſhould not be ſo unreaſonable as you make it, for the Perſons he ſpeaks of to deny that they left the communities whereof they were Members. For example, That the Monkes of S. *Benets* Order make one Body, whereof their ſeverall Monaſteries are ſeverall members, I preſume it will be eaſily granted. Suppoſe now that all theſe Monaſteries being quite out of Order, ſome 20. or 30. of them ſhould reforme themſelves, the reſt perſiſting ſtill in their irregular courſes: were it ſuch a monſtrous impudence as you make it, for theſe Monaſteries, which we ſuppoſe reformed, to deny that they forſook their Order or Community whereof they were parts? In my Opinion it is no ſuch matter. Let the world judge. Againe, whereas the Dr ſaies, *that in a Society of men Vniverſally infected with ſome diſeaſe, they that ſhould free themſelves from the common diſeaſe, could not therefore be ſaid to ſeparate from the Society*: It is very ſtrange to me that you ſhould ſay, he ſpeaks very ſtrangely. Truly Sr I am extreamly deceaved if his words be not plain Engliſh, and plain ſenſe, and containe ſuch a manifeſt Truth as cannot be denyed with modeſty, nor gone about to be proved without vanity. For whatſoever is proved muſt be proved by ſomething more evident: Now what can be more evident then this; That if ſome whole Families were taken with Agues, if the Father of this Family ſhould

free

free himſelfe from his, that he ſhould not therefore deſervedly be thought to abandon and deſert his Family? But (ſay you) if they doe not ſeparate themſelves from the Society of the wicked perſons, how doe they free themſelves from the common diſeaſe? Doe they at the ſame time remaine in the company and yet depart from thoſe infected creatures? Me thinks a Writer of Controverſies ſhould not be ignorant how this may be done without any ſuch difficulty! But if you doe not know, I'le tell you. There is no neceſſity they ſhould leaue the company of theſe infected perſons at all: much leſſe, that they ſhould at once depart from it and remaine with it, which I confeſſe were very difficult. But if they will free themſelues from their diſeaſe, let them ſtay where they are, and take phyſick. Or if you would be better informed how this ſtrange thing may be done, learne from your ſelfe, *They may free their own perſons from the common diſeaſe, yet ſo that they remain ſtill in the company infected, eating and drinking with them, &c.* Which are your own words within foure or fiue lines after this: plainly ſhewing that your miſtaking D. *Potters* meaning, & your wondring at his words as at ſome ſtrange monſters, was all this while affected, and that you are conſcious to your ſelfe of perverting his Argument that you may ſeem to ſay ſomething, when indeed you ſay nothing. Whereas therefore you adde, *we muſt then ſay that they ſeparate themſelues from the perſons, though it be by occaſion of the diſeaſe*, I aſſure you good Sir, you muſt not doe ſo at any hand; for then you alter & ſpoile D. *Potters* caſe quite, and fight not with his reaſon but your own ſhadow. For the inſtance of *a man freeing himſelfe from the diſeaſe of his company, and not leaving his company*, is very fit to proue, by the parity of reaſon, that it is very poſſible, a man may leaue the corruptions of a Church, and not leaue the Church, that is, not ceaſe to be a member of it: But yours *of a man leaving his company by occaſion of their diſeaſe*, hath no analogy at all with this buſineſſe.

95 But *Luther & his followers did not continue in the cõpany of thoſe from whoſe diſeaſes they pretend to free themſelves.* Very true, neither was it ſaid they did ſo. There is no neceſſity that that which is compared to another thing ſhould agree with it in all things: it is ſufficient if it agree in that wherein it is compared. A man freeing himſelfe from the common diſeaſe of a ſociety, and yet continuing a part of it, is here compared to *Luther* and his followers, freeing themſelues from the corruptions of the viſible Church, & continuing a part of the Church. As for accompanying the other parts of it in all things, it was neither neceſſary, nor, without deſtroying our ſuppoſition of their forſaking the corruptions of the Church, poſſible. Not neceſſary; for they may be parts of the Church which doe not joyne with other parts of it in all obſervances. Nor poſſible, for had he accompanied them in all things, he had not freed himſelfe from the common corruptions.

96 But they *indeavoured to force the ſociety whereof they were parts to be healed and reformed as they were; and if it refuſed, they did, when they had power driue them away, even their ſuperiours both Spirituall and Temporall as is notorious.* The proofes hereof are wanting and there-

fore

fore I might deferre my anſwer untill they were produced; yet take this before hand: If they did ſo, then herein, in my opinion, they did amiſſe; for I haue learnt from the ancient Fathers of the Church, that *nothing is more againſt Religion then to force Religion*, & of S. *Paul*, *the weapons of the Chriſtian warfare are not carnall.* And great reaſon: For humane violence may make men counterfeit, but cannot make them believe, & is therefore fit for nothing but to breed forme without, & Atheiſme within. Beſides, if this meanes of bringing men to embrace any Religion were generally uſed (as if it may be juſtly uſed in any place by thoſe that haue power, and think they haue truth, certainly they cannot with reaſon deny but that it may bee uſed in every place, by thoſe that haue power as well as they, and think they haue truth as wel as they,) what could follow but the maintenance perhaps of truth, but perhaps onely of the profeſſion of it in one place, & the oppreſſion of it in a hundred? What will follow from it but the preſervation peradventure of unity, but peradventure only of uniformity in particular States & Churches; but the immortalizing the greater and more lamentable diviſions of Chriſtendome and the world? And therefore what can follow from it, but perhaps in the judgement of carnall policie, the temporall benefit and tranquillity of temporall States and Kingdomes, but the infinit prejudice, if not the deſolation of the kingdome of Chriſt? And therefore it well becomes thē who haue their portions in this life, who ſerve no higher State then that of *England*, or *Spain*, or *France*, nor this neither any further then they may ſerue themſelves by it; who thinke of no other happineſſe but the preſervation of their own fortunes and tranquillity in this world; who think of no other meanes to preſerve States, but humane power and Machiavillian policie; and belieue no other Creed but this, *Regi aut Civitati imperium habenti nihil iniuſtum, quod utile!* Such men as theſe it may become to maintaine by worldly power and violence their State inſtrument, Religion. For if all be vain and falſe, (as in their judgement it is) the preſent whatſoever, is better then any, becauſe it is already ſetled: and alteration of it may draw with it change of States, and the change of State the ſubverſion of their fortune. But they that are indeed ſervants and lovers of Chriſt, of truth, of the Church, and of man-kinde, ought with all courage to oppoſe themſelves againſt it, as a common enemy of all theſe. They that know there is a King of Kings and Lord of Lords, by whoſe will and pleaſure Kings and Kingdomes ſtand and fall, they know, that to no King or ſtate any thing can be profitable which is unjuſt; and that nothing can be more evidently unjuſt, then to force weak men by the profeſſion of a religion which they believe not, to looſe their owne eternall happineſſe, out of a vain and needleſſe feare, leaſt they may poſſibly diſturb their temporall quietneſſe. There is no danger to any ſtate from any mans opinion; unleſſe it be ſuch an opinion by which diſobedience to authority, or impiety is taught or licenc'd, which ſort, I confeſſe may juſtly be puniſhed as well as other faults; or unleſſe this ſanguinary doctrine bee joyn'd with it, that it is lawfull for him by humane violence to enforce others to it. Therefore if Proteſtants did of-

fer violence to other mens conſciences and compell them to embrace their Reformation, I excuſe them not: much leſſe if they did ſo to the ſacred Perſons of Kings, and thoſe that were in authority over them, who ought to be ſo ſecur'd from violence, that even their unjuſt and tyrannous violence, though it may be avoided (according to that of our Saviour, *When they perſecute you in one Citty fly into another,*) yet may it not be reſiſted by oppoſing violence againſt it. Proteſtants therefore that were guilty of this crime are not to be excuſed, and bleſſed had they been had they choſen rather to be Martyrs then murderers, and to dye for their religion rather then to fight for it. But of all the men in the world you are the moſt unfit to accuſe them hereof, againſt whō the ſoules of the Martyrs from under the Altar cry much lowder then againſt all their other Perſecutors together: Who for theſe many ages together haue daily ſacrificed *Hecatombes* of innocent Chriſtians, under the name of Heretiques, to your blind zeal and furious ſuperſtition. Who teach plainly, that you may propagate your Religion whenſoever you haue power by depoſing of Kings and invaſion of Kingdomes, & think when you kill the adverſaries of it, you doe God good ſervice. But for their departing corporally from them, whom mentally they had forſaken: For their forſaking the externall Cōmunion & company of that part of the unreformed part of the Church, in their ſuperſtitions & impieties: thus much of your accuſation we embrace & glory in it; And ſay though ſome Proteſtants might offend in the manner or the degree of their ſeparation, yet certainly their ſeparation it ſelfe was not Schiſmaticall, but innocent, and not only ſo, but juſt and neceſſary. And as for your obtruding upon D. *Potter* that he ſhould ſay, *There neither was nor could be iuſt cauſe to doe ſo, no more then to depart from Chriſt himſelfe.* I haue ſhewed divers times already, that you deal very injuriouſly with him, confounding together, *Departing from the Church*, and *Departing from ſome generall opinions and practiſes*, which did not conſtitute but vitiate, not make the Church but marre it. For though he ſaies, that which is moſt true, that *there can be no iuſt cauſe to depart from the Church*, that is, to ceaſe being a member of the Church, *no more then to depart from Chriſt himſelf*, in as much as theſe are not divers but the ſame thing, yet he no where denies, but there might be iuſt and neceſſary cauſe to depart from ſome opinions and practiſes of your Church, nay of the Catholique Church. And therefore you doe vainly to infer, that *Luther and his followers for ſo doing, were Schiſmatiques.*

97 *Ad* § 35. I anſwer in a word, that neither are *Optatus* his ſayings rules of Faith, and therefore not fit to determine Controverſies of Faith; And then that *Majorinus* might well be a Schiſmatique for departing from *Cæcilianus*, and the Chayre of *Cyprian* & *Peter* without cauſe, and yet *Luther* and his followers who departed from the Communion of the Biſhop of Rome, and the Biſhop of their own Dioceſſe be none, becauſe they had juſt and neceſſary cauſe of their departure. For otherwiſe they muſt haue continued in the profeſſion of known Errours and the practiſe of manifeſt corruptions.

98 *Ad*

98 *Ad § 36.* In the next Section you tell us, that *Chriſt our Lord gaue S. Peter & his ſucceſſors authority over his whole Militant Church.* And for proof hereof *you firſt referre us to Brerely, citing exactly the places of ſuch cheefe Proteſtants as haue confeſſed the antiquity of this point.* Where firſt you fall into the Fallacy which is called *Ignoratio elenchi*, or miſtaking the Queſtion; for being to proue this point true, you onely prove it ancient. Which, to what purpoſe is it, when both the parties litigant are agreed that many errors were held by many of the ancient Doctors, much more ancient then any of thoſe who are pretended to be confeſſed by Proteſtants to haue held with you in this matter: and when thoſe whom you haue to doe with, and whom it is vain to diſpute againſt but out of Principles received by them, are all peremptory, that though novelty be a certain note of falſhood, yet no antiquity leſſe then Apoſtolicall is a certain note of truth? Yet this I ſay not as if I did acknowledge what you pretend; that Proteſtants did confeſſe the Fathers againſt them in this point. For the point here iſſuable is not, whether S. *Peter* were head of the Church? Nor whether the Biſhop of Rome had any priority in the Church? Nor whether he had authority over it given him by the Church? But whether by Divine right, and by Chriſts appointment he were Head of the Catholique Church? Now having peruſed *Brerely*, I cannot find any one Proteſtant confeſſing any one Father to haue concurred in opinion with you in this point. And the Reader hath reaſon to ſuſpect, that you alſo out of all the Fathers could not finde any one authority pertinent to this purpoſe: for otherwiſe you were much to blame, citing ſo few, to make choice of ſuch as are impertinent. For let the underſtanding Reader peruſe the 55. *Epiſt.* of S. *Cyprian*, with any ordinary attention, out of which you take your firſt place, and I am confident hee ſhall finde that he meanes nothing elſe by the words quoted by you, But that in one particular Church at one time there ought to bee but one Biſhop, and that he ſhould be obeyed in all things lawfull: The non-performance whereof was one of the moſt ordinary cauſes of hereſies againſt the Faith, and Schiſme from the Communion of the Church Vniverſall. He ſhall finde ſecondly, and that by many convincing Arguments, that though he write to *Cornelius* Biſhop of Rome, yet hee ſpeaks not of him, but of himſelfe then Biſhop of *Carthage*, againſt whom a faction of Schiſmatiques had then ſet up another. And therefore here your ingenuitie is to bee commended aboue many of your ſide: For whereas they ordinarily abuſe this place to proue, that in the whole Church there ought to be but one Prieſt and one Iudge; you ſeem ſomewhat diffident hereof, and thereupon ſay, *that theſe words plainly condemne Luther, whether he will underſtand them as ſpoken of the Vniverſall or of every particular Church.* But whether they condemne *Luther* is another Queſtion. The queſtion here is, whether they plainly proue the Popes Supremacy over al other Biſhops? which certainly they are as far from proving, as from proving the ſupremacy of any other Biſhop: ſeeing it is evident they were intended not of one Biſhop over the whole Catholique Church, but of one Biſhop in one particular Church.

99 And no leſſe impertinent is your ſaying out of *Optatus*, if it be well lookt into, though at the firſt ſight it may ſeem otherwiſe; becauſe *Optatus* his ſcene happened to be *Rome*, whereas S. *Cyprians* was *Carthage*. The truth is the Donatiſts had ſet up at *Rome* a Biſhop of their faction: not with intent to make him Biſhop of the whole Church but of that Church in particular. Now *Optatus* going upon S. *Cyprians* aboue mentioned ground of *one Biſhop in one Church*, proves them Schiſmatiques for ſo doing, and he proves it by this Argument: S. *Peter* was firſt Biſhop of *Rome*, neither did the Apoſtles attribute to themſelves each one his particular Chaire, (underſtand *in that Citty*, for in other places others I hope had Chaires beſides S. *Peter*) and therefore he is a Schiſmatique, who againſt that one ſingle Chaire erects another (underſtand as before, *in that place*) making another Biſhop of that Dioceſſe beſides him who was lawfully elected to it.

100 But *yet by the way he ſtiles S. Peter head of the Apoſtles, and ſaies that from thence he was called Cephas.* Anſ. Perhaps he was abuſed into this opinion, by thinking *Cephas* derived from the greeke word κεφαλή a head: whereas it is a Syriack word and ſignifies a ſtone. Beſides S. *Peter* might be head of the Apoſtles, that is, firſt in order and honour among them, and not have ſupreme Authority over them. And indeed that S. *Peter* ſhould have authority over all the Apoſtles, and yet exerciſe no one act of Authority over any one of them, and that they ſhould ſhew to him no ſigne of ſubjection, me thinkes is as ſtrange, as that a King of England for twenty five yeares ſhould doe no Act of Regality, nor receive any one acknowledgement of it. As ſtrange me thinks it is, that you ſo many ages after, ſhould know this ſo certainly, as you pretend to doe, and that the Apoſtles (after that thoſe words were ſpoken in their hearing, by vertue whereof S. *Peter* is pretended to have been made their head,) ſhould ſtill be ſo ignorant of it, as to queſtion *which of them ſhould be the greateſt?* yet more ſtrange, that our Saviour ſhould not bring them out of their error, by telling them S. *Peter* was the man, but rather confirme it by ſaying, *the Kings of the Gentiles exerciſe authority over them, but it ſhould not be ſo among them.* No leſſe a wonder was it that S. *Paul* ſhould ſo farre forget S. *Peter* and himſelfe, as that firſt mentioning him often, he ſhould doe it without any title of Honour. Secondly, ſpeaking of the ſeverall degrees of men in the Church, he ſhould not give S. *Peter* the higheſt, but place him in equipage with the reſt of the Apoſtles, and ſay, *God hath appointed* (not *firſt Peter, then the reſt* of the Apoſtles, but) *firſt Apoſtles, ſecondly Prophets.* Certainly if the Apoſtles were *all firſt*, to me it is very probable, that no one of them was before the reſt. For by *Firſt*, all men underſtand either that which is before all, or that before which is nothing. Now in the former ſenſe, the Apoſtles could not be all firſt, for then every one of them muſt have been before every one of the reſt. And therefore they muſt be *Firſt* in the other ſenſe. And therefore No man, and therefore not S. *Peter*, muſt be before any of them. Thirdly and Laſtly, that ſpeaking of himſelfe in particular, and perhaps comparing himſelfe with

with S. *Peter* in particular, rather then any other, he ſhould ſay in plain termes, *I am in nothing inferior to the very chiefeſt Apoſtles*. But beſides all this, Though we ſhould grant againſt all theſe probabilities and many more, that *Optatus* meant that S. *Peter* was head of the Apoſtles, not in our but in your ſenſe, and that S. *Peter* indeed was ſo; yet ſtill you are very farre from ſhewing, that in the judgement of *Optatus*, the Biſhop of Rome, was to be at all, much leſſe by divine right, ſucceſſor to S. *Peter* in this his Headſhip & Authority. For what incōgruity is there, if we ſay, that he might ſucceed S. *Peter* in that part of his care, the government of that particular Church, (as ſure he did even while S. *Peter* was living,) and yet that neither he nor any man was to ſucceed him in his Apoſtleſhip, nor in his government of the Church Vniverſall? Eſpecially ſeeing S. *Peter* and the reſt of the Apoſtles, by laying the foundations of the Church, were to be the *Foundations of it*, and accordingly are ſo called in Scripture. And therefore as in a building it is incongruous that foundations ſhould ſucceed foundations: So it may be in the Church, that any other Apoſtle ſhould ſucceed the firſt.

101 *Ad* §. 37. The next Paragraph I might well paſſe over, as having no Argument in it. For there is nothing in it but two ſayings of S. *Auſtine*, which I have great reaſon to eſteeme no Argument, untill you will promiſe me, to grant whatſoever I ſhall prove by two ſayings of S. *Auſtine*. But moreover, the ſecond of theſe ſentences ſeemes to me, to imply the contradiction of the firſt. For to ſay, *That the Sacriledge of Schiſme is eminent, when there is no cauſe of ſeparation*, implyes to my underſtanding, that there may be a cauſe of Separation. Now in the firſt, he ſaies plainly *That this is impoſſible*. Neither doth any reconciliation of his wordes occurre to me, but only this, that in the former he ſpeaks upon ſuppoſition, that the Publique ſervice of God, where in men are to communicate is unpolluted, and no unlawfull thing practiſed in their communion, which was ſo true of their communion, that the Donatiſts who ſeparated did not deny it. And to make this Anſwer no improbable evaſion, it is obſervable out of S. *Auſtine* and *Optatus*, that though the Donatiſts, at the beginning of their Separation, pretended no cauſe for it, but only that the men from whom they ſeparated, were defiled with the contagion of Traditors; yet afterwards, to make the continuance of it more juſtifiable, they did invent and ſpread abroad this calumny againſt Catholiques, that they ſet pictures upon their Altars: which when S. *Auſtine* comes to Anſwer, he does not deny the poſſibility of the thing, for that had been to deny the Catholique Church to be made up of men, all which had free will to evill, and therefore might poſſibly agree in doeing it, and had he denyed this, the Action of after Ages had been his refutation: Neither does he ſay, (as you would have done,) that it was true, they placed pictures there, and moreover worſhipped them, but yet not for their own ſakes, but for theirs who were repreſented by them: Neither does he ſay, (as you doe in this Chapter) that though this were granted a Corruption, yet were they not to ſeparate for it. What then does he? certainly nothing elſe, but abhorre the

thing, and deny the imputation: Which way of anſwering, does not I confeſſe plainly ſhew, but yet it ſomewhat intimates that he had nothing elſe to anſwer; and that if he could not have denyed this, he could not have denyed the Donatiſts ſeparation from them to have been juſt. If this Anſwer, to this little Argument ſeem not ſufficient, I adde moreover, that if it be applyed to *Luthers* ſeparation, it hath the common fault of all your Allegations out of Fathers, impertinence. For it is one thing to ſeparate from the Communion of the whole world, another to ſeparate from all the Communions in the world: One thing to divide from them who are united among themſelves, another to diuide from them who are divided among themſelves. Now the Donatiſts ſeparated from the whole World of Chriſtians, united in one Communion, profeſſing the ſame Faith, ſerving God after the ſame manner, which was a very great Argument, that they could not have juſt cauſe to leave them: according to that of *Tertullian, Variaſſe debuerat error Eccleſiarum, quod autem apud multos unum eſt, non eſt Erratum ſed Traditum.* But *Luther* and his followers did not ſo. The world, I mean of Chriſtians and Catholiques, was divided and ſubdivided long before hee divided from it; and by their diviſions had much weakned their own Authority, and taken away from you this plea of S. *Auſtine*, which ſtands upon no other Foundation, but the Vnity of the whole worlds Communion.

102 *Ad §. 38. If Luther were in the right, moſt certain thoſe Proteſtants that differed from him were in the wrong*: But that either he or they were Schiſmatiques, it followes not. Or if it does, then either the Ieſuits are Schiſmatiques from the Dominicans, or they from the Ieſuits; The Canoniſts from the Ieſuites, or the Ieſuites from the Canoniſts: The Scotiſts from the Thomiſts, or they from the Scotiſts: The Franciſcans from the Dominicans, or the Dominicans from the Franciſcans. For between all theſe the world knowes, that in point of Doctrine, there is plain and irreconcileable contradiction, and therefore one Part muſt be in error, at leaſt not Fundamentall. Thus your Argument returnes upon your ſelfe, and if it be good, proves the Roman Church in a manner to bee made up of Schiſmatiques. But the Anſwer to it is, that it begges this very falſe and vain ſuppoſition; That whoſoever erres in any point of doctrine is a Schiſmatique.

103 *Ad §. 39.* In the next place you number up your victories, and tell us, *that out of theſe premiſes, this concluſion followes, That Luther and his followers were Schiſmatiques from the Viſible Church, the Pope, the Dioceſſe wherein they were baptized, from the Biſhop vnder whom they lived, from the country to which they belonged, from their Religious order, wherein they were profeſſed, from one another, and laſtly, from a mans ſelfe: Becauſe the ſelfeſame Proteſtant is convicted to day, that his yeſterdaies opinion was an error.* To which I Anſwer, that *Luther* and his followers ſeparated from many of theſe, in ſome opinions and practices: But that they did it without cauſe, which only can make them Schiſmatiques, that was the only thing you ſhould have prov'd, and to that you have not urged one reaſon of any moment,

ment. All of them for weight and ſtrength, were coſen-germans to this pretty device, wherewith you will prove them Schiſmatiques from themſelves, *becauſe the ſelfe ſame Proteſtant to day is convicted in conſcience, that his yeſterdaies opinion was an error.* It ſeemes then that they that hold errors, muſt hold them faſt, and take ſpeciall care of being convicted in conſcience, that they are in error, for fear of being Schiſmatiques! Proteſtants muſt continue Proteſtants, and Puritans Puritans, and Papiſts Papiſts, nay Iewes, and Turkes, and Pagans, muſt remain Iewes, and Turkes, and Pagans, and goe on conſtantly to the Divell, or elſe forſooth they muſt be *Schiſmatiques*, and that *from themſelves*. And this perhaps is the cauſe that makes Papiſts ſo obſtinate, not only in their common ſuperſtition, but alſo in adhering to the proper phancies of their ſeverall Sects, ſo that it is a miracle to heare of any Ieſuite, that hath forſaken the opinion of the Ieſuites: or any Dominican that hath chang'd his for the Ieſuits. Without queſtion, this Gentleman my Adverſary knowes none ſuch, or elſe methinkes he ſhould not have objected it to D. *Potter (That he knew a man in the world who from a Puritan, was turned to a moderate Proteſtant*, which is likely to bee true. But ſure if this bee all his fault, hee hath no reaſon to be aſhamed of his acquaintance. For poſſibly it may be a fault to be in error, becauſe many times it proceeds from a fault: But ſure the forſaking of error cannot be a ſinne, unleſſe to be in error be a vertue. And therefore, to doe as you doe, to damne men for falſe opinions, and to call them Schiſmatiques for leaving them; to make pertinacy in error, that is, an unwillingneſſe to be convicted, or a reſolution not to be convicted, the forme of Hereſies, and to find fault with men, for being convicted in conſcience that they are in error, is the moſt incoherent and contradictious injuſtice that ever was heard of. But Sir, if this be a ſtrange matter to you, that which I ſhall tell you will be much ſtranger. I know a man that of a moderate Proteſtant turn'd a Papiſt, and the day that he did ſo, (as all things that are done are perfected ſome day or other,) was convicted in conſcience, that his yeſterdaies opinion was an error, and yet thinks hee was no Schiſmatique for doing ſo, and deſires to bee informed by you, whether or no hee was miſtaken? The ſame man afterwards upon better conſideration, became a doubting Papiſt, and of a doubting Papiſt, a confirm'd Proteſtant. And yet this man thinks himſelfe no more to blame for all theſe changes, then a Travailer, who uſing all diligence to find the right way to ſome remote Citty, where he never had been, (as the party I ſpeak of had never been in Heaven,) did yet miſtake it, and after finde his error, and amend it. Nay he ſtands upon his juſtification ſo farre, as to maintain that his alterations, not only to you, but alſo from you by Gods mercy, were the moſt ſatisfactory actions to himſelfe, that ever he did, and the greateſt victories that ever he obtained over himſelfe, and his affections to thoſe things which in this world are moſt precious; as wherein for Gods ſake and (as he was verily perſwaded,) out of love to the Truth, he went upon a certain expectation of thoſe inconveni-

ences, which to ingenuous natures are of all moſt terrible. So that though there were much weakneſſe in ſome of theſe alterations, yet certainly there was no wickedneſſe. Neither does he yeeld his weakneſſe altogether without apology, ſeeing his deductions were rationall, and out of Principles commonly received by Proteſtants as well as Papiſts, and which by his education had got poſſeſſion of his underſtanding.

104 *Ad* §. 40. 41. D. *Potter* p. 81. of his booke, to prove our ſeparation from you, not only lawfull but neceſſary, hath theſe words, *Although we confeſſe the Church of Rome* (in ſome ſenſe) *to be a true Church, and her error* (to ſome men) *not damnable; yet for us who are convinced in conſcience, that ſhe erres in many things, a neceſſity lies upon us, even under pain of damnation, to forſake her in thoſe errors.* He meanes not, in the belief of thoſe errors; for that is preſuppoſed to be done already: for whoſoever is convinc'd in conſcience that ſhe erres, hath for matter of belief forſaken, that is, ceaſed to believe thoſe errors. This therefore he meant not, nor could not meane: but that whoſoever is convinc'd in conſcience, that the Church of Rome erres, cannot with a good conſcience but forſake her in the profeſſion and practice of theſe errors: and the reaſon hereof is manifeſt; becauſe otherwiſe, he muſt profeſſe what he believes not, and practiſe what he approves not. Which is no more then your ſelfe in *theſi* have diverſe times affirmed. For in one place you ſay, *It is unlawfull to ſpeak any the leaſt untruth.* Now he that profeſſeth your Religion, and believes it not, what elſe doth he but live in a perpetuall lye! Again in another, *you have called them that profeſſe one thing and believe another, a damned crew of diſſembling Sycophants:* And therefore in inveighing againſt Proteſtants for forſaking the Profeſſion of theſe errors, the beleefe whereof they had already forſaken, what doe you but raile at them for not being a *damned crew of diſſembling Sycophants?* And laſtly §. 42. of this chap. within three leaves after this, whereas *D. Potter grants but only a neceſſity of peaceable externall obedience to the Declaration of the Church, though perhaps erroneous, (provided it be in matter not of faith, but of opinions or Rites,)* condemning thoſe men who by occaſion of errors of this quality, diſturbe the Churches peace, and caſt off her communion: Vpon this occaſion you come upon him with this bitter ſarcaſme, *I thank you for your ingenuous confeſſion, in recompence whereof I will doe a deed of Charity, by putting you in minde into what Labyrinths you are brought, by teaching that the Church may erre in ſome points of faith, and yet that it is not lawfull for any man to oppoſe his judgement or leave her Communion, though he have evidence of Scripture againſt her! Will you have ſuch a man diſſemble againſt his Conſcience, or externally deny Truth known to be contained in holy Scripture?* I Anſwer for him, no: It is not he but you, that would have men doe ſo: not he, who ſaies plainly, that *whoſoever is convinc'd in conſcience that any Church erres, is bound under pain of damnation to forſake her in her Profeſſion and practice of theſe errors:* but you, who finde fault with him, and make long diſcourſes againſt him, for thus affirming.

Affirming. Not he who can eaſily winde himſelfe out of your Imaginary Labyrinth, by telling you, that he no where denies it lawfull for any man to oppoſe any Church, erring in matter of faith, for that he ſpeaks not of matters of faith at all, but only *of Rites and Opinions*. And in ſuch matters, he ſaies indeed at firſt, *It is not lawfull for any man to oppoſe his judgement to the publique*: But he preſently explaines himſelfe by ſaying, not only that he *may hold an opinion contrary to the Publique reſolution, but beſides that he may offer it to be conſidered of*, (ſo farre is he from requiring any ſinfull diſſimulation,) *Provided, he doe it with great Probability of Reaſon, very modeſtly and reſpectfully*, and without ſeparation from the Churches communion. It is not therefore in this caſe, oppoſing a mans private judgement to the publique ſimply, which the Doctor findes fault with: But the degree only and malice of this oppoſition, *oppoſing it factiouſly*. And not holding a mans own conceit, different from the Church abſolutely, which here he cenſures: But a *factious advancing it, and deſpiſing the Church, ſo farre as to caſt off her Communion*, becauſe forſooth ſhe erres in ſome opinion, or uſeth ſome inconvenient, though not impious rites and ceremonies. Little reaſon therefore have you to accuſe him there, as if he required *that men ſhould diſſemble againſt their conſcience, or externally deny a truth known to be contained in holy Scripture*. But certainly a great deale leſſe, to quarrell with him, for ſaying (which is all that here he ſaies,) that *men under pain of damnation, are not to diſſemble, but if they be convinc'd in conſcience, that your, or any other Church* (for the reaſon is alike for all,) *erres in many things, are of neceſſity to forſake that Church, in the Profeſſion and practice of thoſe errors*.

105 But to conſider your exception to this ſpeech of the Doctors, ſomewhat more particularly: I ſay your whole diſcourſe againſt it, is compounded of *falſehoods* and *impertinencies*. The firſt falſehood is, that he in theſe words avoucheth, *that no learned Catholiques can be ſaved*: Vnleſſe you will ſuppoſe, that all learned Catholiques are convinc'd in conſcience, that your Church erres in many things. It may well be fear'd that many are ſo convinc'd, and yet profeſſe what they believe not. Many more have been, and have ſtifled their conſciences, by thinking it an act of humility, to doe ſo. Many more would have beene, had they with liberty and indifference of judgement, examined the grounds of the Religion which they profeſſe. But to think that all the Learned of your ſide, are actually convinc'd of errors in your Church, and yet will not forſake the profeſſion of them, this is ſo great an uncharitableneſſe, that I verily believe, D. *Potter* abhorres it. Your next falſehood is, *That the Doctor affirmes, that you Catholiques want no meanes to Salvation*: and that he judges *the Roman errors not to be in themſelves fundamentall or damnable*. Which calumny I have very often confuted: and in this very place it is confuted by *D. Potter*, and confeſſed by your ſelfe. For in the beginning of this Anſwer you tell us, that the *Doctor avouches of all Catholiques whom ignorance cannot excuſe, that they cannot be ſaved*. Certainly then he muſt needs eſteeme them to want ſomething neceſſary to Salvation. And then in

the Doctors ſaying, it is remarkable that he confeſſes *your errors to ſome men not damnable*: which cleerely imports, that according to his judgement, they were damnable in themſelves, though by accident to them who lived and died in invincible ignorance, and with repentance, they might prove not damnable. A third is, that theſe *Aſſertions, the Roman Errors are in themſelves not damnable, and yet it is damnable for me (who know them to be errors,) to hold and confeſſe them, are abſolutely inconſiſtent*; which is falſe; for be the matter what it will, yet for a man to tell a lye, eſpecially in matter of Religion, cannot but be damnable. How much more then, to goe on in a courſe of lying by profeſſing to believe theſe things divine Truths, which he verily believes to be falſehoods and fables? A fourth is, that *if we erred in thinking that your Church holds errors, this error or erroneous conſcience might be rectifyed and depoſed, by judging thoſe errors not damnable.* For what repugnance is there between theſe two ſuppoſitions, that you doe hold ſome errors, and that they are not damnable? And if there be no repugnance between them, how can the beleefe of the latter remove or deſtroy, or if it be erroneous, rectify the belief of the former? Nay ſeeing there is a manifeſt conſent between them, how can it be avoided, but the belief of the latter, will maintaine and preſerve the belief of the former? For who can conjoyne in one braine not crackt, (pardon me, if I ſpeake to you in your own words,) theſe Aſſertions: In the Roman Church there are errors not damnable, and, in the Roman Church there are no errors at all? Or what ſober underſtanding would ever think this a good collection, I eſteeme the errors of the Roman Church not damnable, therefore I doe amiſſe to think that ſhe erres at all? If therefore you would have us alter our judgements, that your Church is erroneous, your only way is to ſhew, your doctrine conſonant, at leaſt not evidently repugnant to Scripture and Reaſon. For as for this device, this ſhort cut, of perſwading our ſelves that you hold no errours, becauſe we believe your errors are not damnable, aſſure your ſelfe it will never hold.

106 A fift falſehood is, *That we daily doe this favour for Proteſtants*, you muſt mean (if you ſpeak conſequently) to judge *they have no errors, becauſe we judge they have none damnable.* Which the world knowes to be moſt untrue. And for our continuing in their communion notwithſtanding their errors, the juſtification hereof, is not ſo much, that their errors are not damnable: as that they require not the beliefe and profeſſion of theſe errors, among the conditions of their communion. Which puts a main difference between them and you; becauſe we may continue in their communion without profeſſing to believe their opinions, but in yours we cannot. A ſixt is, that according to the *Doctrine of all Divines, there is any difference between a ſpeculative perſwaſion of conſcience, of the unlawfulneſſe of any thing, and a practicall Dictamen that the ſame thing is unlawfull.* For theſe are but diverſe words ſignifying the ſame thing, neither is ſuch a perſwaſion wholly ſpeculative, but tending to practice: nor ſuch a dictamē wholly practicall, but grounded upon ſpeculation. A Seventh is, *That Proteſtants*

ſtants did only conceive in ſpeculation, that the Church of Rome erred in ſome doctrines, and had not alſo a practicall dictamen, that it was damnable for them to continue in the profeſſion of theſe errors. An eighth is, that *it is not lawfull to ſeparate from any Churches communion, for errors not appertaining to the ſubſtance of Faith*: which is not univerſally true, but with this exception, unleſſe that Church requires the belief and profeſſion of them. The ninth is, that *D. Potter teacheth that Luther was bound to forſake the houſe of God, for an unneceſſary light*. Confuted manifeſtly by *D. Potter* in this very place, for by the houſe of God you mean the Roman Church, and of her the Doctor ſaies: *that a neceſſity did lye upon him, even under pain of damnation, to forſake the Church of Rome in her errors*. This ſure is not to ſay, that he was obliged to forſake her, for an unneceſſary light. The tenth is covertly vented in your intimation, *that Luther and his followers were the proper cauſe of the Chriſtian worlds combuſtion*: Whereas indeed the true cauſe of this lamentable effect, was your violent perſecution of them, for ſerving God according to their conſcience, which if it be done to you, you condemne of horrible impiety, and therefore may not hope to be excuſed, if you doe it to others.

107 The eleaventh is, that our *firſt reformers ought to have doubted whether their opinions were certain*. Which is to ſay, that they ought to have doubted of the certainty of Scripture: which in formall and expreſſe termes, containes many of theſe opinions. And the reaſon of this aſſertion is very vaine: *for though they had not an abſolute infallibility promiſed unto them*, yet may they be of ſome things infallibly certaine. As *Euclide* ſure was not infallible, yet was he certain enough, that *twice two were foure*, and *that every whole was greater then a part of that whole*. And ſo though *Calvin* & *Melanctho* were not infallible in all things, yet they might and did know well enough, that your Latine Service was condemned by S. *Paule*, and that the communion in both kindes was taught by our Saviour. The twelfth and laſt is this, that *your Church was in peaceable poſſeſſion* (you muſt mean of her doctrine, and the Profeſſors of it,) *and enioyed preſcription for many ages*. For beſides, that doctrine is not a thing that may be poſſeſſed: And the profeſſors of it were the Church it ſelfe, and in nature of poſſeſſors, (If we may ſpeak improperly,) rather then the thing poſſeſſed, with whom no man hath reaſon to be offended, if they think fit to quit their own poſſeſſion: I ſay that the poſſeſſion, which the governors of your Church held for ſome ages, of the party governed, was not peaceable, but got by fraude, and held by violence.

108 Theſe are the *Falſhoods* which in this anſwer offer themſelves to any attentive Reader, and that which remaines is meere *impertinence*. As firſt, that *a pretence of conſcience will not ſerve to iuſtifie ſeparation from being Schiſmaticall*. Which is true: but little to the purpoſe, ſeeing it was not an erroneous perſwaſion, much leſſe an Hypocriticall pretence, but a true and well grounded conviction of conſcience, which D. *Potter* alleaged to juſtifie Proteſtants from being Schiſmaticall. And therefore though ſeditious men in Church and

State, may pretend conſcience, for a cloak of their rebellion: yet this I hope hinders not, but that an honeſt man ought to obey his rightly informed conſcience, rather then the unjuſt commands of his tyrannous Superiours. Otherwiſe with what colour can you defend either your own refuſing the oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy? Or the ancient Martyrs, and Apoſtles, and Prophets, who oftentimes diſobeyed the commands of men in authority, and for their diſobedience made no other but this Apologie, *Wee muſt obey God rather then men*? It is therefore moſt apparent that this anſwer muſt be meerly impertinent: ſeeing it will ſerve againſt the Martyrs and Apoſtles and Prophets, & even againſt your ſelues, as well as againſt Proteſtants. To as little purpoſe is your rule out of *Lyrinenſis* againſt them that followed *Luther*, ſeeing they pretend and are ready to juſtify, that they forſook not, with the Doctors, the faith, but only the corruption of the Church. As vain altogether is that which follows: That *in caſes of uncertainty we are not to leave our Superiour, or caſt off his obedience, nor publiquely oppoſe his decrees.* From whence it will follow very evidently, that ſeeing it is not a matter of faith, but a diſputed queſtion among you, whether the Oath of Allegiance be lawfull: that either you acknowledge not the King your Superiour, or doe againſt conſcience, in oppoſing his and the kingdomes decree, requiring the taking of this Oath. This good uſe I ſay may very fairely bee made of it, and is by men of your own religion. But then it is ſo far from being a confutation, that it is rather a confirmation of D. *Potters* aſſertion. For hee that uſeth theſe words, doth he not plainly import (and ſuch was the caſe of Proteſtants,) that we are to leaue our Superiours, to caſt off obedience to them, and publiquely to oppoſe their Decrees, when we are certain (as Proteſtants were,) that what they command, God doth countermand. Laſtly, S. *Cyprians* example is againſt Proteſtants impertinently and even ridiculouſly alleaged. *For what if S. Cyprian holding his opinion true but not neceſſary, condemned no man (much leſſe any Church) for holding the contrary?* Yet me thinks this ſhould lay no obligation upon *Luther* to doe ſo likewiſe: ſeeing he held his own opinions not onely true but alſo neceſſary, & the doctrine of the Roman Church not only falſe but damnable. And therefore ſeeing the condition and ſtate of the parties cenſured by S. *Cyprian* and *Luther* was ſo different, no marvell though their cenſures alſo were different according to the ſuppoſed merit of the parties delinquent. For as for your obtruding again upon us, *that we believe the points of difference not Fundamentall or neneſſary*, you have been often told that it is a calumny. We hold your errors as damnable in themſelves as you doe ours, only by accident through invincible ignorance, we hope they are not unpardonable: and you alſo profeſſe to think the ſame of ours.

109 *Ad* §42. The former part of this diſcourſe, grounded on D. *Potters* words p. 105. I haue already in paſſing examined & confuted: I adde in this place. 1. That though the Doctor ſay, *It is not fit for any private man to oppoſe his iudgement to the publique*, That is, his own judgement and bare authority: yet he denies not, but occaſions may happen

happen wherein it may be very warrantable, to oppoſe his reaſon or the authority of Scripture againſt it. And is not then to be eſteem'd to oppoſe his own judgement to the publique, but the judgment of God to the judgement of men. Which his following words ſeem to import, *He may offer his opinion to be conſidered of, ſo he do it with evidence or great probability of Scripture or reaſon.* Secondly, I am to tell you that you haue no ground from him, to enterline his words with that interrogatory (*His own conceits, and yet grounded upon evidence of Scripture?*) For theſe things are in his words oppoſed, and not confounded, and the latter, not intended for a repetition (as you miſtake it) but for an Antitheſis of the former. *He may offer* (ſaith he) *his opinion to be conſidered of, ſo he doe it with evidence of Scripture. But if hee will factiouſly advance his own conceits*, (that is, ſay I, clean contrary to your gloſſe,) *Such as haue not evident nor very probable ground in Scripture*, (for theſe conceits are properly his own) *he may iuſtly bee branded, &c.* Now that this of the two is the better gloſſe, it is proved by your own interrogation. For that imputes abſurdity to D. *Potter*, for calling them a mans *own conceits*, which were *grounded upon evidence of Scripture.* And therefore you have ſhewed little candour or equity, in faſtning upon them this abſurd conſtruction. They not only bearing, but even requiring another more faire and more ſenſible. Every man ought to be preſum'd to ſpeak ſenſe, rather then non-ſenſe, coherently, rather then contradictiouſly, if his words be fairely capable of a better conſtruction. For M. *Hooker*, if writing againſt Puritans, he had ſaid ſomething unawares that might give advantage to Papiſts it were not inexcuſable: ſeeing it is a matter of ſuch extreme difficulty, to hold ſuch a temper in oppoſing one extreme opinion, as not to ſeem to favour the other. Yet if his words be rightly conſider'd, there is nothing in them that will doe you any ſervice. For though he ſaies that *men are bound to doe whatſoever the ſentence of finall deciſion ſhall determine*, as it is plain men are bound to yeeld ſuch an obedience to all Courts of civill judicature: yet he ſaies not, they *are bound to think* that determination lawfull, and that ſentence juſt. Nay it is plain hee ſaies, that they *muſt doe according to the Iudges ſentence, though in their private opinion it ſeem uniuſt*. As if I be caſt wrongfully in a ſuit at law, and ſentenced to pay an hundred pound, I am bound to pay the mony, yet I know no law of God or man, that binds me in conſcience to acquit the Iudge of errour in his ſentence. The queſtion therefore being only what men ought to think, it is vain for you to tell us what M. *Hooker* ſaies at all. For M. *Hooker*, though an excellent man, was but a man. And much more vain, to tell us out of him, what men ought to doe, for point of externall obedience. When in the very ſame place, he ſuppoſeth and alloweth, that in their private opinion they may think, this ſentence to which they yeeld a paſſive obedience, to ſwarve utterly from that which is right. If you will draw his words to ſuch a conſtruction, as if he had ſaid, they *muſt think the ſentence of iudiciall and finall deciſion iuſt and right, though it ſeem in their private opinion to ſwarue utterly from what is right*; It is manifeſt you make him contra-

dict himſelfe,& make him ſay in effect, They muſt think thus,though at the ſame time they think the contrary. Neither is there any *neceſſity, that hee muſt either acknowledge the univerſall infallibility of the Church, or driue men into diſſembling againſt their conſcience*, ſeeing nothing hinders,but I may obey the ſentence of a Iudge, paying the mony he awards me to pay,or forgoing the houſe or land which hee hath judged from me,and yet withall plainly profeſſe, that in my conſcience I conceive his judgement erroneous. To which purpoſe they haue a ſaying in France, that *whoſoever is caſt in any cauſe,hath liberty for ten daies after,to rayle at his Iudges.*

110 This anſwer to this place, the words themſelves offered mee, even as they are alleaged by you: But upon peruſall of the place in the Author himſelfe, I finde that here, as elſewhere you and M.*Brerely* wrong him extremely. For mutilating his words, you make him ſay that abſolutely,which he there expreſly limits to ſome certain caſes. *In litigious and controverted cauſes of ſuch a quality* (ſaith he) *the will of God,is to haue them doe whatſoever the ſentence of iudiciall and finall deciſion ſhall determine.* Obſerue,I pray,He ſaies not abſolutely and in all cauſes,this is the will of God:But only *in litigious cauſes,of the quality of thoſe whereof he there entreats.* In ſuch matters,as haue plaine Scripture or reaſon,neither for them nor againſt them, and wherein men are perſwaded this or that way,*Vpon their own only probable collection*; In ſuch caſes, *This perſwaſion* (ſaith he) *ought to bee fully ſetled in mens hearts,that the will of God is, that they ſhould not diſobey the certain commands of their lawfull ſuperiors,upon uncertain grounds: But doe that which the ſentence of iudiciall and finall deciſion ſhall determine.* For the purpoſe, a Queſtion there is, whether a Surplice may be worne in Diuine ſervice: The authority of Superiors injoynes this Ceremony, and neither Scripture nor reaſon plainely forbids it. *Sempronius* notwithſtanding, is by ſome inducements, which he confeſſes to be onely probable,lead to this perſwaſion that the thing is unlawfull. The *quære* is,whether he ought for matter of practiſe follow the injunction of authority,or his own private and only probable perſwaſion? M.*Hooker* reſolves for the former, upon this ground, that the *certain commands of the Church we liue in,are to be obeyed in all things,not certainly unlawfull.* Which rule is your own, and by you extended to the commands of all Superiors, in the very next Section before this,in theſe words, *In caſes of uncertainty we are not to leaue our Superiour,nor caſt off his obedience, or publiquely oppoſe his decrees.* And yet if a man ſhould conclude upon you,that either you make all Superiours univerſally infallible,or elſe driue men into perplexities and labyrinths of doing againſt conſcience, I preſume you would not think your ſelf fairely dealt with;but alleage, that your words are not extended to all caſes,but limited *to caſes of uncertainty*. As little therefore ought you to make this deduction from M.*Hookers* words, which are apparently alſo reſtrained to *caſes of uncertainty*. For as for requiring a blind and an unlimited obedience, to Eccleſiaſticall deciſions univerſally and in all caſes,even when plain Text or reaſon ſeemes to controule them,

M Hooker

M. *Hooker* is as far from making ſuch an Idol of Eccleſiaſticall Authority, as the Puritans whom he writes againſt. *I grant* (ſaith he,) *that proof derived from the authority of mans iudgement, is not able to worke that aſſurance which doth grow by a ſtronger proofe. And therefore although ten thouſand Generall Councels would ſet down one and the ſame definitiue ſentence, concerning any point of religion whatſoever, yet one demonſtrative reaſon alleaged, or one manifeſt teſtimony cited from the word of God himſelfe, to the contrary, could not chooſe, but over-weigh them all: in as much as for them to be deceived it is not impoſſible, it is that Demonſtrative Reaſon, or Diuine Teſtimony ſhould deceiue.* And again, *Whereas it is thought, that eſpecially with the Church, and thoſe that are called, mans authority ought not to prevail: It muſt and doth prevaile even with them, yea with them eſpecially, as far as equity requireth, and farther we maintain it not. For men to be tied and led by authority, as it were with a kinde of captivitie of iudgement, and though there bee reaſon to the contrary, not to liſten to it, but to follow like beaſts, the firſt in the Heard, this were brutiſh.* Again, *that authority, of men ſhould prevaile with men either againſt or aboue reaſon, is no part of our beliefe. Companies of learned men, be they never ſo great and reverend, are to yeeld unto reaſon, the weight whereof, is no whit preiudic'd by the ſimplicity of his perſon which doth alleage it, but being found to be ſound and good, the bare opinion of men to the contrary, muſt of neceſſitie ſtoop and giue place.* Thus M. *Hooker* in his 7. Sect. of his Second Book: which place becauſe it is far diſtant from that which is alleaged by you, the overſight of it might be excuſable, did you not impute it to D. *Potter* as a fault, that he cites ſome clauſes of ſome Books, without reading the whole. But beſides, in that very Section, out of which you take this corrupted ſentence, he hath very pregnant words to the ſame effect. *As for the Orders eſtabliſhed, ſith equity and reaſon favour that which is in being, till orderly iudgement of deciſion be given againſt it, it is but iuſtice to exact of you, and perverſneſſe in you it ſhould be to deny thereunto your willing obedience. Not that I iudge it a thing allowable, for men to obſerue thoſe Lawes, which in their hearts they are ſtedfaſtly perſwaded, to bee againſt the Law of God: But your perſwaſion in this caſe, yee are all bound for the time to ſuſpend, and in otherwiſe doing, yee offend againſt God, by troubling his Church without iuſt and neceſſary cauſe. Be it that there are ſome reaſons inducing you to think hardly of our Lawes: Are thoſe Reaſons demonſtrative, are they neceſſary, or but meer probabilities only? An argument neceſſary and demonſtratiue is ſuch, as being propoſed to any man and underſtood, the minde cannot chooſe but inwardly aſſent. Any one ſuch reaſon diſcharged, I grant, the conſcience, and ſetteth it at full liberty. For the publique approbation given by the body of this whole Church, unto thoſe things which are eſtabliſhed, doth make it but probable that they are good. And therefore unto a neceſſary proofe that they are not good, it muſt giue place.* This plain declaration of his judgement in this matter, this expreſſe limitation of his former reſolution, hee makes in the very ſame Section, which affords your former quotation; and therefore what Apology can bee made for you, and your ſtore-houſe M.

Brerely

Brerely, for diſſembling of it, I cannot poſſibly imagine.

111 *D. Potter* p. 131. ſaies, *That the errors of the Donatiſts and Novatians, were not in themſelves Hereſies, nor could be made ſo by the Churches determination. But that the Churches intention was only to ſilence diſputes, and to ſettle peace and unity in her government: which becauſe they factiouſly oppoſed, they were juſtly eſteemed Schiſmatiques. From hence you conclude, that the ſame condemnation muſt paſſe againſt the firſt Reformers, ſeeing they alſo oppoſed the commands of the Church, impoſed on them, for ſilencing all diſputes, and ſetling Peace and Vnity in government.* But this collection is deceitfull, and the reaſon is: Becauſe though the firſt Reformers, as well as the Donatiſts and Novatians, oppoſed herein the Commands of the Viſible Church, that is, of a great part of it: yet the Reformers had reaſon, nay, neceſſity to doe ſo, the Church being then corrupted with damnable errors: which was not true of the Church, when it was oppoſed by the *Novatians* and *Donatiſts*. And therefore though they, and the Reformers, did the ſame action, yet doing it upon different grounds, it might in theſe merit applauſe, and in them condemnation.

112 *Ad* §. 43. The next §. hath in it ſome objections againſt *Luthers* perſon, but none againſt his cauſe, which alone I have undertaken to juſtify, & therefore I paſſe it over. Yet this I promiſe, that when you, or any of your ſide, ſhall publiſh a good defence, of all that your Popes have ſaid & done, eſpecially of them whom *Bellarmin* beleeves, in ſuch a long train *to have gone to the Divell:* then you ſhall receive an ample Apology for all the actions and words of *Luther*. In the mean time, I hope all reaſonable and equitable judges, will eſteeme it not unpardonable in the great and Heroicall ſpirit of *Luther*, if being oppoſed, and perpetually baited with a world of Furies, hee were tranſported ſometimes, and made ſomewhat furious. As for you, I deſire you to be quiet, and to demand no more, whether God be wont to ſend ſuch Furies to preach the Goſpell: Vnleſſe you deſire to heare of your killing of Kings: Maſſacring of Peoples; Blowing up of Parliaments: and have a minde to be ask't, whether it bee probable, that that ſhould bee Gods cauſe, which needs to bee maintained by ſuch Divelliſh meanes?

112 *Ad* §. 44. 45. In the two next Particles, which are all of this Chapter, that remain unſpoken to, you ſpend a great deale of reading, & wit, & reaſon, againſt ſome men, who pretending to honour & believe the Doctrine & practice of the viſible Church, (you mean your own,) and condemning their Forefathers who forſook her, ſay they would not have done ſo, yet remain divided from her Communion. Which men in my judgement cannot be defended. For if they believe the Doctrine of your Church, then muſt they believe this doctrine, that they are to returne to your Communion. And therefore if they doe not ſo, it cannot be avoided but they muſt be αὐτοκατάκριτοι, and ſo I leave them, only I am to remember you, that theſe men cannot pretend to be Proteſtants, becauſe they pretend to believe your doctrine, which is oppoſite in Diameter unto the doctrine of Proteſtants; and therefore in

a worke which you profeſſe to have written meerly againſt Proteſtants, all this might have been ſpared.

CHAP. VI.

That Luther, and the reſt of Proteſtants, have added Hereſie unto Schiſme.

BECAVSE Vice is beſt knowne by the contrary Vertue, we cannot well determine what *Hereſie* is, nor who be *Heretiques*, but by the oppoſite vertue of *Faith*, whoſe Nature being once underſtood as farre as belongs to our preſent purpoſe, we ſhall paſſe on with eaſe to the definition of *Hereſie*, and ſo be able to diſcerne who be *Heretiques*. And this I intend to doe, not by entring into ſuch particular Queſtions as are controverted between Catholiques and Proteſtants, but only by applying ſome generall grounds, either already proved, or elſe yeelded to, on all ſides.

2 Almighty God having ordained Man to a ſupernaturall End of Beatitude by *ſupernaturall meanes*, it was requiſite that his Vnderſtanding ſhould be enabled to apprehend that *End*, and *meanes* by a *ſupernaturall* knowledge. And becauſe if ſuch a knowledge were no more then *probable*, it could not be able ſufficiently to overbeare our Will, and encounter with human probabilities, being backed with the ſtrength of fleſh and blood; It was further neceſſary, that this ſupernaturall knowledge ſhould be moſt *certaine* and infallible; and that *Faith* ſhould beleeue nothing more *certainly* then that it ſelf is a moſt *certain* Beliefe, and ſo be able to beat downe all gay *probabilities* of humane *Opinion*. And becauſe the aforeſaid *Means* and *end of Beatificall Viſion*, do farre exceed the reach of naturall wit, the *certainty* of faith could not alwaies be joyned with ſuch *evidence* of reaſon, as is wont to be found in the *Principles*, or *Concluſions* of humane naturall *Sciences*; that ſo all fleſh might not glory in the arme of fleſh, but that he, *who glories, ſhould glory* (a) *in our Lord*. Moreover, it was expedient that our belief, or aſſent to divine truths ſhould not only be unknowne, or *inevident* by any humane diſcourſe, but that abſolutely alſo it ſhould be obſcure in it ſelf, and (ordinarily ſpeaking) be void even of ſupernaturall evidence; that ſo we might have occaſion to actuate, and teſtifie the obedience which we owe to our God, not only by ſubmitting our *Will* to his *Will* and *Commands*, but by ſubjecting alſo our *Vnderſtanding* to his *Wiſdome* and *Words*, captivating (as the Apoſtle ſpeaks) the ſame *Vnderſtanding* (b) to the Obedience of Faith: Which occaſion had been wanting, if Almighty God had made *cleere* to us, the truths which now are *certainly*, but *not evidently* preſented to our minds. For where Truth doth manifeſtly open it ſelf; not *obedience*, but *neceſſity* commands our aſſent. For this reaſon, Divines teach, that the Objects of Faith being not evident to humane reaſon, it is in mans power not only to abſtaine from believing, by ſuſpending our Iudgments, or exerciſing no act one way or other; but alſo to disbelieve, that is, to believe the contrary of that which Faith propoſeth; as the examples of innumerable Arch-heretiques can beare witneſſe. This obſcurity of faith we learne from holy Scripture, according to thoſe words of the Apoſtle. *Faith is the* (c) *ſubſtance of things to be hoped for, the argument of things not appearing*. And, *We ſee by a glaſſe* (d) *in a dark manner: but then face to face*. And, accordingly *S. Peter* ſaith: *Which you doe well attending unto, as to* (e) *a Candle ſhining in a dark place*.

a 2. Cor. 10.

b 2. Cor. 10. 5.

c Heb. 11. 1.

d 1. Cor. 13. v. 12.

e 2. Pet. 1. v. 19.

3 Faith being then *obſcure* (whereby it differeth from naturall *Sciences*) and yet being moſt *certain* and *infallible* (wherein it ſurpaſſeth humane Opinion) it muſt relie upon ſome motive and ground, which may be able to give it *certainty*, and yet not releaſe it from *obſcurity*. For if this *motive, ground*, or *formall Object* of Faith, were any thing evidently preſented to our underſtanding: and if alſo we did evidently know, that it had a neceſſary connection with the Articles which we believe, our aſſent to ſuch Articles could not be *obſcure*, but *evident*; which, as we ſaid, is againſt the nature of our Faith. If likewiſe the motive or ground of our faith were *obſcurely propounded* to *us*, but were not in it ſelfe *infallible*, it would leave our aſſent in *obſcurity*, but could not endue it with *certainty*. We muſt therefore for the ground of our Faith, find out a motive obſcure to *us*, but moſt certain *in it ſelfe*, that the act of faith may remaine both *obſcure*, and *certain*. Such a *motive* as this, can be no other but the divine authority of almighty God, revealing, or ſpeaking thoſe truths which our faith believes. For it is manifeſt, that God's infallible teſtimony may transfuſe *Certainty* to our faith, and yet not draw it out of *obſcurity*; becauſe no humane diſcourſe, or demonſtration can evince, that God revealeth any ſupernaturall Truth, ſince God had beene no leſſe perfect then he is, although he had never revealed any of thoſe objects which we now believe.

4 Nevertheleſſe, becauſe Almighty God out of his infinite wiſdome and ſweetneſſe, doth concurre with his Creatures in ſuch ſort as may befit the temper, & exigence of their natures; and becauſe Man is a Creature endued with *reaſon*, God doth not exact of his Will or Vnderſtanding any other then, as the Apoſtle ſaith, *rationabile* (f) *obſequium*, an Obedience, ſweetned with

f Rom. 12. v. 1.

with good reaſon; which could not ſo appeare, if our Vnderſtanding were ſummoned to believe with *certainty*, things no way repreſented as infallible and *certain*. And therefore Almighty God obliging us under paine of eternall damnation to believe with greateſt certainty divers verities, not knowne by the light of naturall reaſon, cannot faylo to furniſh our Vnderſtanding, with ſuch inducements, motives, and arguments as may ſufficiently perſwade any mind which is not partiall or paſſionate, that the objects which we believe, proceed from an Authority ſo *Wiſe*, that it can-
g *Pſal.* 92. not be deceived, ſo *Good* that it cannot deceive; according to the words of *David: Thy Teſtimonies are made* (g) *credible exceedingly*. Theſe inducements are by Divines, called *argumēta credibilitatis, arguments of credibility*, which though they cannot make us *evidently* ſee what we believe, yet they *evidently* convince that in true wiſdome, & prudence, the objects of faith deſerve credit, & ought to be accepted as things revealed by God. For without ſuch reaſons & inducemēts our judgment of faith
h *Eccleſ.* 19. 4. could not be conceived prudent, holy Scripture telling us, that, *he who ſoone* (h) *believes, is light of heart*. By theſe arguments and inducements our Vnderſtanding is both ſatisfied with *evidence of credibility*, and the objects of faith retaine their *obſcurity*: becauſe it is a different thing to bee evidently *credible*, and evidently *true*; as thoſe who were preſent at the Miracles wrought by our bleſſed Saviour, and his Apoſtles, did not evidently ſee their doctrine to be true (for then it had not been *Faith* but *Science*, and all had been neceſſitated to believe, which we ſee fell out otherwiſe,) but they were evidently convinced, that the things confirmed by ſuch Miracles, were *moſt credible*, and worthy to be imbraced as truths revealed by God.

5. Theſe evident Arguments of Credibility are in great abundance found in the Viſible Church of Chriſt, perpetually exiſting on earth. For, that there hath been a company of men profeſſing ſuch and ſuch doctrines, we have from our next Predeceſſours, and theſe from theirs upward, till we come to the Apoſtles, and our Bleſſed Saviour; which gradation is knowne by evidence of ſenſe, by reading bookes, or hearing what one man delivers to another. And it is evident that there was neither cauſe, nor poſſibility, that men ſo diſtant in place, ſo different in temper, ſo repugnant in private ends, did, or could agree to tell one and the ſelfe ſame thing, if it had been but a fiction invented by themſelves, as ancient *Tertullian* well ſaith: *How is it likely that*
i *Præſcript. cap.* 28. *ſo many* (i) *and ſo great Churches ſhould erre in one faith? Among many events there is not one iſſue, the error of the Churches muſt needs have varied. But that which among many is found to be One, is not miſtaken, but delivered. Dare then any body ſay, that they erred who delivered it?* With this never interrupted exiſtence of the Church are joyned the many and great miracles wrought by men of that Congregation or Church; the ſanctity of the perſons; the renowned victories over ſo many perſecutions, both of all ſorts of men, and of the infernall ſpirits; and laſtly, the perpetuall exiſtence of ſo holy a Church, being brought up to the *Apoſtles* themſelves, *ſhe* comes to partake of the ſame aſſurance of truth, which *They* by ſo many powerfull wayes, did communicate to their Doctrine, and to the Church of their times, together with the divine Certainty which *they* received from our Bleſſed Saviour himſelfe, revealing to Man-kind what he heard from his
k *Præſc. c.* 21. & 37. Father; and ſo we conclude with *Tertullian: We* receive it *from the Churches, the Churches* (k) *from the Apoſtles, the Apoſtles from Chriſt, Chriſt from his Father*, And if we once interrupt this line of ſucceſſion, moſt certainly made knowne by meanes of holy *Tradition*, we cannot conjoyn the preſent Church, and doctrine, with the Church, and doctrine of the Apoſtles, but muſt invent ſome new meanes, and arguments ſufficient of themſelves to find out, and prove a true Church, and faith independently of the *preaching*, and *writing* of the Apoſtles; neither of which
l *Præſ. c.* 21. can be knowne but by *Tradition*; as is truely obſerved by *Tertullian* ſaying: *I will preſcribe, that* (l) *there is no meanes to prove what the Apoſtles preached, but by the ſame Church which they founded.*

6 Thus then we are to proceed: By evidence of manifeſt and incorrupt Tradition, I know that there hath alwaies been a never-interrupted Succeſſion of men from the Apoſtles time, believing, profeſſing, and practiſing ſuch and ſuch doctrines: By evident arguments of credibility, as Miracles, Sanctity, Vnity, &c. and by all thoſe wayes whereby the Apoſtles, and our Bleſſed Saviour himſelfe confirmed their doctrine, we are aſſured that what the ſaid never-interrupted Church propoſeth, doth deſerve to be accepted and acknowledged as a divine truth: By evidence of Senſe, we ſee that the ſame Church propoſeth ſuch and ſuch doctrines as divine truths, that is, as revealed and teſtified by Almighty God. By this divine Teſtimony we are infallibly aſſured of what we believe: and ſo the laſt period, ground, motive, and *formall obiect* of our Faith, is the infallible teſtimony of that ſupreme Verity, which neither can deceive, nor be deceived.

7 By this orderly deduction our Faith commeth to be endued with theſe qualities which we ſaid were requiſite thereto; namely *Certainty*, *Obſcurity*, and *Prudence*. *Certainty* proceeds from the *infallible* Teſtimony of God propounded and conveyed to our underſtanding by ſuch a meane as is infallible in it ſelfe, and to us is evidently knowne that it propoſeth this point or that, and which can manifeſtly declare in what ſenſe it propoſeth them; which meanes we have proved to be only the viſible Church of Chriſt. *Obſcurity* from the manner in which God ſpeakes to Man-kind, which ordinarily is ſuch, that it doth not manifeſtly ſhew the perſon who ſpeakes, nor the truth of the thing ſpoken. *Prudence* is not wanting, becauſe our faith is accompanyed with ſo many arguments of *Credibility*, that every well diſpoſed *Vnderſtanding*, may and ought to judge, that the doctrines ſo confirmed deſerve to be believed, as proceeding from divine Authority.

8. And thus from what hath been ſaid, we may eaſily gather the particular nature, or definition of *Faith*. For, *it is a voluntary, or free, infallible, obſcure aſſent to ſome truth, becauſe it is teſtified*

ſtified by God, and is ſufficiently propounded to us for ſuch: which propoſall is ordinarily made by the Viſible Church of Chriſt. I ſay, *Sufficiently propoſed by the Church*; not that I purpoſe to diſpute whether the propoſall of the Church enter into the *formall Obiect*, or *motive* of Faith: or whether an error be any hereſie, *formally and preciſely*, becauſe it is againſt the propoſition of the Church, as if ſuch propoſall were the formall Object of Faith; which D. *Potter* to no purpoſe at all, labours ſo very hard to diſprove: But I only affirme, that when the Church propounds any Truth, as revealed by God, we are aſſured that it is ſuch indeed; and ſo it inſtantly growes, to be a fit Object for Chriſtian faith, which enclines and enables us to beleeve whatſoever is duely preſented, as a thing revealed by Almighty God. And in the ſame manner we are ſure, that whoſoever oppoſeth any doctrine propoſed by the Church, doth thereby contradict a truth, which is teſtified by God: As when any lawfull Superiour notifies his will, by the meanes, and as it were propoſall of ſome faithfull meſſenger, the ſubject of ſuch a Superiour in performing, or neglecting what is delivered by the Meſſenger, is ſaid to obey, or diſobey his owne lawfull Superiour. And therefore becauſe the teſtimony of God is notified by the Church, we may, and we doe moſt truely ſay, that not to beleeve what the Church propoſeth, is to deny God's holy word or teſtimony, ſignified to us by the Church, according to that ſaying of *S. Irenæus. We need not goe* (m) *to any other to ſeek the truth, which we may eaſily receive from the Church.*

m *Lib.3. cont. hæreſ. cap.4.*

9. From this definition of faith we may alſo know what *Hereſie* is, by taking the contrary termes, as *Hereſie* is contrary to *Faith*, and ſaying: *Hereſie is a voluntary error againſt that which God hath revealed, and the Church hath propoſed for ſuch.* Neither doth it import, whether the error concerne points in themſelves great or ſmall, fundamentall or not fundamentall. For more being required to an act of Vertue, then of Vice, if any truth though neuer ſo ſmall may be believed by *Faith* as ſoone as we know it to be teſtified by divine revelation; much more will it be a formall *Hereſie* to deny any leaſt point ſufficiently propounded as a thing witneſſed by God.

10. This divine Faith is divided into *Actuall*, and *Habituall*. *Actuall* faith, or faith actuated is when we are in act of conſideration, and belife of ſome myſtery of Faith; for example, that our Saviour Chriſt, is true God, and Man, &c. *Habituall* faith, is that from which we are denominated *Faithfull*, or *Believers*, as by *Actuall* faith they are ſtiled, *Believing*. This *Habit* of faith is a *Quality* enabling us moſt firmly to believe Objects above humane diſcourſe, and it remaineth permanently in our Soule, even when we are ſleeping, or not thinking of any Myſtery of Faith. This is the firſt among the three *Theologicall* Vertues. For *Charity* unites us to God, as he is infinitely *Good in himſelfe*; *Hope* tyes us to him, as he is unſpeakably *Good to us*. *Faith* joynes us to him, as he is the *Supreame immoveable Verity*. *Charity* relies on his *Goodneſſe*; *Hope* on his *Power*; *Faith* on his divine *Wiſdome*. From hence it followeth, that *Faith* being one of the Vertues which Divines terme *Infuſed* (that is, which cannot be acquired by human wit, or induſtry, but are in their Nature and Eſſence, ſupernaturall,) it hath this property; that it is not deſtroyed by little and little, (contrarily to the *Habits*, called *acquiſiti*, that is, *gotten by human endeavours*, which as they are ſucceſſiuely produced, ſo alſo are they loſt ſucceſſiuely, or by little and little) but it muſt either be conſerved entire, or wholly deſtroyed: And ſince it cannot ſtand entire with any one act which is directly contrary, it muſt be totally overthrowne, and as it were demoliſhed, and razed by every ſuch act. Wherefore, as *Charity*, or the Love of God is expelled from our ſoule by any one act of *Hatred*, or any other mortall ſinne againſt his divine Majeſty: and as *Hope* is deſtroyed by any one act of voluntary *Deſperation*: ſo *Faith* muſt periſh by any one act of *Hereſy*; becauſe every ſuch act is directly, and formally oppoſite therevnto. I know that ſome ſinnes which (as Divines ſpeak) are *ex genere ſuo*, in their kind, grievous and *mortall*, may be much leſſened, and fall to be *veniall*, *ob levitatem materiæ*; becauſe they may happen to be exerciſed in a matter of ſmall conſideration; as for example, to ſteale a penny, is veniall, although Theft in his kind be a deadly ſinne. But it is likewiſe true, that this Rule is not generall for all ſorts of ſinnes; there being ſome ſo inexcuſably wicked of their owne nature, that no ſmalneſſe of matter, nor paucity in number, can defend them from being deadly ſinnes. For, to give an inſtance, what Blaſphemy againſt God, or voluntary falſe Oath is not a deadly ſinne? Certainly, none at all, although the ſalvation of the whole world ſhould depend upon ſwearing ſuch a falſhood. The like hapneth in our preſent caſe of Hereſie, the iniquity whereof redounding to the injury of God's ſupreme wiſdome and Goodneſſe, is alwayes great, and enormous. They were no precious ſtones which *David* (n) pickt out of the water, to encounter *Golias*; & yet if a man take from the number but one, and ſay they were but foure, againſt the Scripture affirming them to have been fiue; he is inſtantly guilty of a damnable ſinne. Why? Becauſe by this ſubtraction of *One*, he doth deprive Gods word and Teſtimony of *all* credit and infallibility. For if either he could deceive, or be deceived in any *one* thing, it were but wiſdome to ſuſpect him in *all*. And ſeeing every *Hereſy* oppoſeth ſome Truth revealed by God; it is no wonder that no one can be excuſed from deadly, and damnable ſinne. For if voluntary *Blaſphemy*, and *Periury*, which are oppoſite only to the *infuſed Morall* Vertue of *Religion*, can never be excuſed from mortall ſinne: much leſſe can *Hereſy* be excuſed, which oppoſeth the *Theologicall* Vertue of *Faith*.

n 1. *Reg.* 17.

11 If any object, that *Schiſme* may ſeem to be a greater ſinne then *Hereſy*; becauſe the Vertue of *Charity* (to which Schiſme is oppoſite) is greater then Faith, according to the Apoſtle, ſaying: *Now there remain* (o) *Faith, Hope, Charity; but the greater of theſe is Charity.* *S. Thomas* anſwers in theſe words: *Charity hath two Obiects, one principall, to wit, the Divine* (p) *Goodneſſe;*

o 1. *Cor.* 13. 13.

p 2. 2. *q.* 39. *ar.* 2. *in corp. & ad* 3.

Goodneſſe; and another ſecondary, namely the good of our Neighbour; But Schiſme and other ſinnes which are committed againſt our Neighbour, are oppoſite to Charity in reſpect of this ſecondary good, which is leſſe, then the obiect of Faith, which is God, as he is the Prime Verity, on which Faith doth relie; and therefore theſe ſinnes are leſſe then Infidelity. He takes *Infidelity* after a generall manner, as it comprehends *Hereſie*, and other vices againſt Faith.

12. Having therefore ſufficiently declared, wherein *Hereſy* conſiſts; Let us come to prove that which we propoſed in this Chapter. Where I deſire, it be ſtill remembred: That the viſible Catholique Church cannot erre damnably, as *D. Potter* confeſſeth: And, that when *Luther* appeared, there was no other viſible true Church of Chriſt diſagreeing from the *Roman*, as we have demonſtrated in the next precedent Chapter.

13 Now, that *Luther* and his followers cannot be excuſed from formall *Hereſy*, I prove by theſe reaſons. To oppoſe any truth propounded by the viſible true Church as revealed by God, is formall *Hereſie*, as we have ſhewed out of the definition of *Hereſie*: But *Luther*, *Calvin*, and the reſt did oppoſe divers truths propounded by the viſible Church as revealed by God; yea they did *therefore* oppoſe her, becauſe ſhee propounded as divine revealed truths, things which they judged either to be falſ, or human inventions: Therefore they committed formall *Hereſie*.

14 Moreover, every Errour againſt any doctrine revealed by God, is damnable Hereſie, whether the matter in it ſelfe be great or ſmall, as I proved before: and therefore either the Proteſtants, or the *Roman* Church muſt be guilty of formall Hereſy; becauſe one of them muſt erre againſt the word & teſtimony of God: but you grant (perforce) that the *Roman* Church doth not erre damnably, & I adde that ſhe cannot erre damnably, becauſe ſhe is the truly Catholique Church, which you confeſſe cannot erre damnably: Therefore Proteſtants muſt be guilty of formall *Hereſy*.

15 Beſides, we have ſhewed that the viſible Church is Iudge of Controverſies, and therefore muſt be infallible in all her Propoſals; which being once ſuppoſed, it manifeſtly followeth, that to oppoſe what ſhe delivereth as revealed by God, is not ſo much to oppoſe *her*, as *God* himſelf; and therefore cannot be excuſed from grievous Hereſy.

16 Againe, if *Luther* were an *Heretique*, for thoſe points wherein he diſagreed from the *Roman* Church; All they who agree with him in thoſe very points, muſt likewiſe be Heretiques. Now, that *Luther* was a formall Heretique I demonſtrate in this manner. To ſay, that Gods viſible true Church is not univerſall, but confined to one only place or corner of the world, is according to your owne expreſſe words (q) *properly* Hereſy, *againſt that Article of the Creed, wherein we profeſſe to beleeve the holy Catholique Church:* And you brand *Donatus* with hereſy, becauſe he limited the univerſall Church to *Africa*. But it is manifeſt, and acknowledged by *Luther* himſelf, and other chief Proteſtants that *Luthers* Reformation when it firſt began (and much more for divers Ages before) was not *Vniverſall*, nor ſpread over the world, but was confined to that compaſſe of ground which did contain *Luthers* body. Therefore his Reformation cannot be excuſed from formall Hereſy. If S. *Auguſtine* in thoſe times ſaid to the Donatiſts, *There are innumerable teſtimonies* (r) *of holy Scripture in which it appeareth that the Church of Chriſt is not only in Africa, as theſe men with moſt impudent vanity doe rave, but that ſhe is ſpread over the whole earth:* much more may it be ſaid; It appeareth by innumerable teſtimonies of holy Scripture that the Church of Chriſt cannot be confined to the Citty of *Wittemberg*, or to the place where *Luthers* feet ſtood, but muſt be ſpread over the whole world. It is therefore *moſt impudent vanity, and dotage* to limit her to *Luthers* Reformation. In another place alſo this holy Father writes no leſſe effectually againſt *Luther* then againſt the *Donatiſts*. For having out of thoſe words, *In thy ſeed all Nations ſhall be bleſſed*, proved that Gods Church muſt be *univerſall*, he ſaith: *Why* (s) *doe you ſuperadde, by ſaying that Chriſt remaines heire in no part of the earth, except where he may have* Donatus *for his Coheire. Give me this* (Vniverſall) *Church if it be among you: ſhew your ſelves to all Nations, which we already ſhew to be bleſſed in this Seed: Give us this* (Church) *or elſe laying aſide all fury, receive her from us.* But it is evident, that *Luther* could not, when he ſaid, *At the beginning I was alone*, give us an *univerſall* Church: Therefore happy had he been, if he had then, and his followers would now, *receive her from us.* And therefore we muſt conclude with the ſame holy Father, ſaying in another place of the univerſall Church: *She hath this* (t) *moſt certain mark, that ſhe cannot be hidden: She is then knowne to all Nations. The Sect of Donatus is unknowne to many Nations; therefore that cannot be ſhe. The Sect of Luther* (at leaſt when he began, and much more before his beginning) *was unknowne to many Nations, therefore that cannot be ſhe.*

17 And that it may yet further appeare how perfectly *Luther* agreed with the *Donatiſts*: It is to be noted, that they never taught, that the Catholique Church ought not to extend it ſelf further then that part of *Africa*, where their faction reigned, but only that in fact it was ſo confined, becauſe all the reſt of the Church was prophaned, by communicating with *Cæcilianus*, whom they falſly affirmed to have been ordained Biſhop by thoſe who were *Traditours*, or givers up of the Bible to the Perſecutors to be burned: yea at that very time they had ſome of their Sect reſiding in *Rome*, and ſent thither one *Victor*, a Biſhop, under colour to take care of the Brethren in that Citty, but indeed as *Baronius* (u) obſerveth, that the world might account them Catholiques by communicating with the Biſhop of *Rome*, to communicate with whom was ever taken by the Ancient Fathers as an aſſured ſigne of being a true Catholique. They had alſo, as *S. Auguſtine* witneſſeth, a pretended (w) Church in the houſe and territory of a Spaniſh Lady called *Lucilla*, who

q *Pag.* 126.

r *Epiſt.* 50.

s *De Vnit Eccleſ. cap.* 6.

t *Cont. lit. Petil. lib.* 1. *cap.* 104.

u *Anno* 321. *nu.* 2. *Spond.*

w *De Vni. Eccleſ. c.* 3.

who went flying out of the Catholique Church, becauſe ſhe had been juſtly checked by *Cæcilianus*. And the ſame *Saint* ſpeaking of the conference he had with *Fortunius* the Donatiſt, ſaith: *Here did he firſt* (x) *attempt to affirme that his Communion was ſpread over the whole Earth &c. but becauſe the thing was evidently falſe, they got out of this diſcourſe by confuſion of language* whereby nevertheleſſe they ſufficiently declared, that they did not hold, that the true Church ought neceſſarily to be confined to one place, but only by meere neceſſity were forced to yield that it was ſo in fact, becauſe their Sect which they held to be the only true Church was not ſpread over the world: In which point *Fortunius*, and the reſt were more modeſt, then he who ſhould affirme that *Luther's* reformation in the very beginning was *ſpread over the whole Earth*; being at that time by many degrees not ſo farre diffuſed as the Sect of the *Donatiſts*. I have no deſire to proſecute the ſimilitude of Proteſtants with *Donatiſts*, by remembring that the Sect of theſe men was begun and promoted by the paſſion of *Lucilla*; and who is ignorant what influence two women, the Mother, and Daughter, miniſtred to Proteſtancy in England? Nor will I ſtand to obſerve their very likenes of phraſe with the *Donatiſts*, who called the Chaire of *Rome*, the Chaire of peſtilence, and the *Roman* Church an Harlot, which is *D. Potter's* owne phraſe, wherein he is leſſe excuſable then they, becauſe he maintaineth her to be a true Church of Chriſt: and therefore let him duely ponder theſe words of *S. Auguſtine* againſt the *Donatiſts*. *If I perſecute him iuſtly who detracts* (y) *from his Neighbour, why ſhould I not perſecute him who detracts from the Church of Chriſt, and ſaith, this is not ſhe, but this is an Harlot?* And leaſt of all, will I conſider, whether you may not be well compared to one *Ticonius* a *Donatiſt*, who wrote againſt *Parmenianus* likewiſe a *Donatiſt*, who blaſphemed, that the Church of Chriſt had periſhed (as you doe even in this your Book writ againſt ſome of your Proteſtant Brethren, or as you call them *Zelots* among you, who hold the very ſame or rather a worſe Hereſie) and yet remained among them, even after *Parmenianus* had excommunicated him, (as thoſe your Zealous Brethren would proceed againſt you if it were in their power,) and yet like *Ticonius* you remain in their Communion, and come not into that Church which is, hath been, and ſhall ever be univerſall: For which very cauſe S. *Auguſtin* complaines of *Ticonius*, that although he wrote againſt the Donatiſts, yet he was of *an hart* (z) *ſo extreamly abſurd*, as not to forſake them altogether. And ſpeaking of the ſame thing in another place he obſerves, that although *Ticonius* did manifeſtly confute them who affirmed that the Church had periſhed; yet, *he ſaw not* (ſaith this holy Father) *that which in good conſequence* (a) *he ſhould have ſeen, that thoſe Chriſtians of Africa belonged to the Church ſpread over the whole world, who remained united, not with them who were divided from the communion and vnity of the ſame world, but with ſuch as did communicate with the whole world.* But *Parmenianus, and the reſt of the Donatiſts ſaw that conſequence, and reſolved rather to ſettle their mind in obſtinacy againſt the moſt manifeſt truth which Ticonius maintained; then by yeelding thereto, to be overcome by thoſe Churches in Africa, which enioyed the Communion of that vnity which Ticonius defended, from which they had divided themſelves*. How fitly theſe words agree to Catholiques in England in reſpect of the Proteſtants, I deſire the Reader to conſider. But theſe and the like reſemblances of Proteſtants to the *Donatiſts*, I willingly let paſſe, and only vrge the main point: That ſince *Luthers* Reformed Church was not in being for divers Centuries before *Luther*, and yet was (becauſe ſo forſooth they will needs have it) in the Apoſtles time, they muſt of neceſſity affirme heretically with the *Donatiſts*, that the true and unſpotted Church of Chriſt periſhed; and that ſhe which remained on earth was (O blaſphemy!) an Harlot. Moreover the ſame hereſy followes out of the doctrine of *D. Potter*, and other Proteſtants, that the Church may erre in points not fundamentall; becauſe we have ſhewed that every errour againſt any one revealed truth, is *Hereſy* and *damnable*, whether the matter bee otherwiſe of it ſelfe, great or ſmall. And how can the Church more truely be ſaid to periſh, then when ſhe is permitted to maintaine a *damnable Hereſy*? Beſides, we will hereafter prove, that by any act of Hereſy all divine faith is loſt; and to imagine a true Church of faithfull perſons without any faith, is as much as to fancy a living man without life. It is therefore cleere, that Donatiſt-like they hold that the Church of Chriſt periſhed: yea they are worſe then the *Donatiſts*, who ſaid, that the Church remained at leaſt in *Africa*; whereas Proteſtants muſt of neceſſity be forced to grant, that for a long ſpace before *Luther*, ſhe was no where at all. But let us goe forward to other reaſons.

x *Ep.* 163.

y *Conc. ſuper. geſt. cum Emerit.*

z *De doctr. Chriſt. lib.* 3. *cap.* 30.

a *Cont. Parm. l.* 1. *cap.* 8.

18 The holy Scripture, and Ancient Fathers doe aſſigne Separation from the Viſible Church as a mark of *Hereſie*; according to that of S. *Iohn*: *They went out* (b) *from us*. And, *Some who* (c) *went out from us*. And, *Out of you ſhall* (d) *ariſe men ſpeaking perverſe things*. And accordingly *Vincentius Lyrinenſis* ſaith: *Who ever* (e) *began hereſies, who did not firſt ſeparate himſelf from the Univerſality, Antiquity, and Conſent of the Catholique Church*? But it is manifeſt, that when *Luther* appeared, there was no viſible Church diſtinct from the *Roman*, out of which ſhe could depart, as it is likewiſe well knowne that *Luther*, and his followers departed out of *her*: Therefore ſhe is no way lyable to this Mark of *Hereſie*, but Proteſtants cannot poſſibly avoid it. To this purpoſe S. *Proſper* hath theſe pithy words: A Chriſtian communicating (f) with the univerſall Church *is a Catholique, and he who is divided from her, is an Heretique; and Antichriſt*. But *Luther* in his firſt Reformation could not communicate with the viſible Catholique Church of thoſe times, becauſe he began his Reformation by oppoſing the ſuppoſed Errors of the then viſible Church: we muſt therefore ſay with S. *Proſper*, that he was an *Heretique* &c. Which like-

b 2. *Ioan.* 19.

c *Act.* 15. 24.

d *Act.* 20. 30.

e *Lib. adver. ſus hær. c.* 34.

f *Dimid. temp. Antichriſt. cap.* 5.

likewiſe is no leſſe cleerely proved out of S. *Cyprian*, ſaying: *Not we* (g) *departed from them, but they from us, and ſince Hereſies and Schiſmes are bred afterwards, while they make to themſelves divers Conventicles, they have forſaken the head and origen of Truth.*

19 And that we might not remain doubtfull what ſeparation it is, which is the marke of *Hereſy*, the ancient Fathers tell us more in particular, that it is from the Church of *Rome*, as it is the Sea of *Peter*. And therefore *D. Potter* need not to be ſo hot with us, becauſe we ſay and write that the Church of *Rome*, in that ſenſe as ſhe is the Mother Church of all others, and with which all the reſt agree, is truly called the *Catholique Church*. S. *Hierome* writing to Pope *Damaſus* ſaith: *I am in the Communion* (h) *of the Chaire of Peter, I know that the Church is built upon that Rock. Whoſoever ſhall eat the Lambe out of this houſe, he is prophane. If any ſhall not be in the Arke of Noe, he ſhall periſh in the time of the deluge: Whoſoever doth not gather with thee, doth ſcatter, that is, he that is not of Chriſt is of Antichriſt.* And elſewhere, *Which doth he* (i) *call his faith? That of the Roman Church? Or that which is contained in the Bookes of Origen? If he anſwer, the Roman, then we are Catholiques, who have tranſlated nothing of the error of Origen.* And yet farther: *Know thou, that the* (k) *Roman faith commended by the voice of the Apoſtle doth not receive theſe deluſions, though an Angell ſhould denounce otherwiſe, then it hath once been preached.* S. *Ambroſe* recounting how his Brother *Satyrus* inquiring for a Church wherein to give thankes for his delivery from ſhipwrack, ſaith: *he called unto him* (l) *the Biſhop, neither did he eſteeme any favour to be true, except that of the true faith, and he asked of him whether he agreed with the Catholique Biſhops*; that is, *with the Roman Church*? And having underſtood that he was a *Schiſmatique*, that is, ſeparated from the *Roman* Church, he abſtained from communicating with him. Where we ſee the priviledge of the *Roman* Church confirmed both by word and deed, by doctrine and practice. And the ſame *Saint* ſaith of the *Roman Church*: *From thence the Rights* (m) *of Venerable Communion doe flow to all.* S. *Cyprian* ſaith: *They are bold* (n) *to ſaile to the Chaire of Peter, and to the principall Church, from whence Prieſtly Vnity hath ſprung. Neither doe they conſider, that they are Romans, whoſe faith was commended by the preaching of the Apoſtle, to whom falſhood cannot have acceſſe.* Where we ſee this holy Father joynes together the *principall Church*, and the *Chaire of Peter*; and affirmeth that *falſehood* not only hath not had, but *cannot have acceſſe to that Sea.* And elſewhere: *Thou wroteſt that I ſhould ſend* (o) *a Coppy of the ſame letters to Cornelius our Collegue, that laying aſide all ſolicitude, he might now be aſſured that thou didſt Communicate with him, that is, with the Catholique Church.* What think you *M. Doctor* of theſe words? Is it ſo ſtrange a thing to take for one and the ſame thing, to communicate with the *Church and Pope of Rome*, and to communicate with the *Catholique Church*! S. *Irenæus* ſaith: *Becauſe it were long to number the ſucceſſions of all Churches* (p) *we declaring the Tradition* (and faith preached to men, and comming to us by Tradition) *of the moſt great, moſt ancient, and moſt known Church, founded by the two moſt glorious Apoſtles Peter and Paul; which Tradition it hath from the Apoſtles, comming to us by ſucceſſion of Biſhops; we confound all thoſe who any way either by evill complacence of themſelves, or vain glory, or by blindnes, or ill Opinion doe gather otherwiſe then they ought. For to this Church for a more powerfull Principality, it is neceſſary that all Churches reſort, that is, all faithfull people of what place ſoever: in which (Roman. Ch.) the Tradition which is from the Apoſtles hath alwayes been conſerved from thoſe who are every where.* S. *Auguſtine* ſaith: *It grieves us* (q) *to ſee you ſo to lie cut off. Number the Prieſts even from the Sea of Peter; and conſider in that order of Fathers who ſucceeded to whom. She is the Rock which the proud Gates of Hell doe not overcome.* And in another place, ſpeaking of *Cæcilianus*, he ſaith: *He might contemne the conſpiring* (r) *multitude of his Enemies, becauſe he knew himſelfe to be united, by Communicatory letters both to the Roman Church in which the Principality of the Sea Apoſtolique did alwayes floriſh; and to other Countries from whence the Goſpell came firſt into Africa.* Ancient *Tertullian* ſaith: *If thou be neere Italy, thou haſt Rome, whoſe* (s) *Authority is neere at hand to us: a happy Church, into which the Apoſtles haue powred all Doctrine, together with their blood.* S. *Baſill* in a letter to the Biſhop of *Rome* ſaith, *In very deed that which was given* (t) *by our Lord to thy Piety, is worthy of that moſt excellent voice which proclaimed thee Bleſſed, to wit, that thou maiſt diſcern betwixt that which is counterfeit, and that which is lawfull and pure, and without any diminution mayeſt preach the Faith of our Anceſtors.* *Maximinianus* Biſhop of Conſtantinople about twelue hundred yeares agoe, ſaid: *All the bounds of the earth who haue ſincerely acknowledged our Lord, and Catholiques through the whole world profeſſing the true Faith, look upon the power of the Biſhop of Rome, as upon the ſunne &c. For the Creator of the world, amongſt all men of the world elected him,* (he ſpeaks of S. *Peter*) *to whom he granted the Chaire of Doctour to be principally poſſeſſed by a perpetuall right of Priviledge; that whoſoever is deſirous to know any Divine and profound thing, may haue recourſe to the Oracle, and Doctrine of this inſtruction.* *Iohn* Patriarck of *Conſtantinople*, more then eleven hundred yeares agoe in an Epiſtle to Pope *Hormiſda*, writeth thus: *Becauſe* (u) *the beginning of ſalvation is to conſerue the rule of right Faith, and in no wiſe to ſwarue from the tradition of our fore-Fathers; becauſe the words of our Lord cannot faile, ſaying: Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build my Church; the prooфes of deeds haue made good theſe words, becauſe in the Sea Apoſtolicall the Catholique Religion is alwaies conſerved inviolable.* And again: *We promiſe hereafter not to recite in the ſacred Myſteries the names of them who are excluded from the Communion of the Catholique Church, that is to ſay, who conſent not fully with the Sea Apoſtolique.* Many other Authorities of the ancient Fathers might be

h *Ep. 57. ad Damaſ.*

i *Lib. 1. Apolog.*

k *Ibid. lib. 3.*

l *De obitu Satyri fratris.*

m *Lib. 1. ep. 4. ad Imperatores.*

n *Epiſt. 55. ad Cornel.*

o *Epiſt. 52.*

p *Lib. 3. cont. hær. c. 3.*

q *In Pſal. cont. patrem Donati.*

r *Ep. 162.*

ſ *Præſcr. cap. 36.*

t *Epiſt. ad Pont. Rom.*

u *Epiſt. ad Hormiſ. P. P.*

be produced to this purpoſe; but theſe may ſerue to ſhew, that both the *Latin*, and *Greek* Fathers held for a Note of being a Catholique, or an Heretique, to haue been united, or diuided from the Sea of *Rome*. And I haue purpoſely alleaged only ſuch Authorities of Fathers, as ſpeak of the priuileges of the Sea of *Rome*, as of things permanent, and depending on our *Saviours* promiſe to S. *Peter*, from which a generall rule, and ground ought to be taken for all Ages, becauſe *Heauen and Earth ſhall (vv) paſſe, but the word of our Lord ſhall remain for ever*. So that I here conclude, that vv Mat. 24. 35. ſeeing it is manifeſt that *Luther* and his followers diuided themſelues from the Sea of *Rome*, they beare the inſeparable Mark of *Hereſie*.

20 And though my meaning be not to treat the point of Ordination, or Succeſſion in the Proteſtants Church, becauſe the Fathers alleaged in the laſt reaſon, aſſigne Succeſſion as one mark of the true Church; I muſt not omit to ſay, that according to the grounds of *Proteſtants* themſelues, they can neither pretend *perſonall Succeſſion* of Biſhops, nor *Succeſſion of doctrine*. For whereas Succeſſion of Biſhops ſignifies a never-interrupted line of Perſons, endued with an indelible *Quality*, which Diuines call a *Character*, which cannot be taken away by *depoſition, degradation*, or other meanes whatſoeuer; and endued alſo with Iuriſdiction and Authority to teach, to preach, to govern the Church by lawes, precepts, cenſures, &c. Proteſtants cannot pretend Succeſſion in either of theſe. For (beſides that there was never Proteſtant Biſhop before *Luther*, and that there can be no continuance of *Succeſſion*, where there was no beginning to ſucceed,) they commonly acknowledge no *Character*, and conſequently muſt affirme that when their pretended Biſhops or Prieſts are deprived of Iuriſdiction, or degraded, they remain meer lay Perſons as before their Ordination; fulfilling what *Tertullian* obiects as a mark of Hereſie: *To day a Prieſt, to morrow* (x) *a Lay-man*. For if here be no immoueable *Character*, their power of *Order* muſt conſiſt only in Iuriſdiction, and authoritie, or in a kinde of morall deputation to ſome function, which therefore may be taken away by the ſame power, by which it was given. Neither can they pretend Succeſſion in Authority, or Iuriſdiction. For all the Authority, or Iuriſdiction which they had, was conferred by the Church of *Rome*, that is, by the Pope: Becauſe the whole Church collectively doth not meet to ordain Biſhops or Prieſts, or to giue them Authority. But according to their own doctrine, they believe that the Pope neither *hath, or ought to haue any Iuriſdiction, Power, Superiority, Preheminence, or Authority Eccleſiaſticall, or Spirituall within this Realme*, which they ſweare euen when they are ordained Biſhops, Prieſts, and Deacons: How then can the Pope giue Iuriſdiction where they ſweare he neither *hath, nor OVGHT to haue any*? Or if yet he had, how could they without *Schiſme* withdraw themſelues from his obedience? Beſides, the *Roman* Church never gaue them Authority to oppoſe Her, by whom it was given. But grant, their firſt Biſhops had ſuch Authority from the Church of *Rome*: after the deceaſe of thoſe men, who gaue Authority to their pretended Succeſſours? The Primate of England? But from whom had he ſuch Authority? And after his deceaſe, who ſhall confer Authority upon his Succeſſours? The temporall Magiſtrate? King *Henry*, neither a Catholique, nor a Proteſtant? King *Edward*, a Child? Queen *Elizabeth*, a Woman? An Infant of one houres Age, is true King in caſe of his Predeceſſours deceaſe: But ſhall your Church lye fallow till that Infant-King, and green Head of the Church come to yeares of diſcretion? Doe your Biſhops, your Hierarchy, your Succeſſion, your Sacraments, your being or not being Heretiques for want of Succeſſion, depend on this new-found Supremacy-doctrine brought in by ſuch a man meerly upon baſe occaſions, and for ſhameful ends; impugned by *Calvin*, and his followers; derided by the Chriſtian world; and even by chiefe Proteſtants as *D. Andrewes*, *Wotton*, *&c.* not held for any neceſſary point of faith? And from whō I pray you, had Biſhops their Authority, when there were no Chriſtian Kings? Muſt the Greeke Patriarchs receiue ſpirituall Iuriſdiction from the Greek Turk? Did the Pope, by the Baptiſme of Princes, looſe the ſpirituall Power he formerly had of conferring ſpirituall Iuriſdiction upon Biſhops? Hath the temporall Magiſtrate authority to preach, to abſolue from ſinnes, to inflict excommunications, and other Cenſures? Why hath he not Power to excommunicate, as well as to diſpenſe in Irregularity, as our late Soueraign Lord King *Iames*, either diſpenſed with the late *Archbiſhop* of *Canterbury*, or elſe gaue commiſſion to ſome Biſhops to doe it? and ſince they were ſubiect to their Primate, and not he to them, it is cleer, that they had no Power to diſpenſe with him, but that power muſt proceed from the Prince, as Superiour to them all, and head of the Proteſtants Church in England. If he haue no ſuch authority, how can he giue to others what himſelfe hath not? Your Ordination, or Conſecration of Biſhops and Prieſts imprinting no *Character*, can only conſiſt in giving a Power, Authority, Iuriſdiction, or (as I ſaid before) ſome kind of Deputation to exerciſe Epiſcopall, or Prieſtly functions: If then, the temporall Magiſtrate conferres this Power &c. he can, nay he cannot chuſe but Ordain, and conſecrate Biſhops, & Prieſts, as often as he confers Authority or Iuriſdiction: and your Biſhops as ſoone as they are deſigned & confirmed by the King, muſt *ipſo facto* be Ordained and Conſecrated by him without intervention of *Biſhops*, or *Matter* and *Form* of *Ordination*: Which abſurdities you will bee more unwilling to grant, then well able to avoid, if you will be true to your own doctrines. The Pope from whom originally you muſt beg your Succeſſion of Biſhops, never received, nor will, nor can acknowledge to receiue any Spirituall Iuriſdiction from any Temporall Prince, and therefore if Iuriſdiction muſt be derived from Princes, he hath none at all: and yet either you muſt acknowledge, that hee hath true ſpirituall Iuriſdiction, or that your ſelues can receiue none from him.

x *Præſcr. cap.* 41.

21 Moreouer, this new Reformation, or Reformed Church of Proteſtants, will by them be pretended

pretended to be *Catholique*, or *Vniverſall*, and not confined to *England* alone, as the Sect of the *Donatiſts* was to *Africa*: and therefore it muſt comprehend all the Reformed Churches in *Germany*, *Holland*, *Scotland*. *France* &c. In which number, they of *Germany*, *Holland*, and *France* are not governed by Biſhops, nor regard any perſonall ſucceſſion, unleſſe of ſuch fat-beneficed Biſhops as *Nicolaus Amſfordius*, who was conſecrated by *Luther*, (though *Luther* himſelfe was never Biſhop) as witneſſeth (y) *Dreſſerus*. And though *Scotland* hath of late admitted ſome Biſhops, I much doubt whether they hold them to be neceſſary, or of divine Inſtitution; and ſo their enforced admitting of them, doth not ſo much furniſh that kingdome with *perſonall Succeſſion* of Biſhops, as it doth convince them to want *Succeſſion of Doctrine*; ſince in this their neglect of Biſhops they diſagree both from the milder Proteſtants of England, and the true Catholique Church: And by this want of a continued perſonall Succeſſion of Biſhops, they retaine the note of *Schiſme*, and *Hereſy*. So that the Church of Proteſtants, muſt either not be *Vniverſall*, as being confined to England; Or if you will needs comprehend all thoſe Churches which want ſucceſſion, you muſt confeſſe, that your Church doth not only communicate with *Schiſmaticall* and *Hereticall* Churches, but is alſo compounded of ſuch Churches; and your ſelves cannot avoid the note of Schiſmatiques, or Heretiques, if it were but for participating with ſuch hereticall Churches. For it is impoſſible to retain Communion with the true Catholique Church, and yet agree with them who are divided from her by Schiſme, or Hereſy; becauſe that were to affirme, that for the ſelfe ſame time, they could be *within*, and *without* the Catholique Church, as proportionably I diſcourſed in the next precedent Chapter, concerning the communicating of moderate Proteſtants with thoſe who maintaine that Hereſy of the Latency and Inviſibility of Gods Church, where I brought a place of *S. Cyprian* to this purpoſe, which the Reader may be pleaſed to reviewe in the *fift* Chapter, and 17. *Number*.

y *In Millenario ſexto Pag.* 187.

22 But beſides this defect in the perſonall Succeſſion of Proteſtant Biſhops, there is another of great moment; which is, that they want the right *Forme* of ordaining *Biſhops*, and *Prieſts*, becauſe the manner which they uſe is ſo much different from that of the *Roman* Church (at leaſt according to the common opinion of Divines) that it cannot be ſufficient for the *Eſſence* of *Ordination*; as I could demonſtrate if this were the proper place of ſuch a Treatiſe, and will not faile to doe if D. *Potter* give me occaſion. In the mean time the Reader may be pleaſed to read the Author (z) cited here in the margent, and then compare the forme of our Ordination with that of Proteſtants; and to remember, that if the forme which they uſe either in Conſecrating Biſhops, or in ordaining Prieſts be *at leaſt* doubtfull, they can neither have *undoubted* Prieſts, nor Biſhops. For *Prieſts* cannot be ordained but by true *Biſhops*, nor can any be a true Biſhop, unleſſe he firſt be *Prieſt*. I ſay, their Ordination is *at leaſt* doubtfull; becauſe that ſufficeth for my preſent purpoſe. For Biſhops and Prieſts, whoſe Ordination is *notoriouſly known* to be but doubtfull, are not to be eſteemed Biſhops, or Prieſts: and no man without Sacriledge can receive Sacraments from them; all which they adminiſter unlawfully: And (if we except Baptiſme, with manifeſt danger of invalidity, and with obligation to be at leaſt conditionally repeated) ſo Proteſtants muſt remain doubtfull of Remiſſion of ſinnes, of their Eccleſiaſticall Hierarchy, and may not pretend to be a true Church, which cannot ſubſiſt without *undoubted* true Biſhops and Prieſts, nor without due adminiſtration of Sacraments, which (according to Proteſtants) is an eſſentiall note of the true Church. And it is a world to obſerve the proceeding of Engliſh Proteſtants in this point of their *Ordinations*. For firſt, *Ann.* 3. *Edw.* 6. *cap.* 2. when he was a Child about twelve yeares of age, *It was enacted, that ſuch* (a) *forme of making, and conſecrating of Biſhops and Prieſts, as by ſixe Prelates, and ſixe other to be appointed by the King, ſhould be deviſed* (marke this word *deviſed*) *and ſet forth under the great Seale; ſhould be uſed, and none other*. But after this Act was repealed 1. *Mar. Seſſ.* 2. in ſo much as that when afterward *An.* 6. *&* 7. *Reg. Eliz.* Biſhop *Bonner* being endicted upon a certificate made by D. *Horne* a Proteſtant Biſhop of *Wincheſter*, for his refuſall of the Oath of Supremacy; and he excepting againſt the endictment becauſe D. *Horne* was no Biſhop; all the Iudges reſolved that his exception was good, if indeed D. *Horne* was not Biſhop, and they were all at a ſtand, till *An.* 8. *Eliz. cap.* 1. the act of *Edw.* 6. was renewed and confirmed, with a particular *proviſo*, that no man ſhould be impeached or moleſted by meanes of any certificate by any Biſhop or Archbiſhop made before this laſt Act. Whereby it is cleere, that they made ſome doubt of their own ordination, and that there is nothing but uncertainty in the whole buſineſſe of their Ordination, which (forſooth) muſt depend upon ſixe Prelats, the great Seale, Acts of Parliaments being contrary one to another, and the like.

z See *Adamum Tanerum tom.* 4. *diſp.* 7. *quæſt.* 2. *dub.* 3. *&* 4.

a *Dyer. fol.* 234. *term. Mich.* 6. *&* 7. *Eliz.*

23 But though they want Perſonall Succeſſion, yet at leaſt they have Succeſſion of doctrine as they ſay, and pretend to prove, becauſe they believe as the *Apoſtles* believed. This is to begg the Queſtion, and to take what they may be ſure, will never be granted. For if they want Perſonall Succeſſion, and ſleight Eccleſiaſticall Tradition, how will they perſwade any man, that they agree with the doctrine of the Apoſtles? We have heard *Tertullian* ſaying: *I will preſcribe* (b) againſt all Heretiques) *that there is no meanes to prove what the Apoſtles preached, but by the ſame Churches which they founded*. And *S. Irenæus* tels us that, *We may* (c) *behold the Tradition of the Apoſtles in every Church, if men be deſirous to hear the truth, and we can number them who were made Biſhops by the Apoſtles in Churches, and their Succeſſors even to us*. And the ſame Father in another place ſaith: *We ought to obey* (d) *thoſe Prieſts who are in the Church, who have Succeſſion from the Apoſtles, and who together with Succeſſion in their Biſhopricks have received the certaine*

b *Sup. c.* 5.

c *L.* 3. *c.* 5.

d *L.* 4. *c.* 43.

certain gift of truth. S. Auſtine ſaith: *I am kept in the Church* (e) *by the ſucceſſion of Prieſts from the very Sea of Peter the Apoſtle, to whom our Saviour after his Reſurrection committed his ſheep to be fed, even to the preſent Biſhop. Origen* to this purpoſe giveth us a good and wholſome Rule (happy, if himſelfe had followed the ſame) in theſe excellent words: *Since there be many who think* (f) *they believe the things which are of Chriſt, and ſome are of different opinion from thoſe who went before them; let the preaching of the Church be kept, which is delivered by the Apoſtles by order of Succeſſion, and remaines in the Church to this very day; that only is to be believed for truth, which in nothing diſagrees from the Tradition of the Church.* In vain then doe theſe men brag of the doctrine of the Apoſtles, unles firſt they can demonſtrate that they enjoyed a continued ſucceſſion of Biſhops from the Apoſtles, and can ſhew us a Church which, according to *S. Auſtine*, is deduced *by undoubted SUCCESSION from the Sea* (g) *of the Apoſtles, even to the preſent Biſhops.*

e *Contr. epiſt. Fundam. c.* 4.

f *Præf. ad lib. Periarchon.*

g *Cont. Fauſt. cap.* 2.

23 But yet nevertheleſſe, ſuppoſe it were granted, that they agreed with the doctrine of the Apoſtles; this were not ſufficient to prove a *Succeſſion* in *Doctrine*. For *Succeſſion*, beſides agreement or ſimilitude, doth alſo require a never-interrupted conveying of ſuch doctrine, from the time of the Apoſtles, till the daies of thoſe perſons, who challenge ſuch a *Succeſſion*. And ſo *S. Auguſtine* ſaith: We are to believe that Goſpell which from the time of the Apoſtles, *the* (h) *Church* hath brought downe to our daies *by a never-interrupted courſe of times, and by undoubted ſucceſſion of connection*. Now, that the Reformation begunne by *Luther*, was interrupted for divers ages before him, is manifeſt out of Hiſtory, and by his endeavouring a Reformation, which muſt preſuppoſe abuſes. He cannot therefore pretend a continued Succeſſion of that Doctrine which he fought to revive, and reduce to the knowledge, and practice of men. And they ought not to prove that they have Succeſſion of doctrine, becauſe they agree with the doctrine of the Apoſtles; but contrarily we muſt inferre, that they agree not with the Apoſtles, becauſe they cannot pretend a never-interrupted ſucceſſion of doctrine from the times of the Apoſtles, till *Luther*. And here it is not amiſſe to note, that although the *Waldenſes, Wicliffe &c.* had agreed with Proteſtants in all points of doctrine; yet they could not bragge of Succeſſion from them, becauſe their doctrine hath not been free from *interruption*, which neceſſarily croſſeth *Succeſſion*.

h *Lib. 28. cont. Fauſt. cap.* 2.

24 And as want of Succeſſion of Perſons and *Doctrine*, cannot ſtand with that *Vniverſality of Time*, which is inſeparable from the *Catholique* Church; ſo likewiſe the diſagreeing Sects which are diſperſed throughout divers Countries, and Nations, cannot help towards that *Vniverſality of Place*, wherewith the true Church muſt be endued: but rather ſuch locall multiplication, doth more & more lay open their diviſion, & want of Succeſſion in Doctrine. For the excellent Obſervation of *S. Auguſtine* doth punctually agree with all modern Heretiques, wherein this holy Father having cited theſe words out of the Prophet *Ezechiell*, (i) *My flocks are diſperſed upon the whole face of the Earth*; he addes this remarkable ſentence: *Not all Heretiques* (k) *are ſpread over the face of the Earth, and yet there are Heretiques ſpread over the whole face of the Earth, ſome here, ſome there, yet they are wanting in no place, they know not one another. One Sect for example in Africa, another Hereſy in the Eaſt, another in Egypt, another in Meſopotamia. In divers places they are divers: one Mother, pride hath begot them all, as our own Mother the Catholique Church hath brought forth all faithfull people diſperſed throughout the whole world. No wonder then, if Pride breed Diſſention, and Charity Vnion.* And in another place, applying to Heretiques thoſe words of the Canticles: *If thou know not* (l) *thy ſelfe, goe forth, and follow after the ſteps of the flocks, and feed thy kids*, he ſaith: *If thou know not thy ſelfe, goe* (m) *thou forth, I doe not caſt thee out, but goe thou out, that it may be ſaid of thee: They went from us, but they were not of us. Goe thou out in the ſteps of the flocks; not in my ſteps, but in the ſteps of the flocks, nor of one flock, but of divers and wandring flocks; And feed thy Kids, not as Peter, to whom is ſaid, Feed my ſheepe: but feed thy Kids in the Tabernacles of the Paſtors; not in the Tabernacle of the Paſtor, where there is one flock, and one Paſtor.* In which words this holy Father doth ſet downe the Markes of Hereſy, to wit, *going out* from the Church, and Want of Vnity among themſelves, which proceed from not acknowledging one ſupreme Viſible Paſtor and Head under Chriſt. And ſo it being Proved that Proteſtants having neither ſucceſſion of *Perſons*, nor *Doctrine*, nor *Vniverſality* of *Time*, or *Place*, cannot avoid the juſt note of *Hereſy*.

i *Cap. 24. k Lib. de Paſtorib. c.* 8. l *Cant.* 1. m *Ep.* 48.

25 Hitherto we have brought arguments to prove, that *Luther*, and all Proteſtants are guilty of *Hereſy* againſt the *Negative* Precept of *faith*, which obligeth us under paine of damnation, not to imbrace any one errour, contrary to any Truth ſufficiently propounded, as teſtified or revealed by Almighty God. Which were enough to make good, that among Perſons who diſagree in any one point of Faith, one part only can be ſaved: Yet we will now prove that Whoſoever erreth in any one point, doth alſo break the *Affirmative* Precept of *Faith*, whereby we are obliged poſitively, to believe ſome revealed truth with an *infallible*, and *ſupernaturall Faith*, which is neceſſary to ſalvation, even *neceſſitate finis*, or *medii*, as Divines ſpeak; that is, ſo neceſſary that not any, after he is come to the uſe of Reaſon, was or can be ſaved without it, according to the words of the Apoſtle: *Without Faith* (n) *it is impoſſible to pleaſe God.*

n Heb. 11. 6.

26 In the beginning of this Chapter I ſhewed, that to Chriſtian Catholique faith are required *Certainty*, *Obſcurity*, *Prudence*, and *Supernaturality*; All which Conditions we will proue to bee wanting in the beliefe of Proteſtants, even in thoſe points which are true in themſelues, and to which they yeeld aſſent, as hapeneth in all thoſe particulars, wherein they agree with us; from whence it will follow, that they wanting true *Divine Faith*, want meanes abſolutely neceſſary to ſalvation.

The faith of Proteſtants wanteth Certainty.

27 And firſt, that their beliefe wanteth *Certainty*, I proue, becauſe they denying the Vniuerſall infallibility of the Church, can haue no certain ground to know what Obiects are reuealed, or teſtified by God. Holy Scripture is in it ſelfe moſt true and infallible; but without the direction & declaration of the Church, we can neither haue certain means to know what Scripture is Canonicall; nor what Tranſlations be faithfull, nor what is the true meaning of Scripture. Every Proteſtant, as I ſuppoſe, is perſwaded that his own opinions, be true, and that he hath uſed ſuch means as are wont to be preſcribed for underſtanding the Scripture, as Prayer, Conferring of divers Texts, &c. and yet their diſagreements ſhew that ſome of them are deceaued: And therefore it is cleer that they haue no one certain ground whereon to rely for underſtanding of Scripture. And ſeeing they hold all the Articles of Faith, even concerning fundamentall points, upon the ſelfe ſame ground of Scripture, interpreted, not by the Churches Authority, but according to ſome other Rules, which as experience of their contradictions teach, doe ſometimes faile; it is cleer that the ground of their faith is infallible in no point at all. And albeit ſometime it chance to hit on the truth, yet it is likewiſe apt to lead them to errour: As all Arch-heretiques believing ſome truths, & withall divers errours upon the ſame ground and motive, have indeed no true divine infallible faith, but only a fallible humane opinion, and perſwaſion. For if the ground upon which they rely were certain, it could never produce any errour.

28 Another cauſe of uncertainty in the faith of Proteſtants, muſt riſe from their diſtinction of points fundamentall, and not fundamentall. For ſince they acknowledge, that every errour in fundamentall points deſtroyeth the ſubſtance of faith and yet cannot determine what points bee fundamentall; it followeth that they muſt remain uncertain whether or no they be not in ſome fundamentall error, and ſo want the ſubſtance of faith, without which there can be no hope of Salvation.

29 And that he who erreth againſt any one reuealed truth (as certainly ſome Proteſtants muſt doe, becauſe contradictory Propoſitions cannot both be true) doth looſe all *Divine faith*; is a very true doctrine delivered by Catholique Divines, with ſo generall a conſent, that the contrary is wont to be cenſured as temerarious. The Angelicall Doctor S. *Thomas* propoſeth this Queſtion: 2.2.q.5. ar. 3. *in corp.* *Whether* (a) *he who denieth one Article of faith, may retain faith in other Articles?* and reſolveth that he cannot: which he proveth, (*Argumento ſed contra*) becauſe, *As deadly ſin is oppoſite to Charity; ſo to deny one Article of faith is oppoſite to faith. But Charity doth not remain with any one deadly ſin; therefore faith doth not remain after the deniall of any one Article of faith.* Whereof he gives this farther reaſon: *Becauſe* (ſaith he) *the nature of every habit doth depend upon the formall Motiue and Obiect thereof, which Motiue being taken away, the nature of the habit cannot remain. But the formall Obiect of faith is the ſupreme truth as it is manifeſted in Scriptures, and in the doctrine of the Church which proceeds from the ſame ſupreme verity. Whoſoeuer therefore doth not rely upon the doctrine of the Church (which proceeds from the ſupreme verity, manifeſted in Scripture) as upon an infallible Rule, hee hath not the habit of faith, but belieues thoſe things which belong to faith, by ſome other meanes then by faith: as if one ſhould remember ſome Concluſion, and not know the reaſon of that demonſtration, it is cleer that hee hath not certain knowledge, but only Opinion. Now it is manifeſt, that hee who relies on the doctrine of the Church, as upon an infallible Rule, will yeeld his aſſent to all, that the Church teacheth. For if a-mong thoſe things, which ſhe teacheth, he hold what he will, and doth not hold what he will not, hee doth not rely upon the doctrine of the Church, as upon an infallible Rule, but only upon his own will. And ſo it is cleer that an Heretique, who with pertinacity denieth one Article of faith, is not ready to follow the doctrine of the Church in all things: And therefore it is manifeſt, that whoſoeuer is an Heretique in any one Article of faith, concerning other Articles, hath not faith, but a kind of Opinion, or his own will.* Thus far, *S. Thomas*. And afterward: A *man doth belieue* (q) *all the Articles of faith for one and the ſelfe ſame reaſon, to wit, for the Prime Verity propoſed to us in the Scripture, underſtood aright according to the Doctrine of the Church: and therefore whoſoeuer fals from this reaſon or motiue, is totally deprived of faith.* From this true doctrine wee are to infer, that to retain, or want the ſubſtance of faith, doth not conſiſt in the matter, or multitude of the Articles, but in the oppoſition againſt Gods divine teſtimony, which is involved in every leaſt error againſt faith. And ſince ſome Proteſtants muſt needs erre, and that they haue no certain rule to knowe, why rather one then another; it manifeſtly follows that none of them haue any Certainty for the ſubſtance of their faith in any one point. Moreover D. *Potter*, being forced to confeſſe that the Roman Church wants not the ſubſtance of faith, it follows that ſhe doth not erre in any one point againſt faith, becauſe as we haue ſeen out of *S. Thomas*, every ſuch errour deſtroies the ſubſtance of faith. Now if the Roman Church did not erre in any one point of faith, it is manifeſt that Proteſtants erre in all thoſe points wherein they are contrary to her. And this may ſuffice, to

¶ *Ad 2.*

prove

prove that the faith of Proteſtants wants Infallibility.

30 And now for the ſecond Condition of faith, I ſay: If Proteſtants haue *Certainty*, they want *Obſcurity*, and ſo haue not that faith which, as the Apoſtle ſaith, is of things *not appearing*, or not neceſſitating our Vnderſtanding to an aſſent. For the whole edifice of the faith of Proteſtants, is ſetled on theſe two Principles: Theſe particular Books are Canonicall Scripture: And the ſenſe and meaning of theſe Canonicall Scriptures, is cleer and evident, at leaſt in all points neceſſary to Salvation. Now, theſe Principles being once ſuppoſed, it cleerly followeth, that what Proteſtants believe as neceſſary to ſalvation, is evidently known by them to be *true*, by this argument: It is *certain* and *evident*, that whatſoever is contained in the word of God, is true. But it is *certain* and *evident*, that theſe Books in particular are the word of God: Therefore it is *certaine* and *evident*, that whatſoever is contained in theſe Books is true. Which *Concluſion* I take for a *Maior* in a ſecond Argument, and ſay thus: It is *certain* and *evident* that whatſoever is contained in theſe Books is true: but it is *certain* and *evident*, that ſuch particular Articles (for example, the Trinity, Incarnation, Originall ſin, &c.) are contained in theſe Books: Therefore it is *certain* and *evident*, that theſe particular Objects are true. Neither will it avail you to ſay, that the ſaid Principles are not evident by naturall diſcourſe, but onely to *the eye of reaſon cleered by grace*, as you ſpeak. For ſupernaturall evidence, no leſſe (yea rather more) drawes and excludes *obſcurity*, then naturall evidence doth: neither can the party ſo enlightned be ſaid voluntarily to captivate his underſtanding to that light, but rather his underſtanding is by a neceſſity made captive, and forced not to disbelieve, what is preſented by ſo cleare a light: And therefore your imaginary faith is not the true faith defined by the Apoſtle, but an invention of your own.

They want the ſecond Condition of Faith: Obſcurity.

31 That the faith of Proteſtants wanteth the third Condition which was *Prudence*, is deduced from all that hitherto hath been ſaid. What wiſdome was it, to forſake a Church confeſſedly very ancient, and beſides which, there could be demonſtrated no other viſible Church of Chriſt upon earth? A Church acknowledged to want nothing neceſſary to Salvation; endued with Succeſſion of Biſhops, with *Viſibility* and Vniverſality of *Time* and *Place*; A Church which if it bee not the true Church, her enemies cannot pretend to have any Church, Ordination, Scriptures, Succeſſion, &c. and are forced for their own ſake, to maintain her perpetuall Exiſtence, and Being! To leave, I ſay, ſuch a Church, and frame a Community, without either Vnity, or means to procure it; a Church which at *Luthers* firſt revolt had no larger extent then where his body was; A Church without *Vniverſality* of *place* or *Time*; A Church which can pretend no *Viſibility*, or *Being*, except only in that former Church which it oppoſeth; A Church void of Succeſſion of *Perſons* or *Doctrine*? What wiſedome was it to follow ſuch men as *Luther*, in an oppoſition againſt the viſible Church of Chriſt, begun upon meer paſſion? What wiſdome is it to receive from *Vs*, a Church, Ordination, Scriptures, Perſonall Succeſſion, and not Succeſſion of Doctrine? Is not this to verifie the name of *Hereſie*, which ſignifieth *Election* or *Choice*? Whereby they cannot avoid that note of Imprudency, (or as *S. Auguſtine* calls it) Fooliſhneſſe, ſet down by him againſt the *Manichees*, and by me recited before. *I would not* (ſaith he) *believe* (r) *the Goſpell, unleſſe the Authority of the Church did moue me. Thoſe therefore whom I obeyed, ſaying, Believe the Goſpel, why ſhould I not obey the ſame mē ſaying to me, Doe not believe Manichæus* (Luther, Calvin, &c.) *Chooſe what thou pleaſeſt: If thou ſay, Believe the Catholiques; they warne me not to believe thee. Wherefore if I believe them, I cannot believe thee. If thou ſay, Doe not believe the Catholiques; thou ſhalt not doe well, in forcing me to the faith of Manichæus, becauſe by the Preaching of Catholiques, I believed the Goſpell it ſelfe. If thou ſay; you did well to believe them* (Catholiques) *commending the Goſpell, but you did not well to believe them, diſcommending Manichæus; doſt thou think me ſo very FOOLISH, that without any reaſon at all, I ſhould believe what thou wilt, and not believe, what thou wilt not?* Nay this holy Father is not content to call it *Fooliſhneſſe*, but meer *Madneſſe*, in theſe words: *Why ſhould I not moſt diligently enquire* (s) *what Chriſt commanded of thoſe before all others, by whoſe Authority I was moved to believe, that Chriſt commanded any good thing? Canſt thou better declare to me, what he ſaid, whom I would not haue thought to haue been, or to be, if the Beliefe thereof had been recommended by thee to me? This therefore I believed by fame, ſtrengthned with Celebrity, Conſent, Antiquitie. But every one may ſee that you, ſo few, ſo turbulent, ſo new, can produce nothing which deſerues Authority. What MADNESSE is this? Believe them* (Catholiques) *that we ought to believe Chriſt; but learne of us what Chriſt ſaid. Why I beſeech thee? Surely if they* (Catholiques) *were not at all, and could not teach mee any thing, I would more eaſily perſwade my ſelfe, that I were not to believe Chriſt, then I ſhould learne any thing concerning him from other then thoſe, by whom I believed him.* Laſtly, I aske what wiſedome it could bee to leaue all viſible Churches, and conſequently the true Catholique Church of Chriſt, which you confeſſe cannot erre in points neceſſary to ſalvation, and the *Roman* Church which you grant doth not erre in fundamentalls, and follow private men who may erre even in points neceſſary to ſalvation? Eſpecially if we adde, that when *Luther* roſe, there was no viſible true Catholique Church beſides that of Rome, and them who agreed with her; in which ſenſe, ſhe was, and is, the only true Church of Chriſt, and not capable of any Error in faith. Nay, even *Luther*, who firſt oppoſed the *Roman* Church, yet comming to diſpute againſt other Heretiques, he is forced to give the Lye both to his

Their faith wants Prudence.

r *Cont. ep. Fund. c. 5.*

s *Lib. de util. Cred. c. 14.*

own words and deeds, in saying: *We freely confesse* (t) *that in the Papacy there are many good things, worthy the name of Christian, which have come from them to us. Namely, we confesse that in the Papacy there is true Scripture, true Baptisme, the true Sacrament of the Altar, the true keys for remission of sinnes, the true office of Preaching, true Catechisme, as our Lords Prayer, Ten Commandements, Articles of faith &c.* And afterward: *I avouch, that under the Papacy there is true Christianity, yea the Kernell and Marrow of Christianity, and many pious and great Saints.* And again he affirmeth, that *the Church of Rome hath the true Spirit, Gospells, Faith, Baptisme, Sacraments, the Keyes, the Office of Preaching, Prayer, Holy Scripture, and whatsoever Christianity ought to have.* And a little before: *I heare and see that they bring in Anabaptisme only to this end, that they may spight the Pope, as men that will receive nothing from Antichrist; no otherwise then the Sacramentaries doe, who therefore believe only Bread and Wine to be in the Sacrament, meerely in hatred against the Bishop of Rome; and they think that by this meanes they shall overcome the Papacy. Verily these men rely upon a weak ground, for by this meanes they must deny the whole Scripture, and the Office of Preaching. For we have all these things from the Pope; otherwise we must goe make a new Scripture. O Truth, more forcible* (as S. *Austine* saies) *to wring out* (x) *Confession, then is any racke, or torment!* And so we may truly say with *Moyses*: *Inimici nostri sunt Iudices: Our very Enemies give* (y) *sentence for us.*

t *In epist. cont. Anab. ad duos Parochos. to. 2. Germ. Witt. fol. 229. & 230.*

x *Contra Donat. post collat. cap. 24.*

y Deut. c. 32. 31.

32 Lastly, since your faith wanteth *Certainty*, and *Prudence*, it is easy to inferre that it wants the fourth Condition, *Supernaturality*. For being but an *Humane* perswasion, or Opinion, it is not in nature, or Essence *Supernaturall*. And being *imprudent*, and rash, it cannot proceed from divine Motion and grace; and therefore it is neither supernaturall in *it selfe*, nor in the *cause* from which it proceedeth.

Their faith wants Supernaturality.

33 Since therefore we have proved, that whosoever erres against any one point of faith, looseth all divine faith, even concerning those other Articles wherein he doth not erre; and that although he could still retaine true faith for some points, yet any one errour in whatsoever other matter concerning faith, is a grievous sinne; it cleerely followes, that when two or more hold different doctrines concerning faith and Religion, there can be but one Part saved. For declaring of which truth, if Catholiques be charged with *Want* of *Charity*, and *Modesty*, and be accused of rashnesse, ambition, and fury, as *D. Potter* is very free in this kind; I desire every one to ponder the words of *S. Chrysostome*, who teacheth, that every least errour overthrowes all faith, and whosoever is guilty thereof, is in the *Church*, like one, who in the *Common-wealth* forgeth false coine. *Let them heare* (saith this holy Father) *what S. Paul saith: Namely, that they who brought in some small errour* (z) *had overthrown the Gospell. For, to shew how a small thing ill mingled doth corrupt the whole, he said, that the Gospell was subverted. For as he who clips a little of the stamp from the Kings mony, makes the whole piece of no value: so whosoever takes away the least particle of sound faith, is wholly corrupted, alwaies going from that beginning to worse things. Where then are they, who condemne us as contentious persons, because we cannot agree with Heretiques, and doe often say, that there is no difference betwixt us and them, but that our disagreement proceeds from Ambition to dominere?* And thus having shewed that Protestants want true *Faith*, it remaineth that, according to my first designe, I examine whether they doe not also want *Charity*, as it respects a mans selfe.

z Galat. 1. 7.

THE ANSVVER TO THE SIXTH CHAPTER.

That Protestants are not Heretiques.

Ad §. 1 IF that will accuse any one man, much more any great multitude of men of any great and horrible crime, should in all reason and justice take care that the greatnesse of his evidence doe equall, if not exceed the quality of the crime. And such an accusation you would here make shew of, by pretending, first, *to lay such grounds of it, as are either already proved, or else yeelded on all sides*: and after to raise a firme and stable structure of convincing arguments upon them. But both these I find to be meere and vaine pretences, and having

having conſidered this Chapter alſo without prejudice or paſſion, as I did the former, I am enforc'd by the light of Truth, to pronounce your whole diſcourſe, a painted and ruinous Building upon a weak & ſandy Foundation.

2 *Ad* §.2.3. Firſt for your grounds, a great part of thē, is falſely ſaid to be either proved or granted. It is true indeed that *Man by his naturall wit or induſtry could never have attained to the knowledge of Gods will to give him a ſupernaturall and eternall happineſſe*, nor of the meanes by which his pleaſure was to beſtow this happineſſe upon him. And therefore your firſt ground is good, *That it was requiſite his underſtanding ſhould be enabled to apprehend that end and meanes by a knowledge ſupernaturall.* I ſay this is good, if you mean by *knowledge*, an apprehenſion or beliefe. But if you take the word properly and exactly, it is both falſe, for faith is not knowledge, no more then three is foure, but eminently contained in it, ſo that he that knowes, believes, and ſomething more, but he that believes many times does not know, nay if he doth barely and meerely believe, he doth never know: and beſides it is retracted by your ſelfe preſently, where you require, *That the object of faith muſt be both naturally and ſupernaturally unknown.* And againe in the next page, where you ſay, *Faith differs from ſcience in regard of the objects obſcurity.* For that ſcience and knowledge properly taken are Synonimous termes, and that a knowledge of a thing abſolutely unknown is a plain implicancy, I think are things ſo plain, that you will not require any proofe of them.

3 But then whereas you adde, *that if ſuch a knowledge were no more then probable, it could not be able ſufficiently to overbeare our will, and encounter with humane probabilities, being backed with the ſtrength of fleſh and bloud, and therefore conclude, that it was farther neceſſary, that this ſupernaturall knowledge ſhould be moſt certain and infallible:* To this I anſwere, that I doe heartily acknowledge and believe the Articles of our faith be in themſelves Truths, as certain and infallible as the very common Principles of Geometry and Metaphyſicks. But that there is required of us a knowledge of them, and an adherence to them, as certain as that of ſenſe or ſcience, that ſuch a certainty is required of us under pain of damnation, ſo that no man can hope to be in the ſtate of Salvation, but he that findes in himſelfe ſuch a degree of faith, ſuch a ſtrength of adherence: This I have already demonſtrated to be a great errour, and of dangerous and pernitious conſequence. And becauſe I am more and more confirm'd in my perſwaſion that the truth which I there delivered, is of great and ſingular uſe, I will here confirme it with more reaſons. And to ſatisfy you that this is no ſingularity of my own, my Margent preſents you with a [a] Pro-

[a] M. *Hooker* in his anſwer to *Travers* his ſupplication. --I have taught that the aſſurance of things which we believe by the word, is not ſo certain as of that we perceive by ſence. And is it as certaine? Yea I taught, that the things which God doth promiſe in his word are ſurer unto us then any thing we touch, handle or ſee. But are we ſo ſure and certain of them? If we be, why doth God ſo often prove his promiſes unto us, as he doth by arguments taken from our ſenſible experience? We muſt be ſurer of the proofe then the thing proved, otherwiſe it is no proofe. How is it that if ten men doe all looke upon the Moone, every one of them knowes it as certainly to bee the Moone as another: but many believing one and the ſame promiſes all haue not one and the ſame fullneſſe of perſwaſion? How falleth it out that men being aſſured of any thing by ſence, can be no ſurer of it then they are? whereas the ſtrongeſt in faith that liveth upon the earth, had alwaies need to labour, and ſtrive, and pray, that his aſſurance concerning heavenly and ſpirituall things may grow, increaſe, and be augmented.

teſtant Divine of great authority, and no way ſingular in his opinions, who hath long ſince preached and juſtified the ſame doctrine.

4 I ſay then that every Text of Scripture which makes mention of any that were *weak*, or any that were *ſtrong in faith*: of any that were *of litle*, or any that were *of great faith*: of any that *abounded*, or any that were *rich* in faith: of *encreaſing, growing, rooting, grounding, eſtabliſhing, confirming in faith*: Every ſuch Text, is a demonſtrative refutation of this vain fancy: proving that faith, even true and ſaving faith, is not a thing conſiſting in ſuch an indiviſible point of perfection as you make it, but capable of augmentation and diminution. Every Praier you make to God to encreaſe your faith (or if you conceive ſuch a prayer derogatory from the perfection of your faith,) *The Apoſtles praying to Chriſt to encreaſe their faith*, is a convincing argument of the ſame concluſion. Moreover if this doctrine of yours were true, then ſeeing not any the leaſt doubting can conſiſt with a moſt infallible certainty, it will follow that every leaſt doubting in any matter of faith, though reſiſted and involuntary, is a damnable ſinne, abſolutely deſtructive, ſo long as it laſts, of all true and ſaving faith: which you are ſo farre from granting, that you make it no ſinne at all, but only an occaſion of merit: and if you ſhould eſteeme it a ſinne, then muſt you acknowledge, contrary to your owne Principles, that there are Actuall ſinnes meerely involuntary. The ſame is furthermore invincibly confirmed by every deliberate ſinne that any Chriſtian commits; by any progreſſe in Charity that he makes. For ſeeing, as S. *Iohn* aſſures us, *our faith is the victory which overcomes the world*, certainly if the faith of all true Believers were perfect, (and if true faith be capable of no imperfection, if all faith be a knowledge moſt certain and infallible, all faith muſt be perfect, for the moſt imperfect that is, according to your doctrine, if it be true, muſt be *moſt certain*, and ſure the moſt perfect that is, cannot be more then moſt certain,) then certainly their victory over the World, and therefore over the fleſh, and therefore over ſinne, muſt of neceſſity be perfect, and ſo it ſhould be impoſſible for any true believer to commit any deliberate ſinne, and therefore he that commits any ſinne, muſt not think himſelfe a true believer. Beſides ſeeing faith worketh by Charity, and Charity is the effect of faith: certainly if the cauſe were perfect, the effect would be perfect, and conſequently as you make no degrees in faith, ſo there would be none in charity, and ſo no man could poſſibly make any progreſſe in it, but all true believers ſhould be equall in Charity, as in faith you make them equall: & from thence it would follow unavoidably, that whoſoever findes in himſelfe any true faith, muſt preſently perſwade himſelfe that he is perfect in Charity: and whoſoever on the other ſide, diſcovers in his charity any imperfection, muſt not believe that he hath any true faith. Theſe you ſee are ſtrange and portentous conſequences, and yet the deduction of them from your doctrine is cleere and apparent; which ſhewes this doctrine of yours, which you would fain have true, that there might be ſome neceſſity of your Churches infallibility, to be indeed plainly repugnant not

only

only to Truth but even to all Religion and Piety,& fit for nothing but to make men negligent of making any progreſſe in faith or Charity. And therefore I muſt entreat and adjure you either to diſcover unto me (which I take God to witneſſe I cannot perceive,) ſome fallacy in my reaſons againſt it, or never hereafter to open your mouth in defence of it.

5 As for that one ſingle reaſon which you produce to confirm it, it will appeare upon examination to be reſolved finally into a groundleſſe Aſſertion of your own,contrary to all Truth and experience,and that is, *That no degree of faith,leſſe then a moſt certaine and infallible knowledge, can bee able ſufficiently to overbeare our will and encounter with humane probabilities, being backt with the ſtrength of Fleſh and Blood.* For who ſees not that many millions in the world forgoe many times their preſent eaſe and pleaſure, undergoe great and toylſome labours,encounter great difficulties,adventure vpon great dangers, and all this not upon any certain expectation,but upon a probable hope of ſome future gain and commodity, and that not infinite and eternall, but finite and temporall? Who ſees not that many men abſtain from many things they exceedingly deſire, not upon any certain aſſurance, but a probable feare of danger that may come after? What man ever was there ſo madly in loue with a preſent penny, but that hee would willingly ſpend it upon any litle hope that by doing ſo hee might gain an hundred thouſand pound? And I would fain know *what gay probabilities* you could deviſe to diſſwade him from this Reſolution. And if you can deviſe none,what reaſon then,or ſenſe is there, but that a probable hope of infinite and eternall happineſſe, provided for all thoſe that obey *Chriſt Ieſus*,and much more a firme faith, though not ſo certain, in ſome ſort,as ſenſe or ſcience, may be able to ſway our will to obedience, and encounter with all thoſe temptations which Fleſh and Blood can ſuggeſt to avert us from it? Men may therefore talke their pleaſure of an abſolute and moſt infallible certainty,but did they generally believe that obedience to Chriſt were the only way to preſent and eternall felicity,but as firmly and undoubtedly as that there is ſuch a Citty as *Conſtantinople*, nay but as much as *Cæſars* Commentaries,or the Hiſtory of *Saluſt*,I believe the liues of moſt men, both Papiſts and Proteſtants would be better then they are.Thus therefore out of your own words I argue againſt you: He that requires to true faith, an abſolute and infallible certainty, for this onely Reaſon *becauſe any leſſe degree could not be able to overbeare our will*, &c. imports, that if a leſſe degree of faith were able to doe this, then a leſſe degree of faith may be true and divine and ſaving Faith: But experience ſhews, and reaſon confirmes,that a firm faith, though not ſo certain as ſenſe or ſcience, may be able to encounter and overcome our will and affections: And therefore it followes from your own reaſon, that faith which is not a moſt certain and infallible knowledge may be true and divine and ſaving faith.

6 All theſe Reaſons I haue imployed to ſhew that ſuch a moſt certain and infallible faith as here you talk of,is not ſo neceſſary,but that without

without ſuch a high degree of it, it is poſſible to pleaſe God. And therefore the Doctrines delivered by you § 25. are moſt preſumptuous and uncharitable: *viz*: *That ſuch a moſt certain and infallible faith is neceſſary to ſalvation, neceſſitate Finis, or Medii*, ſo neceſſary, that *after a man is come to the uſe of reaſon, no man ever was or can bee ſaved without it.* Wherein you boldly intrude into the judgement ſeat of God, & damne men for breaking Lawes, not of God's, but your own making. But withall, you cleerly contradict your ſelfe, not only where you affirm, *That your faith depends finally upon the Tradition of Age to Age, of Father to Sonne*, which cannot be a fit ground, but onely for a Morall Aſſurance; nor only, where you pretend, that *not alone Hearing and Seeing*, but alſo *Hiſtories, Letters, Relations of many* (which certainly are things not certain and infallible,) *are yet foundations good enough to ſupport your faith*; Which Doctrine, if it were good and allowable, Proteſtants might then hope that their Hiſtories and Letters and Relations might alſo paſſe for means ſufficient of a ſufficient Certainty, and that they ſhould not bee excluded from Salvation for want of ſuch a Certainty. But indeed the preſſure of the preſent difficulty compell'd you to ſpeak here, what I believe you wil not juſtify, and with a pretty tergiverſation to ſhew D. *Potter* your means of morall certainty; whereas the Objection was that you had no means or poſſibility of infallible certainty, for which you are plainly at as great a loſſe and as far to ſeek as any of your Adverſaries. And therefore it concernes you highly not to damne others for want of it, leaſt you involue your ſelues in the ſame condemnation; according to thoſe terrible words of S. *Paul*, *Inexcuſabilis es*, *&c.* In this therefore you plainly contradict your ſelfe. And laſtly moſt plainly, in ſaying as you doe here, you contradict and retract your pretence of Charity to Proteſtants in the beginning of your Book: For there you make profeſſion, that *you haue no aſſurance but that Proteſtants dying Proteſtants, may poſſibly dye with contrition, and be ſaved*: And here you are very peremptory, that *they cannot but want a means abſolutely neceſſary to ſalvation, and wanting that cannot but be damned.*

P. 1. C. 2. §. 14.

P. 2. C. 5. §. 32.

7 The third Condition you require to faith, is, that our aſſent to divine Truths ſhould *not only be unknown and unevident by any humane diſcourſe*, but that *abſolutely alſo it ſhould be obſcure in it ſelfe, and ordinarily ſpeaking, be void even of ſupernaturall evidence.* Which words muſt have a very favourable conſtructiō, or elſe they will not be ſenſe. For who can make any thing of theſe words taken properly, that *faith muſt be an unknown unevident aſſent, or an aſſent abſolutely obſcure?* I had alwaies thought that known and unknown, obſcure and evident had been affections, not of our Aſſent, but the Object of it, not of our beliefe, but the thing believed. For well may wee aſſent to a thing unknown, obſcure, or unevident; but that our aſſent it ſelfe ſhould bee called therefore unknown or obſcure, ſeems to me as great an impropriety, as if I ſhould ſay, your ſight were green or blew, becauſe you ſee ſomething that is ſo. In other places therefore I anſwer your words, but here I muſt anſwer your meaning: which I conceive to be, That it

is

is neceſſary to faith that the Objects of it, the points which we believe ſhould not be ſo evidently certain, as to neceſſitate our underſtandings to an Aſſent, that ſo there might be ſome merit in faith, as you love to ſpeak (who will not receive no not from God himſelfe, but a penny-worth for a penny,) but as we, ſome obedience in it, which can hardly have place where there is no poſſibility of diſobedience, as there is not where the underſtanding does all, and the will nothing. Now ſeeing the Religion of Proteſtants, though it be much more credible then yours, yet is not pretended to haue the abſolute evidence of ſenſe or demonſtration; therefore I might let this doctrine paſſe without exception, for any prejudice that can redound to us by it. But yet I muſt not forbeare to tell you, that your diſcourſe proves indeed this condition requiſite to the merit, but yet not to the eſſence of faith: without it faith were not an act of obedience, but yet faith may bee faith without it; and this you muſt confeſſe, unleſſe you will ſay either the Apoſtles believed not the whole Goſpel which they preached, or that they were not eye-witneſſes of a great part of it: unleſſe you will queſtion S. *Iohn* for ſaying *that which we haue ſeen with our eyes, and which our hands haue handled, &c. declare we unto you*: nay our Saviour himſelfe for ſaying, *Thomas becauſe thou ſeeſt thou believeſt, Bleſſed are they which haue not ſeen and yet haue believed.* Yet if you will ſay that in reſpect of the things which they ſaw, the Apoſtles aſſent was not pure & proper and meer faith, but ſomewhat more; an aſſent containing faith but ſuperadding to it, I will not contend with you, for it will bee a contention about words. But then again I muſt crave leave to tell you, that the requiring this condition, is in my judgement a plain revocation of the former. For had you made the matter of faith either naturally or ſupernaturally evident, it might have been a fitly attẽpered & duely proportioned object for an abſolute certainty naturall or ſupernaturall: But requiring as you doe, *that faith ſhould be an abſolute knowledge of a thing not abſolutely known, an infallible certainty of a thing which though it is in it ſelfe, yet is it not made appeare to us to be infallibly certain*, to my underſtanding you ſpeak impoſſibilities. And truly for one of your Religion to doe ſo, is but a good *Decorum*. For the matter and object of your Faith being ſo full of contradictions, a contradictious faith may very well become a contradictious Religion. Your faith therefore, if you pleaſe to haue it ſo, let it be a free, neceſſitated, certain, uncertain, evident, obſcure, prudent and fooliſh, naturall and ſupernaturall unnaturall aſſent. But they which are unwilling to believe non-ſenſe themſelves, or to perſwade others to doe ſo, it is but reaſon they ſhould make the faith wherewith they believe, an intelligible, compoſſible, conſiſtent thing, and not define it by repugnances. Now nothing is more repugnant, then that a man ſhould be required to give moſt certain credit unto that which cannot be made appeare moſt certainly credible: and if it appeare to him to be ſo, then is it not obſcure that it is ſo. For if you ſpeak of an acquired, rationall, diſcurſive faith, certainly theſe Reaſons which make the object ſeem credible, muſt be the cauſe of it, and conſequently the ſtrength and firmity

of my aſſent muſt riſe and fall together with the apparent credibility of the object. If you ſpeak of a ſupernaturall infuſed faith, then you either ſuppoſe it infuſed by the former meanes, and then that which was ſaid before muſt be ſaid again: for whatſoever effect is wrought meerly by meanes, muſt beare proportion to, and cannot exceed the vertue of the meanes, by which it is wrought: As nothing by water can be made more cold then water, nor by fire more hot then fire, nor by honey more ſweet then honey, nor by gall more bitter then gall: Or if you will ſuppoſe it infuſed without meanes, then that power which infuſeth into the underſtanding aſſent which beares analogie to ſight in the eye, muſt alſo infuſe evidence, that is, Viſibilitie into the Object: & look what degree of aſſent is infus'd into the underſtanding, at leaſt the ſame degree of evidence muſt be infuſed into the Object. And for you to require a ſtrength of credit beyond the appearance of the objects credibility, is all one as if you ſhould require me to goe ten miles an houre upon a horſe that will goe but fiue: to diſcern a man certainly through a myſt or cloud, that makes him not certainly diſcernable; To heare a ſound more cleerly then it is audible; to underſtand a thing more fully then it is intelligible: and he that doth ſo, I may well expect that his next injunction will be, that I muſt ſee ſomething that is inviſible, heare ſomething inaudible, underſtand ſomething that is wholly unintelligible. For he that demands ten of me, knowing I haue but five, does in effect, as if he demanded five, knowing that I have none: and by like reaſon, you requiring that I ſhould ſee things farther then they are viſible, require I ſhould ſee ſomething inviſible, and in requiring that I believe ſomething more firmly then it is made to mee evidently credible, you require in effect that I believe ſomething which appeares to me incredible, and while it does ſo. I deny not but that I am bound to believe the truth of many Texts of Scripture the ſenſe whereof is to me obſcure, & the truth of many Articles of faith the manner whereof is obſcure, and to humane underſtandings incomprehenſible; But then it is to be obſerved, that not the ſenſe of ſuch Texts, not the manner of theſe things is that which I am bound to believe, but the truth of them. But that I ſhould believe the truth of any thing, the truth whereof cannot bee made evident with an evidence proportionable to the degree of faith required of me, this I ſay for any man to be bound to, is unjuſt and unreaſonable, becauſe to doe it is impoſſible.

8 *Ad* § 4.5.6.7.8.9.10.11.& 12. Yet though I deny that it is required of us to be certain in the higheſt degree, infallibly certain of the truth of the things which we believe, for this were to know & not believe, neither is it poſſible unleſſe our evidence of it, be it naturall or ſupernaturall, were of the higheſt degree; yet I deny not but, that wee are to believe the Religion of Chriſt, we are and may be infallibly certain. For firſt, this is moſt certain, that we are in all things to doe according to wiſdome and reaſon rather then againſt it. Secondly, this is as certain, That wiſdome and Reaſon require that wee ſhould believe theſe things which are by many degrees more credible and probable then

then the contrary. Thirdly, this is as certain, that to every man who conſiders impartially what great things may be ſaid for the truth of Chriſtianity, and what poore things they are which may be ſaid againſt it, either for any other Religion or for none at all, it cannot but appear by many degrees more credible, that Chriſtian Religiō, is true then the contrary. And from all theſe premiſes, this concluſion evidently followes, that it is infallibly certain, that we are firmely to beleeve the truth of Chriſtian Religion.

9 Your diſcourſe therefore touching the fourth requiſite to faith which is Prudence, I admit ſo farre as to grant. 1. That if we were required to believe with certainty (I mean a Morall certainty,) things no way repreſented as infallible and certain, (I mean morally,) an unreaſonable obedience were required of us. And ſo likewiſe were it, were we required to believe as abſolutely certain, that which is no way repreſented to us as abſolutely certain. 2. That whom God obligeth to believe any thing, he will not fail to furniſh their underſtandings with ſuch inducements, as are ſufficient (if they be not negligent or perverſe) to perſwade them to believe. 3. That there is an abundance of Arguments exceedingly credible, inducing men to believe the Truth of Chriſtianity: I ſay ſo credible, that though they cannot make us evidently ſee what we believe, yet they evidently convince that in true wiſdome and prudence, the Articles of it deſerve credit, and ought to be accepted as things revealed by God. 4. That without ſuch reaſons and inducements, our choice even of the true faith, is not to be commended as prudent, but to be condemned of raſhneſſe and levity.

10 But then for your making Prudence, not only a commendation of a believer, and a juſtification of his faith, but alſo eſſentiall to it, and part of the definition of it, in that queſtionleſſe you were miſtaken, and have done as if being to ſay what a man is, you ſhould define him, A Reaſonable creature that hath skill in Aſtronomy. For as all Aſtronomers are men, but all men are not Aſtronomers, and therefore Aſtronomy ought not to be put into the definition of men, where nothing ſhould have place, but what agrees to all men: So though all that are truly wiſe (that is, wiſe for eternity,) will believe aright, yet many may believe aright which are not wiſe. I could wiſh with all my heart as *Moſes* did, *that all the Lords people could Propheſy*: That all that believe the true Religion *were able* (according to *S. Peters* injunction) *to give a reaſon of the hope that is in them*, a reaſon why they hope for eternall happineſſe by this way rather then any other! neither doe I think it any great difficulty that men of ordinary capacities, if they would give their minde to it, might quickly be enabled to doe ſo. But ſhould I affirme that all true Believers can doe ſo, I ſuppoſe it would be as much againſt experience and modeſty, as it is againſt Truth and Charity, to ſay as you doe, that *they which cannot doe ſo, either are not at all, or to no purpoſe true believers*. And thus wee ſee that the foundations you build upon, are ruinous and deceitfull, and ſo unfit to ſupport your Fabrick that they deſtroy one another. I come now to ſhew that your Arguments to prove Proteſtants Heretiques,

are all of the ſame quality with your former grounds: which I will doe by oppoſing cleere and ſatisfying Anſwers in order to them.

11 *Ad* §. 13. To the firſt then, delivered by you §.13. *That Proteſtants muſt be Heretiques, becauſe they oppoſed divers Truths propounded for divine by the Viſible Church*: I Anſwer, It is not Hereſy to oppoſe any Truth propounded by the Church, but only ſuch a Truth as is an eſſentiall part of the Goſpell of Chriſt. 2. The Doctrines which Proteſtants oppoſed, were not Truths, but plain and impious falſhoods: Neither thirdly, were they propounded as Truths by the Viſible Church, but only by a Part of it, and that a corrupted Part.

12 *Ad* §. 14. The next *Argument, in the next Particle tells us*, That *every error againſt any doctrine revealed by God is damnable Hereſy: Now either Proteſtants or the Roman Church muſt erre againſt the word of God: But the Roman Church* we *grant (perforce) doth not erre damnably, neither can ſhe, becauſe ſhe is the Catholique Church, which* we (you ſay) *confeſſe cannot erre damnably: Therefore Proteſtants muſt erre againſt Gods word, and conſequently are guilty of formall Hereſy.* Whereunto I anſwer plainly, that there be in this argument almoſt as many falſhoods as aſſertions. For neither is every error againſt any Doctrine revealed by God a damnable Hereſy, unleſſe it be revealed publiquely, & plainly with a command that all ſhould beleeve it. 2. D. *Potter* no where grants, that the Errors of the Roman Church are *not in themſelves damnable*, though he hopes by accident they may not actually damne ſome men amongſt you: and this you your ſelfe confeſſe in divers places of your book, where you tell us, that he *al-*
ch.5.§.41. *lowes no hope of Salvation to thoſe amongſt you, whom ignorance cannot excuſe.* 3. You beg the Queſtion twice in taking for granted, Firſt that *the Roman Church is the truly Catholique Church*; which without much favour can hardly paſſe for a part of it: And againe, that the *Catholique Church cannot fall into any error of it ſelfe damnable*: for it may doe ſo, and ſtill be the Catholique Church, if it retain thoſe Truths which may be an antidote againſt the malignity of this error, to thoſe that held it out of a ſimple un-affected ignorance. Laſtly, though the thing be true, yet I might well require ſome proofe of it from you, that either Proteſtants or the Roman Church muſt erre againſt Gods word. For if their contradiction be your only reaſon, then alſo you or the Dominicans muſt be Heretiques, becauſe you contradict one another as much as Proteſtants and Papiſts.

13 *Ad* §.15. The third Argument pretends that *you have ſhewed already, that the Viſible Church is Iudge of Controverſies, and therefore infallible; from whence you ſuppoſe that it followes, that to oppoſe her, is to oppoſe God.* To which I anſwer, that you have ſaid onely, and not ſhewed that *the Viſible Church is Iudge of Controverſies*. And indeed how can ſhe be Iudge of them if ſhe cannot decide them? And how can ſhe decide them, if it be a queſtion whether ſhe be Iudge of them? That which is queſtion'd it ſelfe, cannot with any ſenſe be pretended to be fit to decide other queſtions; and much leſſe this queſtion, whether it have Authority to judge and decide all queſtions? 2. If ſhe

were

were Iudge, it would not follow that ſhe were infallible, for we have many Iudges in our Courts of Iudicature, yet none infallible. Nay you cannot with any modeſty deny, that every man in the world ought to judge for himſelfe, what Religion is trueſt, and yet you will not ſay that every man is infallible. 3. If the Church were ſuppoſed Infallible, yet it would not follow at all, much leſſe manifeſtly, that to oppoſe her declaration is to oppoſe God: unleſſe you ſuppoſe alſo that as ſhe is infallible, ſo by her oppoſers, ſhe is known or believed to be ſo. Laſtly, If all this were true (as it is all moſt falſe) yet were it to little purpoſe, ſeeing you have omitted to prove that the Viſible Church is the Roman.

14 *Ad* §. 16. In ſtead of a fourth Argument this is preſented to us, *That if Luther were an Heretique, then they that agreed with him muſt be ſo.* And that *Luther* was a formall Heretique, you endeavour to prove by this moſt formall Syllogiſme; *To ſay the Viſible Church is not Vniverſall, is properly an Hereſy: But Luthers Reformation was not Vniverſall: Therefore it cannot be excuſed from formall Hereſy.* Whereunto I Anſwer, firſt to the firſt part, that it is no way impoſſible that *Luther*, had he been the inventor and firſt broacher of a falſe Doctrine, (as he was not) might have been a formall Heretique, and yet that thoſe who follow him may be only ſo materially and improperly, and indeed no Heretiques. Your own men out of S. *Auguſtine* diſtinguiſh between *Hæretici & Hæreticorum ſequaces*: And you your ſelfe though you pronounce *the leaders among the Arrians formall Heretiques*, yet confeſſe that *Salvian* was at leaſt doubtfull whether theſe *Arrians*, who in ſimplicity followed their Teachers, might not be excuſed by ignorance. And about this ſuſpenſion of his you alſo ſeeme ſuſpended, for you neither approve nor condemne it. Secondly, to the ſecond part I ſay, that had you not preſumed upon our ignorance in Logick as well as Metaphyſicks and Schoole Divinity, you would never have obtruded upon us this rope of ſand for a formall Syllogiſme. It is even Coſen German to this, To denie the Reſurrection is properly an Hereſie, But *Luthers* Reformation was not Vniverſall, Therefore it cannot be excuſed from formall Hereſie! Or to this, To ſay the Viſible Church is not Vniverſall is properly an Hereſie: But the preaching of the Goſpell at the beginning was not Vniverſall; therefore it cannot be excuſed from formall Hereſie. For as he whoſe Reformation is but particular, may yet not denie the Reſurrection, ſo may he alſo not denie the Churches Vniverſality. And as the Apoſtles who preached the Goſpell in the beginning, did beleeve the Church Vniverſall, though their preaching at the beginning was not ſo: So *Luther* alſo might and did beleeve the Church Univerſall, though his Reformation were but particular. I ſay he did beleeve it Vniverſall, even in your owne ſenſe, that is, Univerſall *de iure*, though not *de facto*. And as for Vniverſality in fact, he beleeved the Church much more Vniverſall then his reformation: For he did conceive (as appeares by your own Allegations out of him) that not only the Part reformed was the true Church, but alſo that they were Part of it who

needed reformation. Neither did he ever pretend to make a new Church but to reform the old one. Thirdly and laſtly, to the firſt propoſition of this unſyllogiſticall ſyllogiſme, I anſwer, That to ſay the true Church is not alwaies *de facto* univerſall, is ſo far from being an Hereſy, that it is a certaine truth knowne to all thoſe that know the world, and what Religions poſſeſſe farre the greater part of it. *Donatus* therefore was not to blame, for ſaying, that the Church might poſſibly be confin'd to *Africk*; but for ſaying without ground, that then it was ſo. And S. *Auſtine*, as he was in the right, in thinking that the Church was then extended farther then *Africk*; ſo was he in the wrong if he thought that of neceſſity it alwaies muſt be ſo; but moſt palpably miſtakē in conceiving that it was then ſpread over the whole earth, & known to all nations, which if paſſion did not trouble you, & make you forget how lately almoſt halfe the world was diſcovered, and in what eſtate it was then found, you would very eaſily ſee and confeſſe.

15 *Ad* §. 17. In the next Section you pretend *that you have no deſire to proſecute the ſimilitude of Proteſtants with the Donatiſts*; and yet you doe it with as much ſpight and malice as could well bee deviſed, but in vaine: For *Lucilla* might doe ill in promoting the Sect of the Donatiſts, and yet the Mother and the Daughter, whom you glance at, might doe well in *miniſtring influence* (as you phraſe it) *to Proteſtants in England*. Vnleſſe you will conclude becauſe one woman did one thing ill, therefore no woman can doe any thing well: or becauſe it was ill done to promote one Sect, therefore it muſt bee ill done, to maintaine any.

16 The *Donatiſts might doe ill in calling the Chaire of Rome the Chaire of Peſtilence, and the Roman Church an Harlot*; and yet the ſtate of the Church being altered, Proteſtants might doe well to doe ſo, and therefore though, S. *Auſtine might perhaps have reaſon to perſecute the Donatiſts for detracting from the Church*, and calling her harlot, when ſhe was not ſo; yet you may have none to threaten *D. Potter* that you would perſecute him (as the Application of this place intimates you would,) if it were in your power: plainly ſhewing that you are a curſt cow though your hornes be ſhort, ſeeing the Roman Church is not now what it was in S. *Auſtines* time. And hereof the concluſion of your own book affords us a very pregnant teſtimony: where you tell us out of Saint *Auſtine*, that one grand-impediment, which among many kept the ſeduced followers of the faction of *Donatus* from the Churches Communion, was a vile calumny raiſed againſt the Catholiques, that *they did ſet ſome ſtrange thing upon their Altar. To how many* (ſaith S. *Auſtine*) *did the reports of ill tongues ſhut up the way to enter, who ſaid, that we put, I know not what upon the Altar?* Out of deteſtation of the calumny, and juſt indignation againſt it, he would not ſo much as name the impiety wherewith they were charged, and therefore by a Rhetoricall figure calls it, *I know not what*. But compare with him *Optatus*, writing of the ſame matter, and you ſhall plainly perceive that this (*I know not what*) pretended to be ſet upon the Altar, was indeed a picture, which the Donatiſts (knowing how deteſta-

deteſtable a thing it was to all Chriſtians at that time, to ſet up any Pictures in a Church to worſhip them, as your new faſhion is) bruited abroad to be done in the Churches of the Catholique Church. But what anſwer doe S. *Auſtine* and *Optatus* make to this accuſation? Doe they confeſſe and maintaine it? Doe they ſay, as you would now, It is true we doe ſet Pictures upon our Altar, and that not only for ornament or memory, but for worſhip alſo; but we doe well to doe ſo, and this ought not to trouble you, or affright you from our Communion? What other anſwer your Church could now make to ſuch an objection, is very hard to imagine: And therefore were your Doctrine the ſame with the Doctrine of the Fathers in this point, they muſt have anſwered ſo likewiſe. But they to the cõtrary not only deny the crime, but abhorre and deteſt it. To litle purpoſe therefore doe you hunt after theſe poore ſhadowes of reſemblances between us and the *Donatiſts*: unleſſe you could ſhew an exact reſemblance between the preſent Church of Rome and the Ancient: which ſeeing by this, and many other particulars it is demonſtrated to bee impoſſible; that Church which was then a Virgin may be now a Harlot, and that which was detraction in the *Donatiſts*, may be in Proteſtants a juſt accuſation.

17 As ill ſucceſſe have you in comparing D. *Potter* with *Tyconius* whom as *S. Auſtin findes fault with for continuing in the Donatiſts ſeparation, having forſaken the ground of it, the Doctrine of the Churches periſhing: ſo you condemne the Doctor, for continuing in their Communion, who hold* (as you ſay) *the very ſame Hereſy*. But if this were indeed the Doctrine of the *Donatiſts* how is it that you ſay preſently after, *that the Proteſtants who hold the Church of Chriſt periſhed, were worſe then Donatiſts, who ſaid that the Church remained at leaſt in Africa*? Theſe things me thinkes, hang not well together. But to let this paſſe; The truth is, this difference, for which you would faine raiſe ſuch a horrible diſſention between D. *Potter* and his Brethren, if it be well conſidered is only in words and the manner of expreſſion: They affirming only, that the Church periſhed from its integrity, and fell into many corruptions which he denies not: And the Doctor denying only that it fell from its eſſence, and became no Church at all, which they affirme not.

18 Theſe therefore are but velitations, and you would ſeeme to make but ſmall account of them. But the main point you ſay is, that *ſince Luthers Reformed Church was not in being for divers Centuries before Luther, and yet was in the Apoſtles time, they muſt of neceſſity affirme heretically with the Donatiſts, that the true unſpotted Church of Chriſt periſhed, and that ſhe which remained on earth, was* (*O Blaſphemy!*) *an harlot*. By which words it ſeemes you are reſolute perpetually to confound *True* and *Vnſpotted*; and to put no difference between a corrupted Church and none at all. But what is this, but to make no difference betwen a diſeaſed and a dead man? Nay what is it but to contradict your ſelves, who cannot deny but that ſinnes are as great ſtaines and ſpots and deformities in the ſight of God, as errors; and confeſſe your Church to be a congregation of men, whereof every particular

particular, not one excepted, (and conſequently the generality which is nothing but a collection of them) is polluted and defiled with ſinne? You proceed.

19 But, ſay you, *The ſame hereſy followes out of D. Potter and other Proteſtants, that the Church may erre in points not fundamentall; becauſe we have ſhewed that every error againſt any reveale d truth is Hereſy and Damnable, whether the matter be great or ſmall: And how can the Church more truly be ſaid to periſh, then when ſhe is permitted to maintaine damnable Hereſy? Beſides we will hereafter prove that by every act of Hereſy all divine faith is loſt, & to maintaine a true Church without any faith, is to fanſy a living man without life.* Anſ. what you have ſaid before, hath been anſwered before, and what you ſhall ſay hereafter, ſhall be confuted hereafter. But if it be ſuch a certain ground, that *every error againſt any one revealed truth is a damnable Hereſy*, Then I hope I ſhall have your leave to ſubſume, That the Dominicans in your account muſt hold a damnable hereſy, who hold an error againſt the immaculate Conception: which you muſt needs eſteeme a revealed truth, or otherwiſe why are you ſo urgent and importunate to have it defined? ſeeing your rule is, *nothing may be defined unleſſe it be firſt revealed.* But without your leave, I will make bold to conclude, that if either that or the contrary aſſertion be a revealed truth, you or they, chooſe you whether, muſt without contradiction hold a damnable Hereſy: if this ground be true that every contradiction of a revealed Truth is ſuch. And now I dare ſay, for fear of inconvenience you will beginne to temper the crudeneſſe of your former aſſertion, and tell us, that neither of you are Heretiques, becauſe the Truth againſt which you erre though revealed, is not ſufficiently propounded. And ſo ſay I, neither is your Doctrine which Proteſtants contradict ſufficiently propounded. For though it be plain enough, that your Church propoſeth it, yet ſtill methinkes, it is as plain, that your Churche's propoſition is not ſufficient; and I deſire you would not ſay but prove the contrary. Laſtly, to your Queſtion, How *can the Church more truly be ſaid to periſh, then when ſhe is permitted to maintaine a damnable Hereſy?* I Anſwer, ſhe may be more truly ſaid to periſh, when ſhe is not only permitted to doe ſo, but *de facto* doth maintaine a damnable Hereſy. Again, ſhe may be more truly ſaid to periſh, when ſhe falls into an Hereſy, which is not only damnable in it ſelfe, and *ex natura rei*, as you ſpeak, but ſuch an Hereſy, the belief of whoſe contrary Truth is neceſſary, not only *neceſſitate præcepti* but *medii*, and therefore the hereſy ſo abſolutely and indiſpenſably deſtructive of ſalvation, that no ignorance can excuſe it, nor any generall repentance, without a dereliction of it, can begge a pardon for it. Such an hereſy if the Church ſhould fall into, it might be more truly ſaid to periſh, then if it fell only into ſome hereſy of its own nature damnable. For in that ſtate all the members of it, without exception, all without mercy muſt needs periſh for ever: In this, although thoſe that might ſee the truth & would not, cannot upon any good ground hope for Salvation, yet without queſtion, it might ſend many ſoules to heaven, who would gladly have embraced

brac'd the truth, but that they wanted means to diſcover it. Thirdly and laſtly, ſhee may yet more truly bee ſaid to periſh when ſhee Apoſtates from Chriſt abſolutely, or rejects even thoſe Truths out of which her Hereſies may bee reformed; as if ſhee ſhould directly deny *Ieſus to be the Chriſt*, or the Scripture to be the Word of God. Towards which ſtate of Perdition it may well be feared that the Church of Rome doth ſomewhat incline, by her ſuperinducing upon the reſt of her errors the Doctrine of her own infallibility, whereby her errors are made incurable; and by her pretending that the Scripture is to be interpreted according to her doctrine, and not her doctrine to be judg'd of by Scripture, whereby ſhe makes the Scripture uneffectuall for her Reformation.

20 *Ad* § 18. I was very glad when I heard you ſay *The Holy Scripture and ancient Fathers doe aſsigne Separation from the viſible Church as a mark of Hereſie*: for I was in good hope, that no Chriſtian would ſo bely the Scripture, as to ſay ſo of it, unleſſe hee could have produced ſome one Text at leaſt, wherein this was plainly affirmed, or from whence it might be undoubtedly and undeniably collected. For aſſure your ſelfe, good Sir, it is a very haynous crime to ſay, *thus ſaith the Lord, when the Lord doth not ſay ſo*. I expected therefore ſome Scripture ſhould haue been alleaged, wherein it ſhould haue beene ſaid, *whoſoever ſeparates from the Roman Church is an Heretique*: or *the Roman Church is infallible*, or *the Guide of faith*: or at leaſt, *There ſhall be alwaies ſome viſible Church infallible in matters of faith*. Some ſuch direction as this I hoped for: And I pray conſider whether I had not reaſon! The Evangeliſts and Apoſtles who wrote the New Teſtament, we all ſuppoſe were good men, and very deſirous to direct us the ſureſt and plaineſt way to heaven; wee ſuppoſe them likewiſe very ſufficiently inſtructed by the Spirit of God in all the neceſſary points of the Chriſtian faith, and therefore certainly not ignorant of this *Vnum Neceſſarium*, this moſt neceſſary point of all others, without which as you pretend and teach, all faith is no Faith, that is, that *the Church of Rome was deſigned by God the Guide of Faith*. Wee ſuppoſe thē laſtly wiſe men, eſpecially being aſſiſted by the ſpirit of wiſdome, and ſuch as knew that a doubtfull & queſtionable Guide was for mens direction as good as none at all. And after all theſe ſuppoſitions, which I preſume no good Chriſtian will call into queſtion, is it poſſible that any Chriſtian heart can believe, that not One amongſt them all ſhould *ad rei memoriam* write this neceſſary doctrine plainly ſo much as once? Certainly in all reaſon they had provided much better for the good of Chriſtians if they had wrote this, though they had writ nothing elſe. Me thinks the Evangeliſts undertaking to write the Goſpell of Chriſt, could not poſſibly haue omitted, any One of them, this moſt neceſſary point of faith, had they known it neceſſary, (S. *Luke* eſpecially, who plainly profeſſeth that *his intent was to write all things neceſſary*.) Me thinks S. *Paul* writing to the *Romans* could not but haue congratulated this their Priviledge to them! Me thinks inſtead of ſaying, *Your faith is ſpoken of all the world over* (which you haue no reaſon to

be very proud of, for he ſaies the very ſame thing to the *Theſſaloni-ans*,) he could not haue fayl'd to haue told them once at leaſt in plaine termes, that *their faith was the Rule for all the World for ever*. But then ſure he would haue forborn to put them in feare of an impoſſibility, as hee doth in his eleventh Chap. that they alſo, nay the whole Church of the *Gentiles, if they did not look to their ſtanding, might fall away to infidelity*, as the Iews had done. Me thinks in all his other Epiſtles, at leaſt in ſome, at leaſt in one of them, he could not have fayled to haue given the world this direction, had he known it to be a true one, that *all men were to be guided by the Church of Rome, and none to ſeparate from it under pain of damnation.* Me thinks writing ſo often of Heretiques and Antichriſt, hee ſhould haue given the world this (as you pretend) onely ſure preſervative from them. How was it poſſible that S. *Peter* writing two Catholique Epiſtles, mentioning his own departure, writing to preſerve Chriſtians in the faith, ſhould in neither of them commend them to the guidance of his pretended Succeſſours, the Biſhops of Rome? How was it poſſible that S. *Iames*, and S. *Iude* in their Catholique Epiſtles ſhould not giue this Catholique direction? Me thinks S. *Iohn* inſtead of ſaying, *he that believeth that Ieſus is the Chriſt, is born of God*, (The force of which direction, your gloſſes doe quite enervate, and make unavailable to diſcern who are the ſonnes of God,) ſhould haue ſaid, *Hee that adheres to the doctrine of the Roman Church, and lives according to it, he is a good Chriſtian, and by this Mark yee ſhall know him*! What man not quite out of his witts, if he conſider as he ſhould, the pretended neceſſity of this doctrine, that without the beliefe hereof no man ordinarily can be ſaved, can poſſibly force himſelfe to conceive that all theſe good and holy men, ſo deſirous of mens ſalvation, and ſo well aſſured of it (as it is pretended,) ſhould be ſo deeply and affectedly ſilent in it, and not One ſay it plainly ſo much as once, but leaue it to be collected from uncertain Principles, by many more uncertain conſequences? Certainly he that can judge ſo uncharitably of them, it is no marvell if he cenſure other inferiour ſervants of Chriſt as Atheiſts, and Hypocrites, and what he pleaſes. Plain places therefore I did and had reaſon to look for, when I heard you ſay, *the holy Scripture aſſignes Separation from the viſible Church as a Mark of Hereſie*. But inſtead hereof what haue you brought us, but meer impertinencies? S. *Iohn* ſaith of ſome who pretended to be Chriſtians and were not ſo, and therefore when it was for their advantage forſook their Profeſſion, *They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us*. Of ſome, who before the decree of the Councell to the contrary, were perſwaded and accordingly taught, that the convert Gentiles were to keep the Law of *Moſes*, it is ſaid in the Acts, *Some who went out from us*. And again S. *Paul* in the ſame book forewarnes the Epheſians that *out of them ſhould ariſe men ſpeaking perverſe things*. And from theſe places which it ſeems are the plaineſt you have, you collect *that ſeparation from the Viſible Church is aſſigned by Scripture as a Mark of Hereſie*. Which is certainly a ſtrang and unheard of ſtrain of Logick.

Vnleſſe

Vnleſſe you will ſay that every Text wherein it is ſaid, that ſome body goes out from ſome body, affords an Argument for this purpoſe! For the firſt place there is no certainty that it ſpeaks of Heretiques; but, *no Chriſtians, of Antichriſts, of ſuch as denied Ieſus to be the Chriſt*: See the place and you ſhall confeſſe as much. The ſecond place, it is certain, you muſt not ſay it ſpeaks of Heretiques, for it ſpeaks only of ſome who beleeved and taught an Errour, while it was yet a queſtion and not evident, and therefore according to your doctrine, no formall Hereſy. The third ſaies indeed, that of the Profeſſours of Chriſtianity, ſome ſhall ariſe that ſhall teach Hereſy: But not one of them all that ſaies or intimates, that whoſoever ſeparates from the Viſible Church, in what ſtate ſoever, is certainly an Heretique. Heretiques I confeſſe doe alwayes doe ſo; But they that doe ſo are not alwayes Heretiques, for perhaps the ſtate of the Church may make it neceſſary for them to doe ſo; as Rebels alwayes diſobey the command of their King, yet they which diſobey a Kings command (which perhaps may be unjuſt) are not preſently Rebels.

21 Your Allegations out of *Vincentius*, *Proſper*, and *Cyprian* are lyable to theſe exceptions. 1. That they are the ſayings of men not aſſiſted by the Spirit of God, and whoſe Authoritie your ſelves will not ſubmit to in all things. 2 That the firſt and laſt are meerly impertinent, neither of them affirming or intimating, that ſeparation from the preſent Viſible Church is a mark of Hereſy: and the former ſpeaking plainly of ſeparation from Vniverſality, Conſent and Antiquity, which if you will preſume without proof that we did and you did not, you beg the Queſtion. For you know we pretend that we ſeparated only from that preſent Church which had ſeparated from the doctrine of the Ancient, and becauſe ſhe had done ſo, and ſo farre forth as ſhe had done ſo and no farther. And laſtly the latter part of *Proſpers* words cannot be generally true, according to your own grounds; For you ſay a man may be divided from the Church upon meer Schiſme without any mixture of Hereſy: And a man may be juſtly excommunicated for many other ſufficient cauſes beſides Hereſy. Laſtly, a man may be divided by an unjuſt excommunication, and be both before and after a very good Catholique; and therefore you cannot maintain it Vniverſally true, *That he who is divided from the Church is an Heretique, and Antichriſt.*

22 In the 19. §. we have the Authority of eight Fathers urg'd to prove *that the ſeparation from the Church of Rome as it is the Sea of S. Peter* (I conceive you mean as it is the Particular Church) *is the mark of Hereſy*. Which kind of argument I might well refuſe to anſwer, unleſſe you would firſt promiſe me, that whenſoever I ſhould produce as plain ſentences, of as great a number of Fathers, as ancient, for any doctrine whatſoever, that you will ſubſcribe to it, though it fall out to be cõtrary to the doctrine of the Roman Church. For I conceive nothing in the world more unequall or unreaſonable, then that you ſhould preſſe us with ſuch Authorities as theſe, and think your ſelves at liberty from them; and that you ſhould account them Fathers when they are for

you, and Children when they are againſt you. Yet I would not you ſhould interpret this as if I had not great aſſurance, that it is not poſſible for you ever to gain this cauſe at the tribunall of the Fathers, nay not of the Fathers whoſe ſentences are here alleaged. Let us conſider them in order, and I doubt not to make it appear that farre the greater part of them, nay all of them that are any way conſiderable fall ſhort of your purpoſe.

23 S. *Hierome* (you ſay) *writing to Pope Damaſus*, ſaith, *I am in the Communion of the Chaire of Peter: &c.* But then I pray conſider he ſaith it to Pope *Damaſus*: and this will much weaken the Authority, with them who know how great over-truths men uſually write to one another in letters. Conſider againe, that he ſaies only, that *he was then in Communion with the Chaire of Peter*, Nott hat he alwayes would, or of neceſſity muſt be ſo: for his reſolution to the contrary is too evident out of that which he ſaith elſwhere which ſhall be produced hereafter. He ſaies that the *Church at that preſent was built upon that Rock*; but not that only, Nor that alwayes. Nay his judgment as ſhall appeare is expreſſe to the contrary. And ſo likewiſe the reſt of his expreſſions (if we meane to reconcile *Hierome* with *Hierome*) muſt bee conceived as intended by him, of that Biſhop and Sea of Rome, at that preſent time, and in the preſent State, and in reſpect of that doctrine which he there intreats of. For otherwiſe had he conceiu'd it neceſſary for him and all men to conform their judgments in matters of faith, to the judgment of the Biſhop & Church of Rome, how came it to paſſe that he choſe rather to believe the Epiſtle to the Hebrewes Canonicall, upõ the Authority of the Eaſterne Church, then to reject it from the Canon upon the Authority of the Roman? How comes it to paſſe that he diſſented from the Authority of that Church, touching the Canon of the Old Teſtament? For if you ſay, that the Church then conſented with S. *Hierome*, I feare you will looſe your Fort by maintaining your Out-works, and by avoyding this, runne into a greater danger of being forc'd to confeſſe the preſent Roman Church oppoſite herein to the Ancient. How was it poſſible, that he ſhould ever beleeue that *Liberius* Biſhop of Rome either was or could haue been wrought over by *the ſollicitation of Fortunatianus Biſhop of Aquileia, and brought after two years baniſhment to ſubſcribe Hereſie?* Which Act of *Liberius* though ſome fondly queſtion, being ſo vain as to expect we ſhould rather believe them that lived but yeſterday, thirteen hundred years almoſt after the thing is ſaid to be done, and ſpeaking for themſelves in their own Cauſe, rather then the diſ-intereſſed time-fellowes or immediate Succeſſors of *Liberius* himſelfe: yet I hope they will not proceed to ſuch a degree of immodeſty, as once to queſtion whether *S. Hierome* thought ſo. And if this cannot be denyed, I demand then if he had lived in *Liberius* his time, could he or would he have written ſo to *Liberius* as he does to *Damaſus*? would he have ſaid to him, *I am in the Communion of the Chair of Peter, I know that the Church is built upon this Rock, Whoſoever gathereth not with thee ſcattereth.* Would he then have ſaid, the Roman faith and the Catholique were the ſame: or, that the

Hierom de ſcrip. Eccle. tit. Fortunatianus.

the Roman faith received no deluſions, no not from an Angell? I ſuppoſe he could not have ſaid ſo with any coherence to his own beleif; and therefore conceive it undeniable that what he ſaid then to *Damaſus*, he ſaid it (though perhaps he ſtreyned too high) only of *Damaſus*, and never conceiv'd that his words would have been extended to all his Predeceſſors and all his Succeſſors.

24 The ſame Anſwer I make to the firſt place of S. *Ambroſe*, *viz.* That no more can be certainly concluded from it, but that the Catholique Biſhops and the Roman Church were then at unity; ſo that whoſoever agreed with the latter could not then but agree with the former. But that this Rule was perpetuall, and that no man could ever agree with the Catholique Biſhops, but he muſt agree with the Roman Church, this he ſaies not, nor gives you any ground to conclude from him. *Athanaſius* when he was excommunicated by *Liberius*, agreed very ill with the Roman Church, and yet you will not gainſay, but he agreed well enough with the Catholique Biſhops. The ſecond, I am uncertain what the ſenſe of it is, and what truth is in it; but moſt certain that it makes nothing to your preſent purpoſe. For it neither affirmes nor imports, that ſeparation from the Roman Church is a certain marke of Hereſy. For the Rights of Communion (whatſoever it ſignifies,) might be ſaid to flow from it, if that Church were by Eccleſiaſticall Law, the head of all other Churches: But unleſſe it were made ſo by divine Authority, and that abſolutely, Separation from it could not be a marke of Hereſy.

25 For S. *Cyprian* all the world knowes that he[b] reſolutely oppoſed a Decree of the Roman Biſhop, and all that adhered to him in the point of Re-baptizing, which that Church at that time delivered as a neceſſary Tradition. So neceſſary, that by the Biſhop of Rome *Firmilianus* and other Biſhops of *Cappadocia*, *Cilicia* and *Galatia*, and generally all who perſiſted in the contrary opinion,[c] were therefore deprived of the Churches Communion, (which excōmunication could not but involve S. *Cyprian*, who defended the ſame opinion as reſolutely as *Firmilianus*, though Cardinall *Perron* magiſterially and without all colour of proofe affirme the contrary,) and *Cyprian* in particular ſo farre caſt off, as for it to be pronoune'd by *Stephen a falſe Chriſt*.[d] Again ſo neceſſary that the Biſhops which were ſent by *Cyprian* from Africk to Rome, were not admitted to the Communion of ordinary conference: But all men who were ſubject to the Biſhop of Romes Authority, were cōmanded by him not only to deny them the Churches peace & Communion, but even lodging and entertainment: manifeſtly declaring, that they reckoned them among thoſe whom S. *Iohn* forbids *to receive to houſe, or to ſay God ſpeed to them*. All theſe terrors notwithſtanding S. *Cyprian* holdes ſtill his former opinion, & though out of reſpect to the Churches peace[d] *he judged no man, nor cut off any man from the right of Communion, for thinking otherwiſe then he held*, yet he conceived *Stephen* & his adherents,[e] to hold a pernitious error. And S. *Auſtin*, (though diſputing with the *Donatiſts* he uſeth ſome Tergiverſatiō in the point,) yet confeſſeth elſewhere, that *it is not found that*

b It is confeſſed by *Baronius Anno.* 238. N. 41. By *Bellarm. l. 4. de R. Pont. c. 7. §. Tertia ratio.*

c Confeſſed by *Baronius An.* 258. N. 14. & 15. By *Card. Perron.* Repl. *l.* 1. c. 25.

d *Ibid.*

d *Vide Con. Carth. apud ſur. To.* 1.

e *Bell. l.* 2. *de Con. c.* 5. *Aug. ep.* 48. & *lib.* 1. *de Bapt. c.* 18.

Cyprian did ever change his opinion. And ſo farre was he from conceiving any neceſſity of doing ſo, in ſubmitting to the judgement of the Biſhop and Church of Rome, that he plainly profeſſeth that no other Biſhop, *but our Lord Ieſus only, had power to judge* (with authority) *of his judgement*, and as plainly intimates that *Stephen*, for uſurping ſuch a power, and making himſelfe *a judge over Biſhops, was little better then a Tyrant*: and as heavily almoſt he cenſures him, and peremptorily oppoſes him as obſtinate in error, in that very place where he delivers that famous ſaying, *How can he have God for his Father, who hath not the Church for his Mother?* little doubting it ſeemes but a man might have the Church for his Mother, who ſtood in oppoſition to the Church of Rome, and farre from thinking what you fondly obtrude upon him, that to be united to the Roman Church, and to the Church was all one, and that ſeparation from S. *Peters* Chaire was a marke, I mean a certain marke, either of Schiſme or Hereſy. If after all this, you will catch at a phraſe or a complement of S. *Cyprians*, and with that hope to perſwade Proteſtants, who know this ſtory as well as their own name, that S. *Cyprian* did believe that *falſehood could not have acceſſe to the Roman Church*, and that oppoſition to it was the brand of an Heretique: may we not well expect, that you will the next time you write vouch *Luther* & *Caluin* alſo for Abettors of this Phancy, and make us poore men believe not only (as you ſay) that we have no Metaphyſicks, but that we have no ſenſe? And when you have done ſo, it will be no great difficulty for you, to aſſure us that we read no ſuch thing in *Bellarmine*, as *that Cyprian was alwaies accounted in the number of Catholiques*; nor in *Caniſius*, that he was a *moſt excellent Doctor and a moſt glorious Martyr*; nor in your Calendar, that he *is a Saint and a Martyr*; but that all theſe are deceptions of our ſight, and that you ever eſteemed him a very Schiſmatique and an Heretique, as having on him the Marke of the Beaſt, *oppoſition to the chaire of Peter*; Nay that he (what ever he pretended) knew and believed himſelfe to be ſo; in as much as he knew (as you pretend,) and eſteemed this oppoſition to be the Marke of Hereſy, and knew himſelfe to ſtand and ſtand out in ſuch an oppoſition.

Bell. l. 2. de Con. c. 5. §. 1.
Caniſius. in Initio Catech.
Sept. die 14.

26 But we need not ſeeke ſo farre for matter to refute the vanity of this pretence. Let the reader but peruſe this very Epiſtle out of which this ſentence is alleaged, and he ſhall need no farther ſatisfaction againſt it. For he ſhall finde, firſt, that you have helped the dice a little with a falſe, or at leaſt with a very bold and ſtreined Tranſlation: for S. *Cyprian* ſaith not *to whom falſhood cannot have acceſſe*, by which many of your favourable Readers I doubt underſtood, that *Cyprian* had exempted that Church from a poſſibility of error, but to whom *perfidiouſneſſe cannot have acceſſe*, meaning by perfidiouſneſſe in the abſtract, according to a common figure of ſpeech, thoſe perfidious Schiſmatiques whom he there complaines of: and of theſe by a Rhetoricall inſinuation, he ſaies that *with ſuch good Chriſtians as the Romans were, it was not poſſible they ſhould finde favourable entertainment.* Not that he conceived it any way impoſſible they ſhould doe ſo, for the

the very writing this Epiſtle, and many paſſages in it, plainly ſhew the contrary: But becauſe he was confident, or at leaſt would ſeeme to be confident, they never would, and ſo by his good opinion and confidence in the Romans, lay an obligation upon them, to doe as he preſum'd they would doe; as alſo in the end of his Epiſtle, he ſaies even of the people of the Church of Rome, *that being defended by the providence of their Biſhop, nay by their own Vigilance ſufficiently guarded, they could not be taken nor deceived with the poyſons of Heretiques.* Not that indeed he thought either this or the former any way impoſſible: For to what purpoſe, but for prevention hereof, did he write this long and accurate and vehement Epiſtle to *Cornelius?* which ſure had been moſt vainly done, to prevent that which he knew or believed impoſſible! Or how can this conſiſt with his taking notice in the begining of it, *that Cornelius was ſomewhat moved and wrought upon by the attempts of his Adverſaries,* with his reprehending him for being ſo, and with his vehement exhorting him to courage and conſtancy, or with his requeſt to him, in the concluſion of his Epiſtle, that it ſhould *be read publiquely to the whole Clergy and Laity of Rome, to the intent, that if any contagion of their poiſoned ſpeech and peſtiferous ſemination, had crept in amongſt them, it might be wholly taken away from the eares and the hearts of the Brethren. and that the entire and ſyncere charity of good men might be purged from all droſſe of hereticall detraction*: Or laſtly with his vehement perſwaſions to them to decline *for the time to come, and reſolutely avoid their word and conference, becauſe their ſpeech crept as a canker,* as the Apoſtle ſaith; *becauſe evill communication would corrupt good natures, becauſe wicked men carry perdition in their mouthes, and hide fire in their lips?* All which had been but vain and ridiculous pagentry, had he verily believed the Romans ſuch inacceſſible Forts, ſuch immoveable Rocks, as the former ſentences would ſeeme to import, if we will expound them rigidly and ſtrictly, according to the exigence of the words, & not allow him who was a profeſſed Maiſter of the Art, to have uſed here a little Rhetorique, and to ſay, *That could not be,* whereof he had no abſolute certainty but that it might be, but only had, or would ſeem to have a great confidence that it never would be, *ut fides habita fidem obligaret,* that he profeſſing to be confident of the Romans, might lay an obligation upon them to doe as he promiſt himſelfe they would doe. For as for *joyning the Principall Church and the Chair of Peter,* how that will ſerve for your preſent purpoſe, of proving ſeparation from the Roman Church a marke of Hereſy, I ſuppoſe it is hard to underſtand! Nor indeed how it will advantage you in any other deſigne againſt us, who doe not altogether deny, but that the Church of Rome might be called the *Chaire of Peter,* in regard he is ſaid to have preached the Goſpell there, and *the principall Church,* becauſe the City was the Principall and Imperiall City: which *Prerogative of the City,* if we believe the Fathers of the Councell of *Chalcedon* was the ground and occaſion, why the Fathers of former time (I pray obſerve,) conferred upon this Church, this Prerogative above other Churches.

27 And as farre am I from underſtanding, how you can collect from the other ſentence, that to communicate with the Church and Pope of Rome, and to communicate with the Catholique Church, is *alwaies* (for that is your Aſſumpt) one and the ſame thing. S. *Cyprian* ſpeaks not of the Church of Rome at all, but of the Biſhop only, who when he doth communicate with the Catholique Church, as *Cornelius* at that time did, then whoſoever communicates with him, cannot but communicate with the Catholique Church: and then by accident one may truly ſay, ſuch a one communicates with you, that is, with the Catholique Church, and that to communicate with him is to communicate with the Catholique Church. As if *Titius* and *Sempronius* be together, he that is in company with *Titius*, cannot but be at that time in company with *Sempronius*. As if a Generall be marching to ſome place with an Army, he that then is with the Generall muſt at that time be with the Army: And a man may ſay without abſurdity, ſuch a time I was with the Generall, that is, with the Army, and that to be with the Generall is to be with the Army. Or as if a mans hand be joyned to his body, the finger which is joyned to the hand is joyned to the body, and a man may ſay truly of it, this finger is joyned to the hand, that is, to the body, and to be joyned to the hand is to be joyned to the Body; becauſe all theſe things are by accident true. And yet I hope you would not deny, but the finger might poſſibly be joyned to the hand, and yet not to the Body, the hand being cut off from the Body; and a man might another time, be with his Generall and not with his Army, he being abſent from the Army. And therefore by like Reaſon your collection is ſophiſticall, being in effect but this, to communicate with ſuch a Biſhop of Rome, who did communicate with the Catholique Church, was to Communicate with the Catholique Church, therefore abſolutely and alwaies it muſt be true, that to communicate with him, is by conſequent to communicate with the Catholique Church, and to be divided from his Communion, is to be an Heretique.

28 In urging the place of *Irenæus* you have ſhewed much more ingenuity then many of your Fellowes. For whereas they uſually beginne at, *Declaring the Tradition of the &c.* and conceale what goes before, you have ſet it down, though not ſo compleatly as you ſhould have done, yet ſufficiently to ſhew, that what Authority in the matter he attributed to the Roman Church in particular, the ſame for the kind (though perhaps not in the ſame degree) he attributed to all other Apoſtolique Churches. Either therefore you muſt ſay that he conceived the Teſtimony of other Apoſtolique Churches divine and infallible, (which certainly he did not, neither doe you pretend he did, and if he had, the confeſſed Errors and Hereſies which after they fell into, would demonſtrate plainly that he had erred,) or elſe that he conceived the teſtimony of the Roman Church only humane and credible, though perhaps more credible then any one Church beſide, (as one mans Teſtimony is more credible then anothers;) but certainly much more Credible, which was enough for his purpoſe, then that ſecret Tradi-

Tradition, to which thoſe Heretiques pretended, againſt whom he wrote, overbearing them with an argument of their own kinde, farre ſtronger then their own. Now if *Irenæus* thought the Teſtimony of the Roman Church in this point only humane and fallible, then ſurely he could never think, either adhering to it a certain marke of a Catholique, or ſeparation from it a certain marke of a Heretique.

29 Again, whereas your great *Achilles* Cardinall *Perron* in French, as alſo his *noble Tranſlatreſſe* miſled by him, in Engliſh, knowing that mens reſorting to Rome would doe his cauſe little ſervice, hath made bold with the Latine tongue, as he does very often with the Greek, and rendred *Ad hanc Eccleſiam neceſſe eſt omnem convenire Eccleſiam, To this Church it is neceſſary that every Church ſhould agree*, you have Tranſlated it, as it ſhould be, *to this Church it is neceſſary that all Churches reſort*: wherein you have ſhewed more ſincerity, and have had more regard to make the Author ſpeak ſenſe. For if he had ſaid, *By ſhewing the Tradition of the Roman Church we confound all Heretiques, For to this Church, all Churches muſt agree*, what had this been, but to give for a reaſon, that which was more queſtionable then the thing in queſtion: as being neither evident in it ſelfe, and plainly denied by his adverſaries, and not at all proved nor offered to be proved here or elſewhere by *Irenæus*. To ſpeak thus therefore had been weak and ridiculous. But on the other ſide, if we conceive him to ſay thus, *You Heretiques decline a tryall of your Doctrine by Scripture, as being corrupted and imperfect, and not fit to determine Controverſies, without recourſe to Tradition, and inſtead hereof, you fly for refuge to a ſecret Tradition, which you pretend that you received from your Anceſtors, and they from the Apoſtles: certainly your calumnies againſt Scripture are moſt uniuſt and unreaſonable, but yet moreover, aſſure your ſelves, that if you will be tryed by Tradition, even by that alſo you will be overthrown. For our Tradition is farre more famous, more conſtant, and in all reſpects more credible, then that which you pretend to. It were eaſy for me, to muſter up againſt you the uninterrupted ſucceſſions of all the Churches founded by the Apoſtles, all conſpiring in their Teſtimonies againſt you: But becauſe it were too long to number up the Succeſſions of all Churches, I will content my ſelfe with the Tradition of the moſt ancient and moſt glorious Church of Rome, which alone is ſufficient for the confutation and confuſion of your Doctrine, as being in credit and authority, as farre beyond the Tradition you build upon, as the light of the Sunne, is beyond the light of the Gloworme. For to this Church, by reaſon it is placed in the Imperiall Citty, whither all mens affaires doe neceſſarily draw them, or by reaſon of the powerfull Principality it hath over all the adiacent Churches, there is, and alwaies hath been a neceſsity of a perpetuall recourſe of all the faithfull round about: who if there had been any alteration in the Church of Rome, could not in all probability but have obſerved it. But they to the contrary, have alwaies obſerved in this Church the very Tradition which came from the Apoſtles and no other.* I ſay if we conceive his meaning thus, his words will be intelligible and rationall; which if in ſtead of *reſort* we put in *agree* will be quite loſt. Herein therefore

we have been beholding to your honeſty, which makes me think you did not wittingly falſify, but only twice in this ſentence miſtake *Vndiq;* for *Vbiq;*, and Tranſlate it, *every where, and of what place ſoever*, in ſtead of *round about*. For that it was neceſſary *for all the faithfull of what place ſoever to reſort to Rome* is not true. That *the Apoſtolike Tradition hath alwaies been conſerved there from thoſe who are every where*, is not Senſe. Now inſtead of *conſervata* read *obſervata*, as in all probability it ſhould be, and tranſlate *undiq;* truly *round about*, and then the ſenſe will be both plain and good; for then it muſt be rendred thus, *For to this Church, by reaſon of a more powerfull principality, there is a neceſſity that all the Churches, that is, all the faithfull round about, ſhould reſort, in which the Apoſtolique Tradition hath been alwaies obſerved by thoſe who were round about.* If any man ſay I have been too bold a Critick in ſubſtituting *obſervata* inſtead of *conſervata*, I deſire him to know, that the conjecture is not mine, and therefore as I expect no praiſe for it, ſo I hope I ſhall be farre from cenſure. But I would intreat him to conſider, whether it be not likely that the ſame greek word ſignifying *obſervo* and *conſervo*, the Tranſlater of *Irenæus* who could hardly ſpeak Latine, might not eaſily miſtake, and tranſlate Διατηρέω *conſervata eſt*, inſtead of *obſervata eſt*; Or whether it be not likely, that thoſe men which ancienly wrote Books, and underſtood them not, might not eaſily commit ſuch an error; Or whether the ſenſe of the place can be ſalved any other way; if it can in Gods name let it, if not, I hope he is not to be condemned, who with ſuch a little alteration hath made that ſenſe which he found non-ſenſe.

30 But whether you will have it *Obſervata* or *Conſervata*, the new *ſumpſimus* or the old *mumpſimus*, poſſibly it may be ſomething to *Irenæus* but to us or our cauſe it is no way materiall. For if the reſt be rightly tranſlated, neither will *Conſervata* afford you any argument againſt us, nor *Obſervata* helpe us to any evaſion. For though at the firſt hearing the glorious attributes here given, (and that juſtly) to the Church of Rome, *the confounding Heretiques with her tradition, and ſaying it is neceſſary for all Churches to reſort to her*, may ſound like Arguments for you: yet hee that is attentive I hope will eaſily diſcover, that it might be good and rationall in *Irenæus* having to doe with Heretiques, who, ſomewhat like thoſe who would be the only Catholiques, declining a tryall by Scripture as not contayning the Truth of Chriſt perfectly, and not fit to decide Controverſies without recourſe to Tradition: I ſay he will eaſily perceive that it might be rationall in *Irenæus* to urge them with any Tradition of more credit then their own, eſpecially a Tradition conſonant to Scripture, and even contain'd in it; and yet that it may be irrationall in you to urge us, who doe not decline Scripture but appeale to it as a perfect rule of faith, with a Tradition which we pretend is many wayes repugnant to Scripture, and repugnant to a Tradition far more generall then it ſelf, which gives Teſtimony to Scripture, and laſtly repugnant to it ſelf as giving atteſtation both to Scripture and to Doctrines plainly contrary to Scripture. Secondly that the Authority of the Roman Church

was

was then a far greater Argument of the Truth of her Tradition when it was Vnited with all other Apoſtolique Churches, then now when it is divided from them, according to that of *Tertullian*, *Had the Churches erred they would have varied, but that which is the ſame in all, cannot be errour but Tradition*; and therefore though *Irenæus* his Argument may be very probable, yet yours may be worth nothing. Thirdly, that foureteen hundred yeares may have made a great deale of alteration in the Roman Church: as Rivers, though neere the fountain they may retaine their native and unmixt ſyncerity, yet in long progreſſe cannot but take in much mixture that came not from the fountain. And therefore the Roman Tradition though then pure, may now be corrupt and impure: and ſo this Argument (being one of thoſe things which are the worſe for wearing) might in *Irenæus* his time be ſtrong and vigorous, and after declining and decaying may long ſince have fallen to nothing. Eſpecially conſidering that *Irenæus* plaies the Hiſtorian only and not the Prophet, and ſaies only, that the *Apoſtolique Tradition had been alwayes there as in other Apoſtolique Churches conſerved or obſerved*, chooſe you whether, but that *it ſhould be alwayes ſo*, he ſaies not, neither had he any warrant. He knew well enough that there was foretold a *great falling away of* the Churches of Chriſt to Anti-chriſt: that the Roman Church in particular was forewarned that ſhe alſo, *nay the whole Church of the Gentiles, might fall if they look not to their ſtanding*: and therefore to ſecure her that ſhe ſhould ſtand for ever, he had no reaſon, nor Authority. Fourthly, that it appeares manifeſtly out of this book of *Irenæus* quoted by you, that the doctrine of the Chiliaſts was in his judgment Apoſtolique Tradition, as alſo it was eſteemed (for ought appeares to the contrary) by all the Doctors, and Saints, and Martyrs of or about his time, for all that ſpeak of it, or whoſe judgments in the point are any way recorded, are for it: and *Iuſtine Martyr* profeſſeth that *all good and Orthodoxe Chriſtians of his time beleeved it*, and thoſe that did not, he reckons amongſt Heretiques. Now I demand, was this Tradition one of thoſe that was conſerved, and obſerved in the Church of Rome, or was it not? If not, had *Irenæus* known ſo much, he muſt have retracted this commendation of that Church. If it was, then the Tradition of the preſent Church of Rome contradicts the Ancient, and accounts it Hereticall, and then ſure it can be no certain note of Hereſie to depart from them, who have departed from themſelves, and prove themſelves ſubject unto Errour by holding contradictions. Fiftly and laſtly, that out of the Story of the Church it is as manifeſt as the light at noone, that though *Irenæus* did eſteem the Roman Tradition, a great Argument of the doctrine which he there delivers and defends againſt the Heretiques of his time *viz.: that there was one God*, yet he was very far from thinking that Church was, and ever ſhould be a ſafe keeper, and an infallible witneſſe of Tradition in generall: Inaſmuch as in his own life, his action proclaim'd the contrary. For when *Victor* Biſhop of Rome obtruded the Roman Tradition touching the time of Eaſter upon the Aſian Biſhops under the pain of Excommunication, *and*

Rom. 11.

In Dial. cum Tryphon.

damnation, Irenæus, and all the other Weſtern Biſhops, though agreeing with him in his obſervation yet ſharply reprehended him for excommunicating the Aſian Biſhops for their diſagreeing, plainly ſhewing, that they eſteemed that not a neceſſary doctrine and a ſufficient ground of excommunication, which the Biſhop of Rome and his adherents did ſo account of: For otherwiſe how could they have reprehended him for excommunicating them, had they conceived the cauſe of his excommunication juſt and ſufficient? And beſides evidently declaring that they eſteemed not ſeparation from the Roman Church a certain mark of Hereſie, ſeeing they eſteemed not them Heretiques though ſeparated and cut off from the Roman Church.

Lib. 3. cap. 2. Of his reply to King Iames. *c. 2. §. 32.*

Cardinall *Perron* to avoyd the ſtroak of this conuincing argument, raiſeth a cloud of eloquent words, which becauſe you borrow them of him in your Second part, I will here inſert, and with ſhort cenſures diſpell, and let his Idolaters ſee that Truth is not afraid of Giants: His words are theſe.

The firſt inſtance then that Calvin *alleageth againſt the Popes cenſures, is taken from* Euſebius (*a*) *an Arrian author, and from* Ruffinus (*b*) *enemie to the* Roman *Church his tranſlator; who writ,* (*c*) *that* S. IRENEVS *reprehended Pope* Victor *for having excommunicated the Churches of* Aſia *for the queſtion of the day of Paſche, which they obſerved according to a particular tradition that* S. IOHN *had introduced* (*d*) *for a time in their Provinces, becauſe of the neighbourhood of the Iewes, and to bury the Synagogue with honour, and not according to the* Calv. ubi ſupra. *univerſall tradition of the Apoſtles.* Irenæus (*ſaith* Calvin) reprehended Pope Victor bitterly, becauſe for a light cauſe he had moved a great and perillous contention in the Church. *There is this in the text that* Calvin *produceth;* He reprehended him, that he had not done well, to cut off from the body of unity, ſo many and ſo great Churches. *But againſt whom maketh this, but* (*e*) *againſt thoſe that obiect it? for who ſees not, that* S. IRENEVS, *doth not there reprehend the Pope for the* (*f*) *want of power, but for the ill uſe of his power; and doth not reproach to the Pope, that he could not excommunicate the* Aſians, *but admoniſheth him, that for* (*g*) *ſo ſmall a cauſe he ſhould not have cut off ſo many Provinces from the body of the Church?* Iræneus (*ſaith* Euſebius) did fitly exhort Pope Victor, that he ſhould not cut off all the Churches of God which held this ancient tradition. *And* Ruffinus *tranſlating and envenoming* Euſebius *ſaith;* He queſtioned Victor, that he had not done well in cutting off from the body of unity ſo many and ſo great Churches of God. *And in truth, how could* S. IRENEVS *have reprehended the Pope for want of power; he that cries:* To the Roman Church, becauſe of a more powerfull principality; (*that is to ſay*) *as aboue appeareth,* (*h*) *becauſe of a principality more powerfull then the temporall: or* (*as wee have expounded otherwhere*) *becauſe of a more powerful Original:* (i) it is neceſſary that every Church ſhould agree? *And* (*k*) *therefore alſo* S. IRENEVS *alleageth not to Pope* Victor *the example of him, and of the other Biſhops of the* Gaules *aſſembled in a councell holden expreſſely for this effect, who had not excommunicated the* Aſians, *nor the example of* Narciſſus

Ruffin. in verſ. hiſt. Eccl. Euſ. l. 5. c. 24.

Euſeb. hiſt. Eccl. l. 5. c. 24. Ruffin. ib. c. 24. Iren. l. 3. c. 3. 1. Booke. Chapt. 25.

Euſeb. hiſt. Eccl. l. 5. l. 22.

ciſſus *Biſhop of* Ieruſalem, *and of the Biſhops of* Paleſtina *aſſembled in an other Councell, holden expreſſely for the ſame effect, who had not excommunicated them, nor the example of* Palmas, *and of the other Biſhops of* Pontus *aſſembled in the ſame manner, and for the ſame cauſe in the Region of* Pontus, *who had not excommunicated them, but only alleadges to him the example of the Popes his predeceſſors*: The Prelates (*ſaith he*) who have preſided before Soter in the Church where thou preſideſt, Aniſius, Pius, Hyginus, Teleſphorus, and Sixtus, have not obſerved this cuſtome, &c. and nevertheleſſe none of thoſe that obſerved it, have been excommunicated. *And yet, O admirable providence of God, the* (*l*) *ſucceſſe of the after ages ſhewed, that even in the uſe of his power, the Popes proceeding was iuſt. For after the death of* Victor, *the Councels of* Nicea, *of* Conſtantinople, *and of* Epheſus, *excommunicated again thoſe that held the ſame cuſtome with the provinces, that the Pope had excommunicated, and placed them in the Catalogue of heretiques, under the titles of heretiques* Quarto decumans! Iren. apud Euſeb. hiſt. Eccl. l. 5. c. 26. Conc. Antioch. c. 1. Conc. Conſt. c. 7. Conc. Eph. p. 2. act. 6.

But to this inſtance Calvins *Sect doe annex two new obſervations; the firſt, that the Pope having threatned the Biſhops of* Aſia *to excommunicate them,* Polycrates *the Biſhop of* Epheſus *and Metropolitan of* Aſia, *deſpiſed the Popes threats, as it appeares by the anſwer of the ſame* Polycrates *to Pope* Victor, *which is inſerted in the writings of* Euſebius, *and of* S. IEROM, *and which* S. IEROM *ſeemeth to approve, when he ſaith, he reports it* to ſhew the ſpirit and authority of the man. *And the ſecond, that when the Pope pronounced anciently his excommunications, he did no other thing but ſeparate himſelf from the communion of thoſe that he excommunicated, and did not thereby ſeparate them from the univerſall communion of the Church. To the firſt then we ſay, that ſo farre is this Epiſtle of* Polycrates *from abating and deminiſhing the Popes authority, that contrarywiſe it greatly magnifies and exalts it. For although* Polycrates *blinded with the love of the cuſtome of his nation, which he beleeved to be grounded upon the word of God, who had aſſigned the fourteenth of the Moneth of March for the obſervation of the* Paſche, *and upon the example of* S. IOHNS *tradition maintaines it obſtinately; Nevertheleſſe, this that he anſweres, ſpeaking in his own name, and in the name of the Councell of the Biſhops of* Aſia, *to whom he preſided;* I feare not thoſe that threaten us, for my elders have ſaid, it is better to obey God then man. *Doth it not ſhew, that had it not been, that he beleeved the Popes threat, was againſt the expreſſe word of God, there had been cauſe to feare it, and he had been obliged to obey him; for* (*m*) *who knowes not, that this anſwer;* it is better to obey God then men, *is not to be made but to thoſe, whom we were obliged to obey, if their commandements were not contrary to the commandements of God; And that he adds, that he had called the Biſhops of* Aſia, *to a Nationall Councell, being* (*n*) *ſummoned to it by the Pope; doth it not inſinuate, that the other Councels whereof* Euſebius *ſpeaks, that were holden about this matter, through all the provinces of the Earth, and particularly that of* Paleſtina, *which if you beleeve the act that* Beda *ſaid came to his hands,* Theophilus *Archbiſhop of* Ceſarea *had called by the auctority of* Victor, *were holden at the inſtance of the Pope;* Euſeb. hiſt. Eccl. l. 5. c. 24. Hieron. in ſcript. Eccl. in Polyer. Exod. 12. Hieronym. ubi ſupra. Euſeb. hiſt. Eccl. l. 5. c. 23. Beda in frag. de Æquinoctio. vernali.

Pope, and conſequently that the Pope was the firſt mover of the univerſall Church? And that the Councels of Nicea, *of* Conſtantinople *of* Epheſus *embraced the cenſure of* Victor, *and excommunicated thoſe that obſerved the cuſtome of* Polycrates: *doth it not prove, that it was not the Pope but* (o) Polycrates *that was deceived, in beleeving that the Popes cõmandement, was againſt Gods commandement? And that* S. IEROM *himſelfe celebrates the Paſchall Homelies of* Theophilus *Patriarke of* Alexandria, *which followed the order of* Nicea *concerning the* Paſche; *Doth it not iuſtifie, that when* S. IEROM *ſaith; that he reports the Epiſtle of* Polycrates, to ſhew the ſpirit, and authority of the man *he intends by authority, not authority of right, but of fact: that is to ſay, the credit that* Polycrates *had amongſt the* Aſians *and other* Quarto decimans?

Theſe are the Cardinall words, The moſt materiall and conſiderable paſſages whereof to ſave the trouble of repetition, I have noted with letters of reference: whereunto my anſwers noted reſpectively with the ſame letters follow now in order.

(a) If *Euſebius* were an *Arrian* author, It is nothing to the purpoſe; what he writes there is no *Arrianiſme*, nor any thing towards it. Never any error was imputed to the *Arrians* for denying the Authority or the infallibility of the Biſhop or Church of Rome. Beſides what *Euſebius* ſaies, he ſaies out of *Irenæus*: Neither doth or can the Cardinall deny the ſtory to be true & therefore he goes about by indirect Arts to foyle it & caſt a blurre upon it. Laſtly, whenſoever *Euſebius* ſaies any thing, which the Cardinall thinkes for the advantage of his ſide, he cites him, and then he is no *Arrian*: or at leaſt hee would not take that for an anſwer to the arguments he drawes out of him.

(b) That *Ruffinus* was enemy to the Roman Church, is ſaid, but not proved, neither can it be.

(c) *Euſebius* ſaies the ſame alſo of *cæteri omnes Epiſcopi*, all the other Biſhops: that they adviſed *Victor* to keepe thoſe things, that belonged to peace and unity, and that they ſharpely reprehended *Victor*, for having done otherwiſe.

(d) This is ſaid, but no offer made of any proofe of it: The Cardinall thinks we muſt take every thing upon his word. They to whom the Tradition was delivered, *Polycrates* and the *Aſian* Biſhops, knew no ſuch matter, nay profeſſed the contrary. And who is more likely to know the Truth, they which lived within two ages of the fountain of it, or the Cardinall who lived ſixteen ages after it?

(e) How can it make againſt thoſe that object it: ſeeing it is evident from *Irenæus* his Reprehenſion, that he thought *Victor* and the Roman Church, no infallible nor ſufficient Iudge, of what was neceſſary to be believed and done, what not: what was Vniverſall Tradition, what not: what was a ſufficient ground of Excommunication and what not: and conſequently, that there was no ſuch neceſſity as is pretended, that all other Churches, ſhould in matters of faith, conforme themſelves to the Church of Rome?

(f) This is to ſuppoſe that Excommunication, is an Act, or Argument, or ſigne of Power & Authority in the party excommunicating,

over

over the party excommunicated, whereas it is undeniably evident out of the Church Story, that it was often uſed by Equalls upon Equalls, and by Inferiors upon Superiors, if the equalls or inferiors, thought their equalls or ſuperiors did any thing which deſerved it.

(g) And what is this but to confeſſe, that they thought that a ſmall cauſe of excommunication and unſufficient, which *Victor* and his adherents thought great and ſufficient? And conſequently, that *Victor* and his Part declared that to be a matter of faith and of neceſſity, which they thought not ſo; and where was then their conformity?

(h) True, you have ſo expounded it, but not proved nor offered any proofe of your expoſition. This alſo we muſt take upon your Authority. *Irenæus* ſpeaks not one word of any other power, to which he compares or before which he preferres the power of the Roman Church. And it is evident out of the Councell of *Chalcedon*,* that *all the Principality which it had, was given it* (not by God, but) *by the Church, in regard it was ſeated in the Imperiall City*. Whereupon when afterwards *Conſtantinople* was the Imperiall City, they decreed that *that Chuch ſhould have equall Priviledges and dignity and preheminence with the Church of Rome*. All the Fathers agreed in this decree, ſaving only the Legats of the Biſhop of Rome: ſhewing plainly that they never thought of any Supremacy given the Biſhops of Rome by God, or grounded upon Scripture, but only by the Church, and therefore alterable at the Churches pleaſure.

* Can. 28.

(i) This is falſely tranſlated. *Convenire ad Romanam Eccleſiam*, every body knowes ſignifies no more but to reſort or come to the Roman Church: which then there was a neceſſity that men ſhould doe, becauſe that the affaires of the Empire were tranſacted in that place. But yet *Irenæus* ſaies not ſo of every Church ſimply, which had not been true, but only of the adjacent Churches, for ſo he expounds himſelfe in ſaying, *To this Church it is neceſſary that every Church*, that is, all the faithfull *round about ſhould reſort*. With much more reaſon therefore we returne the Argument thus, Had *Irenæus* thought that all Churches muſt of neceſſity agree with the Romã, how could he & all other Biſhops have then pronounc'd, that to be no matter of Faith, no ſufficient ground of Excommunication, which *Victor* and his adherents thought to be ſo? And how then could they have reprehended *Victor* ſo much, for the ill uſe of his power, as Cardinall *Perron* confeſſes they did, ſeeing if that was true which is pretended, in this alſo as well as other things, it was neceſſary for them to agree with the Church of Rome?

Some there are that ſay, but more wittily then truly, that all Cardinall *Bellarmines* works, are ſo conſonant to themſelves, as if he had written them in two houres. Had Cardinall *Perron* wrote his book in two houres, ſure he would not have done that here in the middle of the Book, which he condemns in the beginning of it. For here he urgeth a conſequence, drawn from the miſtaken words of *Irenæus* againſt his lively and actuall practice: which proceeding, there he juſtly condemnes of evident injuſtice. His words are *, *For who knowes not that it*

* In his Letter to *Caſaubon* towards the end.

it is too great an injuſtice to alleage conſequences from paſſages, and even thoſe ill interpreted and miſunderſtood, and in whoſe illation there is alwaies ſome Paralogiſme hid againſt the expreſſe words, and the lively & actuall practiſe of the ſame Fathers from whom they are collected: and that may be good, to take the Fathers for Adverſaries, and to accuſe them for want of ſenſe or memory: but not to take them for Judges, and to ſubmit themſelves to the obſervation of what they have believ'd and practiſed.

(k) This is nothing to the purpoſe: he might chooſe theſe examples, not as of greater force and authority in themſelves, but as fitter to be imploied againſt *Victor*, as domeſtique examples, are fitter and more effectuall then forraine: and for his omitting to preſſe him with his own example and others, to what purpoſe had it been to uſe them, ſeeing their Letters ſent to *Victor* from all parts, wherein they reprehend his preſumption, ſhewed him ſufficiently, that their example was againſt him. But beſides, he that reads *Irenæus* his Letter ſhall ſee, that in the matter of the Lent Faſt, and the great variety about the celebration of it, which he paralels with this of Eaſter, he preſſeth *Victor* with the example of himſelfe and others, not Biſhops of Rome; *both they* (ſaith hee ſpeaking of other Biſhops) *notwithſtanding this difference, retained peace among themſelves,* and *wee alſo among our ſelves retaine it*; inferring from his example, that *Victor* alſo ought to doe ſo.

(l) If the Popes proceeding was juſt, then the Churches of *Aſia* were indeed, and in the ſight of God excommunicate, and out of the ſtate of Salvation: which *Irenæus* and all the other ancient Biſhops never thought. And if they were ſo, why doe you accouut them Saints and Martyrs? But the truth is, that theſe Councells did no way ſhew the Popes proceedings juſt, but rather the contrary. For though they ſetled an uniformity in this matter, yet they ſetled it as a matter formerly indifferent, & not as a matter of faith or neceſſity, as it is evident out of * *Athanaſius*; & conſequently they rather declare *Victors* proceeding unjuſt, who excommunicated ſo many Churches, for differing from him in an indifferent matter.

(m) It ſeemes then *Polycrates* might be a Saint and a Martyr, and yet think the commands of the Roman Church enjoyned upon pain of damnation, contrary to the commandements of God. Beſides S. *Peter* himſelfe, the head of the Church, the Vicar of Chriſt (as you pretend) made this very anſwer to the High Prieſt, yet I hope you will not ſay, he was his inferior and obliged to obey him. Laſtly, who ſees not, that when the Pope commandes us any thing unjuſt, as to communicate Lay men in one kinde, to uſe the Latine ſervice, we may very fitly ſay to him, *it is better to obey God then men*, and yet never think of any authority he hath over us?

(n) Between requeſting and ſummoning, methinkes there ſhould be ſome difference, and *Polycrates* ſaies no more, but that *hee was requeſted by the Church of Rome* to call them, and did ſo. Here then (as very often) the Cardinall is faine to help the dice with a falſe tranſlation, and his pretence being falſe, every one muſt ſee, that that which he

* *In ep. ad Epiſcopos in Africa*: Where he cleerely ſhewes that this queſtion was not a queſtion of faith: by ſaying, *The Councell of Nice was celebrated, by occaſion of the Arrian* hereſy *and the difference about Eaſter. In ſo much as* they in Syria *and* Cilicia *and* Meſopotamia, *did differ herein from* us, and *kept* this feaſt *on the ſame* day with the Iewes: But thankes *be to* God, an agreement was made, as concerning the Faith, ſo alſo concerning this holy Feaſt.

he pretends to be inſinuated by it, is cleerely inconſequent.

(o) *Polycrates* was deceived, if he believed it to be againſt Gods commandement, and the Pope deceived as much, in thinking it to be Gods commandement, for it was neither the one nor the other, but an indifferent matter, wherein God had not interpoſed his Authority. Neither did the Councell of Nice embrace the cenſure of *Victor*, by acknowledging his Excommunication to be juſt and well grounded, for which the Cardinall neither doth pretend, nor can produce any proofe, any way comparable to the fore-alleaged words of *Athanaſius* teſtifying the contrary; though peradventure, having ſetled the obſervation, and reduced it to an uniformity, they might excommunicate thoſe who afterward ſhould trouble the Churches peace for an indifferent matter. And thus much for *Irenæus*.

31 I come now to S. *Auſtine*, and to the firſt place out of him, where he *ſeemes to ſay, that the Succeſſion in the Sea of Peter, was the Rock which our Saviour meant when he ſaid, upon this Rock, &c.* I anſwer, firſt we have no reaſon to be confident of the truth hereof, becauſe S. *Auſtine* himſelfe was not, but retracts it as uncertain, & *leaves to the Reader whether he will think that, or another more probable. Retr. l.1.c.26.* Secondly, what he ſaies of the Succeſſion in the Roman Church in this place, he ſaies it elſe where, of all the Succeſſions in all other Apoſtolique Churches. Thirdly, that as in this place he urgeth the Donatiſts with ſeparation from the Roman Church, as an argument of their Error: So elſewhere he preſſeth them with their Separation from other Apoſtolique Churches, nay more from theſe then from that, becauſe in Rome the Donatiſts had a Biſhop, though not a perpetuall Succeſſion of them, but in other Apoſtolique Churches they wanted both. *Theſe ſcatter'd men* (ſaith he of the Donatiſts *Epiſt.165.*) *read in the holy bookes the Churches to which the Apoſtles wrote, and have no Biſhop in them: But what is more perverſe and mad, then to the Lectors reading theſe Epiſtles to ſay, Peace with you, and to ſeparate from the peace of theſe Churches, to which theſe Epiſtles were written?* So *Optatus* having done you (as it might ſeeme) great ſervice, in upbraiding the Donatiſts as Schiſmatiques, becauſe they had not Communion with the Church of Rome, overthrowes and undoes it all againe, and as it were with a ſpunge wipes out all that he had ſaid for you, by adding after, that they were Schiſmatiques, becauſe *They had not the fellowſhip of Cõmunion with the ſeven Churches of Aſia, to which S. Iohn writes*: whereof he pronounces confidently, (though I know not upon what ground) *Extra ſeptem Eccleſias quicquid foris eſt, alienum eſt.* Now I pray tell me, doe you eſteeme the Authority of theſe Fathers a ſufficient aſſurance, that ſeparation from theſe other Apoſtolique Churches, was a certain marke of Hereſy, or not? If ſo, then your Church hath been for many Ages hereticall. If not, how is their authority, a greater argument for the Roman, then for the other Churches? If you ſay, they conceived ſeparation from theſe Churches a note of Schiſme, only when they were united to the Roman: ſo alſo they might conceive of the Roman, only when it was united to

them. If you ſay, they urg'd this only as a probable, and not as a certain Argument, ſo alſo they might doe that. In a word, whatſoever anſwer you can deviſe to ſhew, that theſe Fathers made not ſeparation from theſe other Churches a mark of Hereſy, apply that to your own Argument, and it will be ſatisfied.

32 The other place is evidently impertinent to the preſent queſtion, nor is there in it any thing but this, That *Cæcilian might contemne the multitude of his adverſaries, becauſe thoſe that were united with him were more, and of more account then thoſe that were againſt him.* Had he preferr'd the Roman Church alone, before *Cæcilians* enemies, this had been litle, but ſomething; but when other Countries from which the Goſpell came firſt into *Africa*, are joyned in this Patent, with the Church of Rome, how ſhe can build any ſingular priviledge upon it I am yet to learne! Neither doe I ſee what can be concluded from it, but that *in the Roman Church was the Principality of an* [a] *Apoſtolique Sea*, which no man doubts: or that the Roman Church was not the Mother Church, becauſe the Goſpell came firſt into Africa, not from her, but from other Churches.

a You doe ill to tranſlate it, *the Principality of the Sea Apoſtolique*, as if there were but one: whereas *S. Auſtine* preſently after ſpeaks of Apoſtolicall Churches, in the plurall number; and makes the Biſhops of thē, joynt Commiſſioners for the judging of Eccleſiaſticall cauſes.

33 Thus you ſee his wordes make very litle, or indeed nothing for you. But now his Action, which according to Cardinall *Perrons* rule, is much more to be regarded then his words, as not being ſo obnoxious to miſinterpretatiō, I mean his famous oppoſition of three Biſhops of Rome in ſucceſſion, touching the great queſtion of Appeales, wherein he and the reſt of the African Biſhops proceeded ſo farre in the firſt or ſecond *Milevitan* Councell, as to [b] *decree any African Excommunicate, that ſhould appeale to any man out of Africk*, and therein continued reſolute unto death: I ſay this famous Action of his, makes cleerely and evidently and infinitely againſt you. For had *Boniface*, and the reſt of the African Biſhops, a great part whereof were Saints and Martyrs, believed as an Article of faith, that Vnion and Conformity with the doctrine of the Roman Church, in all things which ſhe held neceſſary, was a certain note of a good Catholique, and by Gods command neceſſary to Salvation, how was it poſſible they ſhould have oppoſed it in this? Vnleſſe you will ſay they were all ſo fooliſh as to believe at once direct contradictions, *viz.* that conformity to the Roman Church was neceſſary in all points, and not neceſſary in this: or elſe ſo horribly impious, as believing this doctrine of the Roman Church true, and her power to receive Appeales derived from divine Authority, notwithſtanding to oppoſe and condemne it, and to Anathematize all thoſe Africans, of what condition ſoever, that ſhould appeale unto it. I ſay *of what condition ſoever*: For it is evident, that they concluded in their determination, Biſhops as well as the inferior Clergy and Laity: And Cardinall *Perrons* pretence of the contrary, is a

b The words of the Decree (which alſo *Bellarmine* l. 1. *de Matrim.* c. 17. aſſures us to have bin form'd by S. *Auſtine*) are theſe. *Si qui (Africani,) ab Epiſcopis provocandum putaverint, non niſi ad Africana provocent Concilia, vel ad Primates provinciarum ſuarum. Ad tranſmarina autem, qui putaverit appellandum, a nullo intra Africam in Communionem ſuſcipiatur.* This Decree is by *Gratian* moſt impudently corrupted, For whereas the Fathers of that Councell intended it particularly againſt the *Church of Rome*, he tels us they forbad Appeales to All, *excepting only the Church of Rome.*

ſhame-

ſhameleſſe falſhood, repugnant to the plaine words of the Remonſtrance of the *African* Biſhops to *Celeſtine* Biſhop of *Rome*.

The words are theſe. *Præfato debito ſalutationis officio, impendio deprecamur; ut deinceps ad aures veſtras hinc venientes, non facilius admittatis; nec a nobis excommunicatos ultra in Communionem velitis recipere, quia hoc etiam Niceno Concilio definitum facile advertet venerabilitas tua. Nam ſi de inferioribus Clericis vel Laicis videtur id præcaveri, quanto magis hoc de Epiſcopis voluit obſervari!*

34 Your allegation of *Tertullian* is a manifeſt conviction of your want of ſyncerity: For you produce with great oſtentation what he ſaies of the Church of *Rome*, but you and your fellowes alwaies conceale and diſſemble, that immediatly before theſe words he attributes as much for point of direction to any other Apoſtolique Church, and that as he ſends them to *Rome* who lived neare Italy, ſo thoſe neare *Achaia* hee ſends to *Corinth*, thoſe about *Macedonia* to *Philippi*, and *Theſſalonica*, thoſe of *Aſia* to *Epheſus*. His words are, *Goe to now thou that wilt better imploy thy curioſity in the buſineſſe of thy ſalvation, run over the Apoſtolicall Churches, wherein the Chaires of the Apoſtles are yet ſate upon in their places, wherein their Authentique Epiſtles are recited, ſounding out the voyce, and repreſenting the face of of every one! Is Achaia neere thee? there thou haſt Corinth: If thou art not farre from Macedonia, thou haſt Philippi, thou haſt Theſſalonica: If thou canſt goe into Aſia, there thou haſt Epheſus: If thou be adjacent to Italy, thou haſt Rome, whoſe Authority is neere at hand to us* (in *Africk*;) *A happy Church, into which the Apoſtles powred forth all their Doctrine together with their blood*, &c. Now I pray Sir tell me, if you can for bluſhing, why this place might not have been urg'd by a Corinthian, or Philippian, or Theſſalonian, or an Epheſian, to ſhew that in the judgment of *Tertullian*, ſeparation from any of their Churches is a certain mark of Hereſie, as iuſtly and rationally as you alleadge it to vindicate this priviledge to the Roman Church only? Certainly if you will ſtand to *Tertullians* judgment, you muſt either grant the authority of the Roman Church (though at that time a good Topicall Argument, and perhaps a better then any the Heretiques had, eſpecially in conjunction with other Apoſtolique Churches:) yet I ſay you muſt grant it perforce but a fallible Guide as well as that of Epheſus, and Theſſalonica, and Philippi, and Corinth: or you muſt maintain the Authority of every one of theſe infallible, as well as the Roman. For though he make a Panegyrick of the Roman Church in particular, and of the reſt only in generall, yet as I have ſaid, for point of direction he makes them all equall, and therefore makes them (chooſe you whether) either all fallible, or all infallible: Now you will and muſt acknowledge that he never intended to attribute infallibility to the Churches of Epheſus, or Corinth, or if he did, that (as experience ſhewes) he erred in doing ſo; and what can hinder, but then we may ſay alſo that he never intended to attribute infallibility to the Roman Church, or if he did that he erred in doing ſo?

35 From the ſaying of S. *Baſil*, certainly nothing can be gathered, but only *that the Biſhop of Rome may diſcerne betweene that which is counterfeit, and that which is lawfull and pure, and without any diminution may preach the faith of our Anceſtours*. Which certainly he might doe, if ambition and covetouſneſſe did not hinder him, or elſe I ſhould never condemne him for doing otherwiſe. But is there no difference betweene *may* and *muſt*? Beleeve hee may doe ſo, and he

cannot but doe ſo? Or doth it follow, becauſe he may doe ſo, therefore he alwayes ſhall or will doe ſo? In my opinion rather the contrary ſhould follow! For he that ſaith you may doe thus, implies according to the ordinary ſenſe of words, that if he will he may doe othewiſe. You certainly may if you pleaſe leave abuſing the world with ſuch Sophiſtry as this; but whether you will or no, of that I have no aſſurance.

36 Your next Witneſſe I would willingly have examined, but it ſeemes you are unwilling he ſhould be found, otherwiſe you would have giv̄e us your direction where we might have him. Of that *Maximianus* who ſucceeded *Neſtorius*, I can find no ſuch thing in the Councels: Neither can I beleeve that any Patriarch of *Conſtantinople* twelve hundred yeares agoe was ſo baſe a paraſite of the Sea of Rome.

37 Your laſt Witneſſe *Iohn* of *Conſtantinople*, I confeſſe ſpeaks home and advanceth the Roman ſea, even to heaven: But I feare it is, that his owne may goe up with it, which hee there profeſſes to bee all one ſea with the ſea of Rome; and therefore his Teſtimony, as ſpeaking in his own caſe is not much to be regarded. But beſides, I have litle reaſon to be confident that this Epiſtle is not a forgery, for certainly *Binius* hath obtruded upon us many a hundred ſuch. This though written by a Græcian is not extant in Greek but in Latine only. Laſtly, it comes out of a ſuſpicious place, an old book of the *Vatican Library*: which Library the world knowes to have been the Mint of very many impoſtures.

38 *Ad* §. 20. 21. 22. 23. The ſumme of your diſcourſe in the 4. next Sections, if it be pertinent to the Queſtion in agitation, muſt be this: *Want of ſucceſſion of Biſhops and Paſtours holding alwayes the ſame doctrine, and of the formes of ordaining Biſhops and Prieſts which are in uſe in the Roman Church, is a certain mark of Hereſie: But Proteſtants want all theſe things: Therefore they are Heretiques.* To which I Anſwer, That nothing but want of truth and holding errour, can make or prove any man or Church hereticall. For if he be a true Ariſtotelian, or Platoniſt, or Pyrrhoniā, or Epicurean, who holds the doctrine of *Ariſtotle*, or *Plato*, or *Pirrho*, or *Epicurus*, although he cannot aſſigne any that held it before him for many Ages together, why ſhould I not be made a true and orthodox Chriſtian, by beleeving all the doctrine of Chriſt, though I cannot derive my deſcent from a perpetuall Succeſſiō that beleev'd it before me? By this reaſon you ſhould ſay as well, that no man can be a good Biſhop or Paſtour, or King or Magiſtrate, or Father that ſucceeds a bad one. For if I may conforme my will and actions to the Commandements of God, why may I not embrace his doctrine with my underſtanding, although my predeceſſour doe not ſo? You have aboue in this Chapter defin'd *Faith a free Infallible, obſcure, ſupernaturall aſſent to divine Truths, becauſe they are revealed by God & ſufficiently propounded*: This definition is very phantaſticall; but for the preſent I will let it paſſe, and deſire you to give me ſome peece or ſhadow of reaſon, why I may not doe all this without a perpetuall Succeſſion of Biſhops and Paſtours that have done ſo before me? You may

may judge as uncharitably, and ſpeak as maliciouſly of me, as your blind zeale to your Superſtition ſhall direct you, but certainly I know, (and with all your Sophiſtry you cannot make me doubt of what I know,) that I doe beleeve the Goſpell of Chriſt (as it is delivered in the undoubted books of Canonicall Scripture,) as verily as that it is now day, that I ſee the light, that I am now writing: and I beleeve it upon this Motive, becauſe I conceive it ſufficiently, abundantly, ſuperabundantly proved to be divine Revelation: And yet in this, I doe not depend upon any Succeſſion of men that have alwayes beleeved it without any mixture of Errour; nay I am fully perſwaded, there hath been no ſuch Succeſſion, and yet doe not find my ſelf any way weakned in my faith by the want of it; but ſo fully aſſured of the truth of it, that not only, though your divels at *Lowden* doe tricks againſt it, but though an Angell from heaven ſhould gainſay it or any part of it, I perſwade my ſelf that I ſhould not be moved. This I ſay, and this I am ſure is true: and if you will be ſo hyperſceptical as to perſwade me, that I am not ſure that I doe beleeve all this, I deſire you to tell me, how are you ſure that you beleeve the Church of Rome? For if a man may perſwade himſelf he doth beleeve what he doth not beleeve, then may you think you beleeve the Church of Rome, and yet not beleeve it. But if no man can erre concerning what he beleeves, then you muſt give me leave to aſſure my ſelfe that I doe beleeve, and conſequently that any man may beleeve the foreſaid truths upon the foreſaid motives, without any dependance upon any Succeſſion that hath beleeved it alwayes. And as from your definition of faith, ſo from your definition of Hereſy, this phancy may be refuted. For queſtionleſſe no man can be an Heretique but he that holds an Hereſie, and an Hereſie you ſay *is a Voluntary Errour*; therefore no man can be neceſſitated to be an Heretique whether he will or no, by want of ſuch a thing that is not in his power to have: But that there ſhould have been a perpetuall Succeſſion of Beleevers in all points Orthodox, is not a thing which is in your power, therefore our being or not being Heretiques depends not on it. Beſides, what is more certain, then that he may make a ſtreight line who hath a Rule to make it by, though never man in the world had made any before: and why then may not he that beleeves the Scripture to be the word of God, and the Rule of faith, regulate his faith by it, and conſequently beleeve aright without much regarding what other men either will doe or have done? It is true indeed there is a neceſſity that if God will have his words beleeved, he by his Providence muſt take order, that either by ſucceſſion of men, or by ſome other meanes naturall or ſupernaturall, it be preſerv'd and delivered, and ſufficiently notified to bee his word; but that this ſhould be done by a Succeſſion of men that holds no errour againſt it, certainly there is no more neceſſity, then that it ſhould be done by a Succeſſion of men that commit no ſinne againſt it. For if men may preſerve the Records of a Law, and yet tranſgreſſe it, certainly they may alſo preſerve directions for their faith, and yet not follow them. I doubt not but Lawyers at the Barre doe find by frequent experience, that many

men preſerve and produce evidences, which being examined oftimes make againſt themſelves. This they doe ignorantly, it being in their power to ſuppreſſe, or perhaps to alter them. And why then ſhould any man conceive it ſtrange, that an erroneous and corrupted Church ſhould preſerve and deliver the Scriptures uncorrupted, when indeed for many reaſons which I have formerly alleaged, it was impoſſible for them to corrupt them? Seeing therefore this is all the neceſſity that is pretended of a perpetuall Succeſſion of men orthodoxe in all points, certainly there is no neceſſity at all of any ſuch, neither can the want of it prove any man or any Church Heretical.

39 When therefore you have produced ſome proofe of this, which was your Major in your former Syllogiſme, That want of Succeſſion is a certain mark of Hereſy, you ſhall then receive a full anſwer to your Minor. We ſhall then conſider whether your indelible Character be any reality, or whether it be a creature of your own making, a fancy of your own imagination? And if it be a thing, and not only a word, whether our Biſhops and Prieſts have it not as well as yours; & whether ſome mens perſwaſion that there is no ſuch thing, can hinder them from having it, or prove that they have it not if there be any ſuch thing! (Any more then a mans perſwaſion that he has not taken Phyſick or Poyſon, will make him not to have taken it if hee has, or hinder the operation of it?) And whether *Tertullian* in the place quoted by you, ſpeak of a Prieſt made a Lay-man, by juſt depoſition or degradation, and not by a voluntary deſertion of his Order? And whether in the ſame place he ſet not ſome marke upon Heretiques that will agree to your Church? Whether all the Authority of our Biſhops in England before the Reformation, was conferr'd on them by the Pope? And if it were, whether it were the Pope's right, or an uſurpation? If it were his right, whether by Divine Law or Eccleſiaſticall? And if by Eccleſiaſticall only, whether he might poſſibly ſo abuſe his power, as to deſerve to looſe it? Whether *de facto* he had done ſo? Whether ſuppoſing he had deſerved to looſe it, thoſe that deprived him of it had power to take it from him? Or if not, whether they had power to ſuſpend him from the uſe of it, untill good caution were put in, and good aſſurance given, that if he had it again, he would not abuſe it as he had formerly done? Whether in caſe they had done unlawfully that took his power from him, it may not (things being now ſetled, and the preſent government eſtabliſhed) be as unlawfull to goe about to reſtore it? Whether it be not a Fallacy to conclude, becauſe we believe the Pope hath no power in England, now when the King and State and Church hath deprived him upon juſt grounds of it, therefore wee cannot believe that he had any before his deprivation? Whether without Schiſme, a man may not withdraw obediēce from an uſurp'd Authority commanding unlawfull things? Whether the Roman Church might not give authority to Biſhops and Prieſts to oppoſe her errors, as well as a King gives Authority to a Iudge to judge againſt him, if his cauſe be bad; as well as *Traian* gave his ſword to his Prefect, with this commiſſion, that *if he governed well, he ſhould uſe it for him, if ill againſt*

againſt him. Whether the Roman Church gave not Authority to her Biſhops and Prieſts to preach againſt her corruptions in manners? And if ſo, why not againſt her errors in doctrine, if ſhe had any? Whether ſhe gave them not authority to preach the whole Goſpell of Chriſt, and conſequently againſt her doctrine, if it ſhould contradict any part of the Goſpell of Chriſt? Whether it be not acknowledged lawfull in the Church of Rome, for any Lay man or woman that has ability to perſwade others by word or by writing from error, and unto truth? And why this liberty may not be practiſed againſt their Religion, if it be falſe, as well as for it if it be true? Whether any man need any other commiſſion or vocation then that of a Chriſtian, to doe a work of charity? And whether it be not one of the greateſt works of Charity (if it be done after a peaceable manner, and without an unneceſſary diſturbance of order,) to perſwade men out of a falſe, unto a true way of eternall happineſſe? Eſpecially the Apoſtle having aſſur'd us, that he, (whoſoever he is) *who converteth a ſinner from the error of his way, ſhall ſave a ſoule from death, and ſhall hide a multitude of ſinnes?* Whether the firſt Reformed Biſhops died all at once, ſo that there were not enough to ordain Others in the places that were vacant? Whether the Biſhops of England may not conſecrate a Metropolitan of England, as well as the Cardinalls doe the Pope? Whether the King or Queen of England, or they that have the government in their hands, in the minority of the Prince, may not lawfully commend one to them to be conſecrated, againſt whom there is no Canonicall exception? Whether the Doctrine, that the King is ſupream head of the Church of England, (as the Kings of Iudah, & the firſt Chriſtian Emperors were of the Iewiſh and Chriſtian Church,) be any new found doctrine? Whether it may not be true, that Biſhops being made Biſhops, have their authority immediatly from Chriſt, tho ugh this or that man be not made Biſhop without the Kings authority; as well as you ſay, the Pope being Pope, has authority immediatly from Chriſt, and yet this or that man cannot be made Pope without the authority of the Cardinalls? Whether you doe well to ſuppoſe, that Chriſtian Kings have no more authority in ordering the affaires of the Church, then the great Turk, or the Pagan Emperors? Whether the King may not give authority to a Biſhop to exerciſe his function in ſome part of his Kingdome, and yet not be capable of doing it himſelfe: as well as a Biſhop may give authority to a Phyſitian, to practiſe Phyſick in his Dioceſſe, which the Biſhop cannot doe himſelfe? Whether if *Nero* the Emperour would have commanded S. *Peter* or S. *Paul* to preach the Goſpell of Chriſt, and to exerciſe the office of a Biſhop of Rome, whether they would have queſtion'd his Authority to doe ſo? Whether there were any Law of God or man, that prohibited K. IAMES to give Commiſſion to Biſhops, nay to lay his injunction upon them, to doe any thing that is lawfull? Whether a caſuall irregularity may not be lawfully diſpenc'd with? Whether the Popes irregularities if he ſhould chance to incurre any, be indiſpenſable? And if not who is he or who are they, whom the Pope is ſo ſubject unto, that they may di-

ſpenſe

ſpenſe with him? Whether that be certain which you take for granted; *That your Ordination imprints a character and ours doth not?* Whether the power of conſecrating and ordaining by impoſition of hands, may not reſide in the Biſhops, and be derived unto them, not from the King but God; and yet the King have authority to command them to apply this power to ſuch a fit perſon, whom he ſhall commend unto them: As well as if ſome Architects only had the faculty of architecture, and had it immediatly by infuſion from God himſelfe, yet, if they were the Kings ſubjects, he wants not authority to command them to build him a Palace for his uſe, or a fortreſſe for his ſervice: Or as the King of France pretends not to have power to make Prieſts himſelfe, yet I hope, you will not deny him power to command any of his ſubjects that has this power, to ordaine any fit perſon Prieſt, whom he ſhall deſire to be ordained? Whether it doe not follow, that whenſoever the King commands an houſe to be built, a meſſage to be delivered, or a murtherer to be executed, that all theſe things are preſently done without intervention of the Architect, meſſenger, or executioner: As well as, that they are *ipſo facto* ordain'd and conſecrated, who by the Kings authority are commended to the Biſhops to be ordained and conſecrated: Eſpecially ſeeing the King will not deny, but that theſe Biſhops may refuſe to doe what he requires to be done, lawfully if the perſon be unworthy, if worthy, unlawfully indeed, but yet *de facto* they may refuſe: and in caſe they ſhould doe ſo, whether juſtly or unjuſtly; neither the King himſelfe, nor any body elſe, would eſteeme the perſon Biſhop upon the Kings deſignation? Whether many Popes, though they were not conſecrated Biſhops by any temporall Prince, yet might not, or did not receive authority from the Emperor to exerciſe their Epiſcopall function in this or that place? And whether the Emperors had not authority, upon their deſert, to deprive them of their juriſdiction, by impriſonment or baniſhment? Whether Proteſtants doe indeed pretend that their Reformation is univerſall? Whether in ſaying, the *Donatiſts Sect was confined to Africa*, you doe not forget your ſelfe, and contradict what you ſaid above, in §. 17. of this Chapter, where you tell us, *they had ſome of their Sect reſiding in Rome?* Whether it be certain, that none can admit of Biſhops willingly, but thoſe that hold them of divine inſtitution? Whether they may not be willing to have them, conceiving that way of government the beſt, though not abſolutely neceſſary? Whether all thoſe Proteſtants that conceive the diſtinction between Prieſts and Biſhops, not to be of divine inſtitution, be Schiſmaticall and Hereticall for thinking ſo? Whether your forme of ordaining Biſhops and Prieſts, be eſſentiall to the conſtitution of a true Church? Whether the formes of the Church of England differ eſſentially from your formes? Whether in ſaying, that *the true Church cannot ſubſiſt without undoubted true Biſhops and Prieſts*, you have not overthrown the truth of your own Church: wherein I have proved it plainly impoſſible, that any man ſhould be ſo much as morally certain, either of his own Prieſthood or any other mans? Laſtly, whether any one kind of theſe externall formes and orders

ders, and government be ſo neceſſary to the being of a Church, but that they may not be diverſe in diverſe places, and that a good and peaceable Chriſtian may and ought to ſubmit himſelf to the Government of the place where he lives whatſoever it be? All theſe Queſtions will be neceſſary to be diſcuſſed for the clearing of the truth of the *Minor* propoſition of your former Syllogiſme, and your proofs of it: and I will promiſe to debate them fairly with you, if firſt you will bring ſome better proof of the *Maior, That want of Succeſſion is a certain note of Hereſy*, which for the preſent remaines both unprov'd and unprobable.

40 *Ad §.23. The Fathers*, you ſay, *aſſigne Succeſſion as one mark of the true Church*: I confeſſe they did urge Tradition as an argument of the truth of their doctrine and of the falſehood of the contrary; and thus farre they agree with you. But now ſee the difference: They urg'd it not againſt all Heretiques that ever ſhould be, but againſt them who rejected a great part of the Scripture, for no other reaſon but *becauſe it was repugnant to their doctrine, and corrupted other parts with their additions and detractions, and perverted the remainder with divers abſurd interpretations:* So *Tertullian* not a leafe before the words by you cited. Nay they urg'd it againſt them who *when they were confuted out of Scripture, fell to accuſe the Scriptures themſelves as if they were not right, and came not from good authority, as if they were various one from another, and as if truth could not bee found out of them, by thoſe who know not Tradition, for that it was not delivered in writing*, (they did meane wholly,) *but by word of mouth: And that thereupon Paul alſo ſaid, wee ſpeak wiſdome amongſt the perfect.* So *Irenæus* in the very next Chapter before that which you alleage. Againſt theſe men being thus neceſſitated to doe ſo, they did urge Tradition, but what or whoſe Tradition was it? Certainly no other but the joint Tradition of all the Apoſtolique Churches, with one mouth and one voice teaching the ſame doctrine. Or if for brevity ſake they produce the Tradition of any one Church, yet is it apparent, that, that one was then in conjunction with all the reſt; *Irenæus, Tertullian, Origen*, teſtifie as much in the words cited, and *S. Auſtin*, in the place before alleaged by mee. This Tradition they did urge againſt theſe men, and in a time, in compariſon of ours, almoſt contiguous to the Apoſtles: So neare, that one of them, *Irenæus*, was Scholar to one who was Scholar to S. *Iohn* the Apoſtle, *Tertullian* and *Origen* were not an age remov'd from him: and the laſt of them all, litle more then an age from them. Yet after all this they urg'd it not as a demonſtration, but only as a very probable argument, far greater then any their Adverſaries could oppoſe againſt it. So *Tertullian* in the place above quoted §. 5. *How is it likely that ſo many and ſo great Churches ſhould erre in one faith?* (it ſhould be, ſhould have erred into on faith.) And this was the condition of this argument as the Fathers urg'd it. Now if you having to deale with us, who queſtion no Booke of Scripture, which was not anciently queſtioned by ſome whom you your ſelves eſteem good Catholiques; nay who refuſe not to be tryed by your owne Canons, your own Tranſlations,

who in interpreting Scriptures are content to allow of all thoſe rules which you propoſe, only except that we will not allow you to be our Iudges; if you will come fifteen hundred years after the Apoſtles, a fair time for the pureſt Church to gather much droſſe and corruption, and for the *myſtery of iniquity* to bring its work to ſome perfection, which *in the Apoſtles time began to work*, If (I ſay) you will come thus long after and urge us with the ſingle Tradition of one of theſe Churches, being now Catholique to it ſelfe alone, and Hereticall to all the reſt: nay not only with her ancient and originall Traditions, but alſo with her poſt-nate and introduc'd Definitions, and theſe as we pretend, repugnant to Scripture, and ancient Tradition, and all this to decline an indifferent try all by Scripture, under pretence (wherein alſo you agree with the calumnie of the old Heretiques) that *all neceſſary truth cannot be found in them without recourſe to Tradition*: If, I ſay, notwithſtanding all theſe differences, you will ſtill be urging us with this argument, as the very ſame and of the ſame force with that wherewith the fore-mentioned Fathers urg'd the old Heretiques, certainly this muſt needs proceed from a confidence you have, not only that we have no School-Divinity, nor Metaphyſicks, but no Logick or common ſenſe, that we are but pictures of men, and have the definition of rational creatures given us in vain.

41 But now ſuppoſe I ſhould be liberall to you, and grant what you cannot prove, that the Fathers make Succeſſion a certain and perpetuall mark of the true Church; I beſeech you what will come of it? What, that want of Succeſſion is a certain ſigne of an Hereticall company? Truly if you ſay ſo, either you want Logick, which is a certain ſigne of an ill diſputer; or are not pleaſ'd to uſe it, which is a worſe. For ſpeech is a certain ſigne of a living man, yet want of ſpeech is no ſure argument that he is dead, for he may be dumb and yet living ſtill, and we may have other evident tokens that hee is ſo, as eating, drinking, breathing, moving: So, though the conſtant and univerſall delivery of any doctrine by the Apoſtolique Churches ever ſince the Apoſtles, be a very great argument of the truth of it, yet there is no certainty, but that truth, even Divine truth, may through mens wickedneſſe, be contracted from its univerſality, and interrupted in its perpetuity, and ſo looſe this argument, and yet not want others to iuſtifie and ſupport it ſelf. For it may be one of thoſe principles which God hath written in all mens hearts, or a concluſion evidently ariſing from them: It may be either contain'd in Scripture in expreſſe terms, or deducible from it by apparent conſequence. If therefore you intend to prove want of a perpetuall Succeſſion of Profeſſors a certain note of Hereſie, you muſt not content your ſelf to ſhew, that having it is one ſigne of truth; but you muſt ſhew it to be the only ſigne of it and inſeparable from it. But this, if you be well adviſ'd, you will never undertake. Firſt becauſe it is an impoſſible attempt: and then becauſe if you doe it you will marre all: for by proving this an inſeparable ſigne of Catholique doctrine, you will prove your own, which apparently wants it in many points, not to be Catholique. For whereas you ſay

this

this Succeſſion requires two things, agreement with the Apoſtles doctrine, and an uninterrupted conveyance of it down to them that chdllenge it: It will be prov'd againſt you that you fail in both points; and that ſome things wherein you agree with the Apoſtles have not been held alwaies, as your condemning the doctrine of the Chiliaſts, and holding the Euchariſt not neceſſary for Infants; and that in many other things you agree not with them nor with the Church for many ages after. For example; In mutilation of the Communion, in having your Service in ſuch a language as the Aſſiſtants generally underſtand not, your offering to Saints, your picturing of God, your worſhipping of Pictures.

42 *Ad §.24. As for Vniverſality of place, the want whereof you object to Proteſtants as a marke of Hereſie*: You have not ſet down cleerely and univocally what you mean by it, whether univerſality of fact or of right: and if of fact, whether abſolute or comparative: and if comparative, whether of the Church in compariſō of any other Religion, or only of Hereticall Chriſtians: or if in compariſon of theſe, whether in compariſon of all other Sects conjoyn'd, or in compariſon only of any One of them. Nor have you proved it by any good argument in any ſenſe to be a certain mark of Hereſy: For thoſe places of S. *Auſtine* doe not deſerve the name. And truly in my judgement you have done adviſedly in proving it no better. For as for Vniverſality of right, or a right to Vniverſality, all Religions claime it, but only the true has it, and which has it cannot be determin'd, unleſſe it firſt be determin'd which is the true. An abſolute Vniverſality, and diffuſion through all the world if you ſhould pretend to, all the world would laugh at you. If you ſhould contend for latitude with any one Religion, *Mahumetiſme* would carry the victory from you. If you ſhould oppoſe your ſelves againſt all other Chriſtians beſides you, it is certain you would be caſt in this ſuit alſo. If laſtly, being hard driven you ſhould pleaſe your ſelves with being more then any one Sect of Chriſtiās, it would preſently be replied, that it is ūcertain whether now you are ſo, but moſt certain that the time has been when you have not been ſo. Then when the [a] *whole world wondred that it was become Arrian*: then when *Athanaſius oppos'd the world, and the world Athanaſius*: then when [b] *your Liberius* having the contemptible paucity of his adherents objected to him as a note of error, anſwered for himſelfe, *There was a time when there were but three oppoſed the decree of the King, and yet thoſe three were in the right, and the reſt in the wrong*: then when the *Profeſſors of error ſurpaſſed the number of the Profeſſors of truth in proportion, as the ſands of the Sea doe the Starres of the Heaven*. (As [c] S. *Auſtine* acknowledgeth:) then when [d] *Vincentius* confeſſeth, that *the poyſon of the Arrians had contaminated, not now ſome certain portion, but almoſt the whole World*: then when the author of *Nazianzens* life teſtifies, *That* [e] *the Hereſy of Arrius, had poſſeſſed in a manner the whole extent of the world*; and when *Nazianzen* found cauſe to cry out, [f] *Where are they who reproach us with our pouerty, who define the Church by the multitude, and deſpiſe the little flock? They have the People, but we*

[a] *Hierom. Cont. Luciferianos.*
[b] *In Theodoret. Hiſt. 16. c. l. 2.*
[c] *In ep. 48. ad Vincentium.*
[d] *Commenitorij. lib. 1. c. 4.*
[e] *In vita Nazianz.*
[f] *In Orat. Arian. & pro eipſo.*

we the faith. And laſtly when *Athanaſius* was ſo overborn with Sholes & floods of *Arrias*, that he was enforc'd to write a Treatiſe on purpoſe
g To. 2. g againſt thoſe, *who judge of the truth only by plurality of adherents.* So that if you had prov'd want of Univerſality even thus reſtrained, to be an infallible note of Hereſy, there would have been no remedy but you muſt have confeſſed, that the time was when you were Heretiques. And beſides, I ſee not how you would have avoided this great inconvenience, of laying grounds and ſtoreing up arguments for Antichriſt, againſt he comes, by which he may prove his Company the true Church. For it is evident out of Scripture, and confeſſed by you, that though his time be not long, his dominion ſhall be very large; and that the true Church ſhall be then, the *woman driven into the wilderneſſe.*

43 *Ad §. 25. & 26.* The remainder of this Chapter if I would deale ſtrictly with you, I might let paſſe as impertinent to the queſtion now diſputed. For whereas your argument promiſes that this whole Chapter ſhall be imploied in proving *Luther* & the Proteſtants guilty of Hereſy, here you deſert this queſtion, and ſtrike out into another accuſation of them, that *their faith even of the truth they hold, is not indeed true faith.* But put caſe it were not, does it follow, that the having of this faith makes them Heretiques, or that they are therefore Heretiques becauſe they have this faith? *Ariſtotle* beleeved there were Intelligences which moved the Spheares; he believed this with an humane perſwaſion, and not with a certain, obſcure, prudent, ſupernaturall faith: and will you make *Ariſtotle* an Heretique, becauſe he believed ſo? You believe there was ſuch a man as *Iulius Cæſar*, that there is ſuch a City as *Conſtantinople*, and your beliefe hereof has not theſe qualifications which you require: And will you be content that this ſhall paſſe for a ſufficient proofe that you are an Heretique? Hereſy you have defin'd above to be a voluntary error: but he that believes truth, though his belief be not qualified according to your minde, yet ſure in believing truth he believes no error; & from hence according to ordinary Logick methinkes it ſhould follow, that ſuch a man for doing ſo, cannot be guilty of Hereſy.

44 But you will ſay, though he be not guilty of Hereſy for believing theſe truths, yet if his faith be not ſaving, to what purpoſe will it be? Truly very litle to the purpoſe of Salvation, as litle as it is to your proving Proteſtants guilty of Hereſy. But out of our wonted indulgence, let us pardon this fault alſo, and doe you the favour to hear what you can ſay, to beget this faith in us, that indeed wee have no faith, or at leaſt not ſuch a *faith, without which it is impoſſible to pleaſe God.* Your diſcourſe upon this point, you have, I know not upon what policie, disjoynted, and given us the grounds of it in the begining of the Chapter, and the ſuperſtructure here in the end. Them I have already examined, and for a great part of them, proved them vain and deceitfull. I have ſhewed by many certain arguments, that though the ſubject matter of our faith be in it ſelfe moſt certain, yet that abſolute certainty of adherence, is not required to the eſſence of faith, no

nor

nor to make it acceptable with God, but that to both theſe effects it is ſufficient, if it be firme enough to produce Obedience and Charity. I haue ſhewed beſides, that Prudence is rather commendable in faith, then intrinſecall and eſſentiall to it. So that whatſoever is here ſaid, to prove the faith of Proteſtants no faith, for want of certainty or for want of prudence, is already anſwered before it is objected: for the foundation being deſtroyed the building cannot ſtand. Yet for the fuller refutation of all pretences, I will here make good, that to prove our faith deſtitute of theſe qualifications, you have produc'd but vain Sophiſmes, and for the moſt part, ſuch arguments as returne moſt violently upon your ſelves. Thus then you ſay,

45 *Firſt that their belief wanteth certainty, I prove, becauſe they denying the univerſall Infallibility of the Church, can haue no certain ground to know what objects are revealed or teſtified by God.* But if there be no other ground of certainty but your Churches infallibility, upon what certain ground doe you know that your Church is infallible? Upon what certain ground doe you know all thoſe things which muſt be known before you can know that your Church is infallible? As that there is a God: that God hath promiſed his aſſiſtance to your Church in all her Decrees: that the Scripture wherein this promiſe is extant is the word of God: that thoſe texts of Scripture which you alleage for your infallibility are incorrupted: that that which you pretend is the true ſenſe of them? When you have produc'd certain grounds for all theſe things, I doubt not but it will appeare, that we alſo may have grounds certain enough to believe our whole Religion, which is nothing elſe but the Bible, without dependance on the Churches infallibility. Suppoſe you ſhould meet with a man that for the preſent, believes neither Church, nor Scripture, nor God, but is ready & willing to believe them all, if you can ſhew ſome ſufficient grounds to build his faith upon; will you tell ſuch a man there are no certain grounds, by which he may be converted; or there are? If you ſay the firſt, you make all Religion an uncertain thing: If the ſecond, then either you muſt ridiculouſly perſwade, that your Church is infallible, becauſe it is infallible, or elſe that there are other certain grounds beſides your Churches infallibility.

46 But you proceed and tell us, that *Holy Scripture is in it ſelfe moſt true and infallible, but without the direction and declaration of the Church, we can neither haue certain meanes to know what Scripture is Canonicall, nor what Tranſlations be faithfull, nor what is the true meaning of Scripture.* Anſw. But all theſe things muſt be known, before we can know the direction of your Church to be infallible, for no other proofe of it can be pretended, but only ſome Texts of Canonicall Scripture, truly interpreted: Therefore either you are miſtaken, in thinking there is no other meanes to know theſe things, but your Churches infallible direction, or we are excluded from all meanes of knowing her direction to be infallible.

47 *But Proteſtants, though as you ſuppoſe, they are perſwaded their own oponions are true, and that they haue uſed ſuch meanes as are wont to*

be preſcribed for underſtanding the Scripture, as Prayer, conferring of Texts &c. Yet by their diſagreement ſhew, that ſome of them are deceived. Now they hold all the Articles of their faith, upon this only ground of Scripture, interpreted by theſe rules, and therefore it is cleere, that the ground of their faith is infallible in no point at all. The firſt of theſe ſuppoſitions muſt needs be true, but the ſecond is apparently falſe: I mean, that every Proteſtant is perſwaded that he hath uſed thoſe means which are preſcribed for underſtanding of Scripture. But that which you collect from theſe ſuppoſitions is cleerely inconſequent: and by as good Logick you might conclude, that Logick and Geometry ſtand upon no certain grounds, that the rules of the one, and the principles of the other doe ſometimes faile, becauſe the diſagreement of Logicians and Geometricians ſhew, that ſome of them are deceived. Might not a Iew conclude as well againſt all Chriſtians, that they have no certain ground whereon to rely in their underſtanding of Scripture, becauſe their diſagreements ſhew that ſome are deceived; becauſe ſome deduce from it the infallibility of a Church, and others no ſuch matter? So likewiſe a Turke might uſe the ſame argument againſt both Iewes and Chriſtians, and an Atheiſt againſt all Religions, and a Sceptick againſt all reaſon. Might not the one ſay, Mens diſagreement in Religion, ſhew that there is no certainty in any; and the other, that experience of their contradictions teacheth, that the rules of reaſon doe ſometimes faile? Doe not you ſee and feele how void of reaſon and how full of impiety your ſophiſtry is? And how tranſported with zeale againſt Proteſtants, you urge arguments againſt them, which if they could not be anſwered, would overthrow not only your own, but all Religion? But God be thanked, the anſwere is eaſy and obvious! For let men but remember not to impute the faults of men but only to men, and then it will eaſily appear, that there may be ſufficient certainty in reaſon, in Religion, in the rules of interpreting Scripture, though men through their faults, take not care to make uſe of them, and ſo run into divers errors and diſſentions.

48 *But Proteſtants cannot determine what points be fundamentall, and therefore muſt remain uncertain, whether or no they be not in ſome fundamentall error.* Anſ. By like reaſon ſince you acknowledge, that every error in points defin'd and declared by your Church deſtroies the ſubſtance of faith, and yet cannot determine what points be defined, it followeth that you muſt remain uncertain, whether or no you be not in ſome fundamentall error, and ſo want the ſubſtance of faith, without which there can be no hope of Salvation. Now that you are uncertain what points are defined, appeares from your owne words. c. 4. §. 3. of your ſecond Part, where ſay you, *No leſſe impertinent is your diſcourſe, concerning the difficulty to know what is Hereſy: For we grant that it is not alwaies eaſy to determine in particular occaſions, whether this or that Doctrine be ſuch, becauſe it may be doubtfull, whether it be againſt any Scripture, or divine Tradition, or Definition of the Church.* Neither were it difficult to extort from you this confeſſion, by naming diverſe Points, which ſome of you ſay are defin'd, others the contra-

ry

ry. And others hang in ſuſpenſe, and know not what to determine. But this I have done elſewhere: as alſo I have ſhewed plainly enough, that though we cannot perhaps ſay in particular, thus much, and no more is fundamentall, yet believing all the Bible, we are certain enough that we believe all that is fundamentall. As he that in a receit, takes twenty ingredients whereof ten only are neceſſary, though he know not which thoſe ten are, yet taking the whole twenty he is ſure enough that he has taken all that are neceſſary.

49 *Ad §.29. But that he who erreth againſt any one revealed truth looſeth all Divine Faith, is a very true doctrine delivered by Catholique Divines,* (you mean your own) *with ſo generall a conſent, that the contrary is wont to be cenſur'd as temerarious: Now certainly ſome Proteſtants muſt doe ſo, becauſe they hold contradictions which cannot all be true; Therefore ſome of them at leaſt, have no divine faith.* Anſ. I paſſe by your weakneſſe, in urging Proteſtants with the authority of your Divines, which yet in you might very deſervedly be cenſur'd. For when D. *Potter,* to ſhew the many actuall diſſentions between the Romiſh Doctors, notwithſtanding their braggs of potentiall Vnity, referres to *Pappus,* who has collected out of *Bellar.* their contradictions, and ſet them down in his own words to the number of 237. & to *Flacius, de Sectis & controverſiis Religionis Papiſticæ*; you making the very ſame uſe of M. *Breerely* againſt Proteſtants, yet jeere and ſcorne D. *Potter,* as if he offer'd you for a proofe, the bare authority of *Pappus* and *Flacius,* and tell him, which is all the anſwer you vouchſafe him, *It is pretty that he brings Pappus and Flacius, flat Heretiques, to prove your many contradictions:* As if he had proved this with the bare authority, the bare judgement of theſe men, which ſure he does not, but with the formall words of *Bellarmine* faithfully collected by *Pappus.* And why then might not we ſay to you, Is it not pretty that you bring *Breerly* as flat an Heretique as *Pappus* or *Flacius,* to prove the contradictions of Proteſtants? Yet had he been ſo vain as to preſſe you with the meere authority of Proteſtant Divines in any point, me thinkes for your own ſake, you ſhould have pardon'd him, who here and in many other places, urge us with the judgement of your Divines as with weighty arguments. Yet, if the authority of your Divines were even Canonicall, certainly nothing could be concluded from it in this matter, there being not one of them, who delivers for true doctrine this poſition of yours, thus nakedly ſet down, *That any error againſt any one revealed truth deſtroies all divine faith.* For they all require, (not your ſelfe excepted) that this truth muſt not only be revealed, but revealed publiquely, and (all things conſidered) ſufficiently propounded to the erring Party, to be one of thoſe, which God under pain of damnation commands all men to believe. And therefore the contradiction of Proteſtants (though this vaine doctrine of your Divines were ſuppoſed true, is but a weak argument) That any of them have no divine Faith, ſeeing you neither have, nor ever can prove, (without begging the Queſtion of your Churches infallibility,) that the truthes about which they differ, are of this quality and condition.

Bus

But though out of curteſy wee may ſuppoſe this doctrine true, yet we have no reaſon to grant it, nor to think it any thing but a vain and groundleſſe fancy: and that this very weak and inartificiall argument, from the authority of your Divines, is the ſtrongeſt pillar which it hath to ſupport it. Two reaſons you alleage for it out of *Thomas Aquinas*, the firſt whereof vainly ſuppoſeth againſt reaſon and experience, that *by the commiſſion of any deadly ſinne, the habit of Charity is quite extirpated.* And for the ſecond, though you cry it up for an *Achilles*, and think like the Gorgons head it will turne us all into ſtone, and in confidence of it, inſult upon D. *Potter* as if he durſt not come near it, yet in very truth having conſidered it well, I finde it a ſerious, grave, prolixe, and profound *nothing*. I could anſwer it in a word, by telling you, that it beggs without all proofe or colour of proofe, the main queſtion between us, that the infallibility of your Church is either the formall motive, or rule, or a neceſſary condition of faith: which you know we flatly deny, and therefore all that is built upon it has nothing but wind for a foundation. But to this anſwer I will adde a large confutation of this vain fancy, out of one of the moſt rationall and profound Doctors of your own Church, I mean *Eſtius*, who upon the third of the *Sent.* the 23. *diſt.* the 13. §. writes thus, *It is diſputed* (ſaith he) *whether in him who believes ſome of the Articles of our faith, and disbelieves others, or perhaps ſome one, there be faith properly ſo called in reſpect of that which he does believe? In which queſtion we muſt before all, carefully diſtinguiſh between thoſe, who retaining a generall readineſſe to believe whatſoever the Church believes, yet erre by ignorance in ſome doctrine of faith, becauſe it is not as yet ſufficiently declared to them that the Church does ſo believe; and thoſe who after ſufficient manifeſtation of the Churches doctrine, doe yet chooſe to diſſent from it, either by doubting of it, or affirming the contrary. For of the former the anſwer is eaſy; but of theſe, that is, of Heretiques retaining ſome part of wholſome doctrine, the queſtion is more difficult, and on both ſides by the Doctors probably diſputed. For that there is in them true faith of the Articles wherein they doe not erre, firſt experience ſeemes to convince: For many at this day denying, for example ſake, Purgatory, or Invocation of Saints, nevertheleſſe firmely hold, as by divine revelation, that God is Three and One that the Sonne of God was incarnate and ſuffered, and other like things. As anciently the Novatians, excepting their peculiar error, of denying reconciliation to thoſe that fell in perſecution, held other things in common with Catholiques: So that they aſſiſted them very much againſt the Arrians, as Socrates relates in his Eccl. Hiſt. Moreover the ſame thing is proved by the example of the Apoſtles, who in the time of Chriſts paſſion being ſcandaliz'd, loſt their faith in him: as alſo, Chriſt after his reſurrection upbraids them with their incredulity, and calls Thomas incredulous, for denying the Reſurrection,* Ioh. 20. *Whereupon S. Auſtine alſo in his preface upon the* 96. Pſ. ſaith, *That after the Reſurrection of Chriſt, the faith of thoſe that fell was reſtored again. And yet we muſt not ſay, that the Apoſtles then loſt the faith of the Trinity, of the Creation of the world, of Eternall life, and ſuch like other Articles.*

ticles. Beſides, the Iewes before Chriſts comming, held the faith of one God the Creator of Heaven and Earth: who although they loſt the true faith of the Meßias by not receiving Chriſt, yet we cannot ſay, that they loſt the faith of one God, but ſtill retained this Article as firmely as they did before.

Adde hereunto, that neither Iewes nor Heretiques ſeeme to lye, in ſaying they believe either the books of the Prophets, or the four Goſpels: It being apparent enough, that they acknowledge in them Divine Authority, though they hold not the true ſenſe of them, to which purpoſe is that in the Acts. c.20. Believeſt thou the Prophets? I know that thou believeſt. Laſtly it is manifeſt, that many gifts of God, are found even in bad men, and ſuch as are out of the Church; therefore nothing hinders but that Iewes and Heretiques, though they erre in many things, yet in other things may be ſo divinely illuminated as to believe aright. So S. *Auſtin ſeemes to teach in his book,* De Vnico Baptiſmo: contra Petilianum *c.3. in theſe words: When a Iew comes to us to be made a Chriſtian, we deſtroy not in him Gods good things but his own ill. That he believes one God is to be worſhipped, that he hopes for eternall life, that he doubts not of the Reſurrection, we approve and commend him: we acknowledge, that as he did believe theſe things, ſo he is ſtill to believe them, and as he did hold, ſo he is ſtill to hold them. Thus he: ſubioyning more to the ſame purpoſe in the next, and again in the 26. Chapter, and in his third book, De Bapt. contr. Donat. cap. ult. and upon Pſal.64. But now this reaſon ſeems to perſwade the contrary: Becauſe the formall obiect of faith ſeemes to be the firſt verity, as it is manifeſted by the Churches Doctrine as the Divine and infallible Rule, wherefore whoſoever adheres not to this Rule, although he aſſent to ſome matters of faith, yet he embraces them not with faith, but with ſome other kinde of aſſent: as if a man aſſent to a concluſion, not knowing the reaſon by which it is demonſtrated, he hath not true knowledge, but an opinion only of the ſame concluſion. Now that an Heretique adheres not to the rule aforeſaid, it is manifeſt: Becauſe if he did adhere to it, as divine and infallible, he would receive all without exception, which the Church teacheth, and ſo would not be an Heretique. After this manner diſcourſeth S. Thom. 2.2. q.5. art.3. From whom yet Durand diſſents upon this diſtinction, thinking there may be in an Heretique true faith, in reſpect of the Articles in which he doth not erre. Others, as Scotus and Bonaventure, define not the matter plainly, but ſeeme to chooſe a middle way.*

To the authority of S. Auſtine and theſe Schoolemen, this may be adjoyned, That it is uſuall with good Chriſtians to ſay, that Heretiques have not the entire faith. Whereby it ſeemes to be intimated, that ſome part of it they doe retaine. Whereof this may be another reaſon: That if the truths which a Iew or a Heretique holds, he ſhould not hold them by faith, but after ſome other manner, to wit, by his own proper will and judgement, it will follow, that all that excellent knowledge of God and divine things, which is found in them, is to be attributed not to the grace of God, but the ſtrength of Free will, which is againſt S. Auſtine, both elſewhere, and eſpecially in the end of his book De potentia.

As for the reaſon alleaged to the contrary, We anſwer: It is impertinent to faith, by what meanes we believe the prime Verity, that is, by what meanes God uſeth to conferre upon men the gift of Faith. For although now the ordinary meanes be the Teſtimony and teaching of the Church, yet it is certain that by other meanes, faith hath been given heretofore, and is given ſtill. For many of the Ancients, as Adam, Abraham, Melchiſedeck, Iob, *received faith by ſpeciall revelation; the Apoſtles by the Miracles and Preaching of Chriſt; others again by the Preaching and miracles of the Apoſtles; and Laſtly others, by other meanes, when as yet they had heard nothing of the infallibility of the Church; to litle Children by Baptiſme, without any other help, faith is infus'd: And therefore it is poſsible, that a man not adhering to the Churches doctrine as a Rule infallible, yet may receive ſome things for the word of God, which doe indeed truly belong to the faith, either becauſe they are now, or heretofore have been confirm'd by miracles: Or becauſe he manifeſtly ſees that the ancient Church taught ſo, or upon ſome other inducement. And yet nevertheleſſe we muſt not ſay, that Heretiques and Iewes doe hold the Faith, but only ſome part of the Faith. For the Faith ſignifies an entire thing, and compleat in all parts; whereupon an Heretique is ſaid to be ſimply an Infidell, to have loſt the Faith, and according to the Apoſtle* 1. Tim. 1. *to have made ſhipwrack of it, although he holds ſome things, with the ſame ſtrength of aſſent and readineſſe of will, wherewith by others are held all thoſe points which appertaine to the Faith.* And thus farre *Eſtius.* Whoſe diſcourſe I preſume may paſſe for a ſufficient refutation of your argumẽt out of *Aquinas*. And therefore your Corollaries drawn from it, That *every error againſt faith, involves oppoſition againſt Gods teſtimony*, That *Proteſtants have no Faith, no certainty*, and that *you have all Faith*, muſt together with it fall to the ground.

50 But *if Proteſtants have certainty, they want obſcurity, and ſo have not that faith, which as the Apoſtle ſaith is of things not appearing.* This argument you proſecute in the next Paragraph; But I can find nothing in it, to convince or perſwade me that Proteſtants cannot have as much certainty as is required to faith, of an object not ſo evident as to beget ſcience. If obſcurity will not conſiſt with certainty in the higheſt degree, then you are to blame for requiring to faith contradicting conditions. If certainty and obſcurity will ſtand together, what reaſon can be imagin'd that a Proteſtant may not entertain them both as well as a Papiſt? Your bodies & ſouls, your underſtandings and wills are, I think, of the ſame condition with ours: And why then may not we be certain of an obſcure thing as well as you? And as you made this long diſcourſe againſt Proteſtants, why may not wee putting Church inſtead of Scripture, ſend it back again to you? And ſay; If Papiſts have certainty, they want obſcurity, and ſo have not that faith, which as the Apoſtle ſaith, is *of things not appearing*, or not neceſſitating our underſtanding to an aſſent? For the whole edifice of the faith of Papiſts is ſetled on theſe two principles, Theſe particular propoſitions are the propoſitions of the Church, And the ſenſe and meaning of them is clear and evident, at leaſt in all points neceſſary to ſalvation

on. Now theſe principles being once ſuppoſ'd, it clearly followeth, that what Papiſts beleeve as neceſſary to ſalvation is evidently known by them to be true, by this argument; It is certain and evident, that whatſoever is the word of God or Divine Revelation is true; But it is certain and evident that theſe propoſitions of the Church in particular are the word of God and Divine Revelations; therefore it is certain and evident, that all propoſitions of the Church are true. Which Concluſion I take for a Major in a ſecond argument, and ſay thus; It is certain and evident that all propoſitions of the Church are true; But it is certain and evident, that ſuch particulars, for example, The lawfulneſſe of the halfe Communion, The lawfulneſſe and expedience of Latine Service, the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation, Indulgences &c. are the Propoſitions of the Church; therefore it is certain and evident that theſe particular objects are true. Neither will it avail you to ſay, that the ſaid principles are not evident by naturall diſcourſe, but only by the eye of reaſon clear'd by grace: For ſupernaturall evidence, no leſſe (yea rather more) drowns and excludes obſcurity, then naturall evidence doth. Neither can the Partie ſo enlightned, be ſaid voluntarily to captivate his underſtanding to that light, but rather his underſtanding is by neceſſity made captive and forc'd not to disbeleeve what is preſented by ſo clear a light. And therefore your imaginary faith is not the true faith defined by the Apoſtle, but an invention of your own.

51 And having thus cryed quittance with you, I muſt intreat you to deviſe (for truly I cannot) ſome anſwer to this argument, which will not ſerve in proportion to your own. For I hope you will not pretend that I have done you injurie, in ſetling your faith upon principles which you diſclaim. And if you alleage this diſparity, That you are more certain of your principles, then we of ours, and yet you doe not pretend that your principles are ſo evident, as we doe that ours are: what is this to ſay, but that you are more confident then we, but confeſſe you have leſſe reaſon for it? For the evidence of the thing aſſented to, be it more or leſſe, is the reaſon and cauſe of the aſſent in the underſtanding. But then beſides, I am to tell you, that you are here, as every where, extremely, if not affectedly miſtaken in the Doctrine of Proteſtants; who though they acknowledge, that the things which they beleeve are in themſelves as certain as any demonſtrable or ſenſible verities, yet pretend not that their certainty of adherence is moſt perfect and abſolute, but ſuch as may be perfected and increaſ'd as long as they *walke by faith and not by ſight*. And conſonant hereunto is their doctrine touching the evidence of the objects whereunto they adhere. For you abuſe the world & them, if you pretend that they hold the firſt of your two principles, That theſe particular Books are the word of God, (for ſo I think you mean) either to be in it ſelf evidently certain, or of it ſelf and being deveſted of the motives of credibility, evidently credible: For they are not ſo fond as to be ignorant, nor ſo vain as to pretend, that all men doe aſſent to it, which they would if it were evidently certain, nor ſo ridiculous as to imagine, that if an

Indian that never heard of Chriſt or Scripture, ſhould by chance find a Bible in his own Language, and were able to read it, that upon the reading it hee would certainly without a miracle beleeve it to bee the word of God: which he could not chuſe if it were evidently credible. What then doe they affirm of it? Certainly no more then this, that whatſoever man that is not of a perverſe mind, ſhall weigh with ſerious and mature deliberation, thoſe great moments of reaſon which may incline him to beleeve the Divine authority of Scripture, and compare them with the light objections that in prudence can be made againſt it, he ſhall not chuſe but find ſufficient nay abundant inducements to yeeld unto it firme faith and ſyncere obedience. Let that learned man *Hugo Grotius* ſpeake for all the Reſt, in his Booke *of the truth of Chriſtian Religion*; which Book whoſoever attentively peruſes ſhall find that a man may have great reaſon to be a Chriſtian without dependance upon your Church for any part of it: and that your Religion is no foundation of, but rather a ſcandall and an objection againſt Chriſtianity. He then in the laſt Chapter of his ſecond book hath theſe excellent words, *If any be not ſatisfied with theſe arguments above-ſaid, but deſires more forcible reaſons for confirmation of the excellency of Chriſtian Religion, let ſuch know that as there are variety of things which be true, ſo are there divers waies of proving or manifeſting the truth. Thus is there one way in Mathematicks, another in Phyſicks, a third in Ethicks, and laſtly another kind when a matter of fact is in queſtion: wherein verily we muſt reſt content with ſuch teſtimonies as are free from all ſuſpition of untruth; otherwiſe down goes all the frame and uſe of hiſtory, and a great part of the art of Phyſick, together with all dutifulneſſe that ought to be between parents and children: for matters of practice can no way elſe be known but by ſuch teſtimonies. Now it is the pleaſure of Almighty God that thoſe things which he would have us to beleeve (ſo that the very beleef thereof may be imputed to us for obedience) ſhould not ſo evidently appear, as thoſe things which are apprehended by ſenſe and plaine demonſtration, but only be ſo farre forth revealed as may beget faith, and a perſwaſion thereof, in the hearts and minds of ſuch as are not obſtinate: That ſo the Goſpell may be as a touchſtone for triall of mens judgments, whether they be ſound or unſound. For ſeeing theſe arguments, whereof we have ſpoken, have induced ſo many honeſt, godly, and wiſe men to approve of this Religion, it is thereby plain enough that the fault of other mens infidelity is not for want of ſufficient teſtimony, but becauſe they would not have that to be had and embraced for truth which is contrary to their wilfull deſires; it being a hard matter for them to relinquiſh their honours, and ſet at naught other commodities; which thing they know they ought to doe, if they admit of Chriſts doctrine and obey what he hath commanded: And thus is the rather to be noted of them, for that many other hiſtoricall narrations are approved by them to be true, which notwithſtanding are only manifeſt by authority, and not by any ſuch ſtrong proofs, and perſwaſions, or tokens, as doe declare the hiſtory of Chriſt to be true: which are evident, partly by the confeſſion of thoſe Iewes that are yet alive; and partly in thoſe companies and congregations of*

Chriſtians

Chriſtians which are any where to be found; whereof doubtleſſe there was ſome cauſe.

Laſtly ſeeing the long duration or continuance of Chriſtian Religion, and the large extent thereof can be aſcribed to no humane power, therefore the ſame muſt be attributed to miracles: or if any deny that it came to paſſe through a miraculous manner; this very getting ſo great ſtrength and power without a miracle, may be thought to ſurpaſſe any miracle.

52 And now you ſee I hope that Proteſtants neither doe nor need to pretend to any ſuch evidence in the doctrine they beleeve, as cannot well conſiſt both with the eſſence and the obedience of faith. Let us come now to the laſt nullity which you impute to the faith of Proteſtants, and that it is *want of Prudence*. Touching which point, as I have already demonſtrated, that wiſdome is not eſſentiall to faith, but that a man may truly beleeve truth, though upon inſufficient motives; So I doubt not but I ſhall make good, that if prudence were neceſſary to faith, we have better title to it then you; and that if a wiſer then *Solomon* were here, he ſhould have better reaſon to beleeve the Religion of Proteſtants then Papiſts, the Bible rather then the Councell of *Trent*. But let us hear what you can ſay!

53 *Ad §. 31.* You demand then firſt of all, *What wiſdome was it to forſake a Church confeſſedly very ancient, and beſides which there could be demonſtrated no other Viſible Church of Chriſt upon earth?* I anſwer: Againſt God and truth there lyes no preſcription, and therefore certainly it might be great wiſdome to forſake ancient errours for more ancient Truths. One God is rather to be follow'd then innumerable worlds of men: And therefore it might be great wiſdome either for the whole Viſible Church, nay for all the men in the world, having wandred from the way of Truth, to return unto it; or for a part of it, nay for one man to doe ſo, although all the world beſides were madly reſolute to doe the contrary. It might be great wiſdome to forſake the errors though of the only Viſible Church, much more the Roman, which in conceiving her ſelf the whole Viſible Church, does ſomewhat like the Frog in the Fable, which thought the ditch he liv'd in to be all the world.

54 You demand again, *What wiſdome was it to forſake a Church acknowledg'd to want nothing neceſſary to Salvation, indued with Succeſſion of Biſhops, &c, uſq; ad Election or Choice?* I anſwer: Yet might it be great wiſdome to forſake a Church not acknowledged to want nothing neceſſary to Salvation, but accuſed and convicted of many damnable errors: certainly damnable to them who were convicted of them, had they ſtill perſiſted in them after their conviction; though perhaps pardonable (which is all that is acknowledg'd) to ſuch as ignorantly continued in them. A Church vainly arrogating without poſſibility of proof a perpetuall Succeſſion of Biſhops, holding alwaies the ſame doctrine; and with a ridiculous impudence pretending perpetuall poſſeſſion of all the world: whereas the world knows, that a litle before *Luthers* ariſing, your Church was confined to a part of a part of it. Laſtly a Church vainly glorying in the dependance of o-

ther Churches upon her, which yet ſhe ſupports no more then thoſe crouching Anticks which ſeeme in great buildings to labour under the weight they beare, doe indeed ſupport the Fabrick. For a corrupted and falſe Church may give authority to preach the truth, and conſequently againſt her own falſhoods and corruptions. Beſides, a falſe Church may preſerve the Scripture true, (as now the Old Teſtament is preſerved by the Iewes,) either not being arriv'd to that height of impiety as to attempt the corruption of it, or not able to effect it, or not perceiving, or not regarding the oppoſition of it to her corruptions. And ſo we might receive from you lawfull Ordination and true Scriptures, though you were a falſe Church; and receiving the Scriptures from you (though not from you alone,) I hope you cannot hinder us, neither need wee aske your leave, to believe and obey them. And this, though you be a falſe Church, is enough to make us a true one. As for a *Succeſſion of men that held with us in all points of Doctrine*, it is a thing we need not, and you have as litle as we. So that if we acknowledge that your Church before *Luther* was a true Church, it is not for any ends, for any dependance that we have upon you; but becauſe we conceive that in a charitable conſtruction, you may paſſe for a true Church. Such a Church (and no better) as you doe ſometimes acknowledge Proteſtants to be, that is, a Company of men, wherein ſome ignorant ſoules may be ſaved. So that in this ballancing of Religion againſt Religion, and Church againſt Church, it ſeemes you have nothing of weight and moment to put into your ſcale; nothing but ſmoak and winde, vaine ſhadowes and phantaſticall pretences. Yet if Proteſtants on the other ſide, had nothing to put in their Scale but thoſe negative commendations which you are pleas'd to afford them; nothing but, no unity, nor meanes to procure it; no farther extent when *Luther* aroſe then *Luthers* body; no Vniverſality of time or place; no viſibility or being, except only in your Church; no Succeſſion of perſons or doctrine; no leader but *Luther*, in a quarrell begun upon no ground but paſſion; no Church, no Ordination, no Scriptures but ſuch as they receiv'd from you; if all this were true, and this were all that could be pleaded for Proteſtants, poſſibly with an allowance of three graines of partiality your Scale might ſeem to turne. But then if it may appear that part of theſe objections are falſely made againſt them, the reſt vainely; that whatſoever of truth is in theſe imputations, is impertinent to this triall, and whatſoever is pertinent is untrue; and beſides, that plenty of good matter may be alleaged for Proteſtants which is here diſſembled: Then I hope, our cauſe may be good notwithſtanding theſe pretences.

55 I ſay then, that want of Vniverſality of time & place, The inviſibility or not exiſtence of the profeſſors of Proteſtant Doctrine before *Luther*, *Luthers* being alone when he firſt oppoſed your Church, Our having our Church, Ordination, Scriptures, perſonall and yet not doctrinall Succeſſion from you, are vain and impertinent allegations, againſt the truth of our Doctrine and Church. That the entire truth of Chriſt without any mixture of error ſhould be profeſſed or believed

ved in all places at any time, or in any place at all times, is not a thing evident in reaſon, neither have we any Revelation for it. And therefore in relying ſo confidently on it, you build your houſe upon the ſand. And what obligation we had either to be ſo peeviſh, as to take nothing of yours, or ſo fooliſh as to take all, I doe not underſtand. For whereas you ſay that *this is to be chooſers and therefore Heretiques*, I tell you that though all Heretiques are chooſers, yet all chooſers are not Heretiques, otherwiſe they alſo, which chooſe your Religion muſt be Heretiques. As for *our wanting Vnity and Meanes of proving it, Luthers oppoſing your Church upon meere paſſion, our following private men rather then the Catholique Church*; the firſt and laſt are meere untruths, for we want not Vnity, nor Meanes to procure it in things neceſſary. Plain places of Scripture, and ſuch as need no interpreter are our meanes to obtaine it. Neither doe we follow any private men, but only the Scripture, the word of God as our rule, and reaſon, which is alſo the gift of God given to direct us in all our actions, in the uſe of this rule. And then for *Luthers oppoſing your Church upon meere paſſion*, it is a thing I will not deny becauſe I know not his heart, and for the ſame reaſon you ſhould not have affirmed it. Sure I am, whether he oppoſed your Church upon reaſon or no, he had reaſon enough to oppoſe it. And therefore if he did it upon paſſion, we will follow him only in his action and not in his paſſion, in his oppoſition, not in the manner of it; and then I preſume you will have no reaſon to condemne us, unleſſe you will ſay that a good action cannot be done with reaſon, becauſe ſome body before us hath done it upon paſſion. You ſee then how imprudent you have beene in the choice of your arguments, to prove Proteſtants unwiſe in the choice of their Religion.

56 It remaines now, that I ſhould ſhew that many reaſons of moment may bee alleaged for the juſtification of Proteſtants, which are diſſembled by you, and not put into the ballance. Know then Sir that when I ſay, The Religion of Proteſtants, is in prudence to be preferr'd before yours: as on the one ſide I doe not underſtand by your Religion, the doctrine of *Bellarmine* or *Baronius*, or any other privat man amongſt you, nor the Doctrine of the *Sorbon*, or of the *Ieſuits*, or of the *Dominicans*, or of any other particular Company among you, but that wherein you all agree, or profeſſe to agree, *the Doctrine of the Councell of Trent*: ſo accordingly on the other ſide, by the *Religion of Proteſtants*, I doe not underſtand the Doctrine of *Luther*, or *Calvin*, or *Melanchthon*; nor the Confeſſion of *Auguſta*, or *Geneva*, nor the Catechiſme of *Heidelberg*, nor the Articles of the Church of England, no nor the *Harmony* of Proteſtant Confeſſions; but that wherin they all agree, and which they all ſubſcribe with a greater Harmony, as a perfect rule of their Faith and Actions, that is, The BIBLE. The BIBLE, I ſay, The BIBLE only is the Religion of Proteſtants! Whatſoever elſe they believe beſides it, and the plain, irrefragable, indubitable conſequences of it, well may they hold it as a matter of Opinion, but as matter of Faith and Religion, neither can they with cohe-

rence

rence to their own grounds believe it themſelves, nor require the beliefe of it of others, without moſt high and moſt Schiſmaticall preſumption. I for my part after a long (and as I verily believe & hope,) impartiall ſearch of *the true way to eternall happineſſe*, doe profeſſe plainly that I cannot find any reſt for the ſole of my foot, but upon this Rock only. I ſee plainly and with mine own eyes, that there are Popes againſt Popes, Councells againſt Councells, ſome Fathers againſt others, the ſame Fathers againſt themſelves, a Conſent of Fathers of one age againſt a Conſent of Fathers of another age, the Church of one age againſt the Church of another age. Traditive interpretations of Scripture are pretended, but there are few or none to be found: No Tradition but only of Scripture, can derive it ſelfe from the fountain, but may be plainly prov'd, either to have been brought in, in ſuch an age after Chriſt; or that in ſuch an age it was not in. In a word, there is no ſufficient certainty but of Scripture only, for any conſidering man to build upon. This therefore, and this only I have reaſon to believe: This I will profeſſe, according to this I will live, and for this, if there be occaſion, I will not only willingly, but even gladly looſe my life, though I ſhould be ſorry that Chriſtians ſhould take it from me. Propoſe me any thing out of this book, and require whether I believe it or no, and ſeeme it never ſo incomprehenſible to humane reaſon, I will ſubſcribe it *with hand and heart*, as knowing no demonſtration can be ſtronger then this, God hath ſaid ſo, therefore it is true. In other things I will take no mans liberty of judgement from him; neither ſhall any man take mine from me. I will think no man the worſe man, nor the worſe Chriſtian: I will love no man the leſſe, for differing in opinion from me. And what meaſure I meat to others I expect from them again. I am fully aſſured that God does not, and therefore that men ought not to require any more of any man then this, To believe the Scripture to be Gods word, to endeavour to find the true ſenſe of it, and to live according to it.

57 This is the Religion which I have choſen after a long deliberation, and I am verily perſwaded that I have choſen wiſely, much more wiſely thē if I had guided my ſelfe according to your Churches authority. For the Scripture being all true, I am ſecur'd by believing nothing elſe, that I ſhall believe no falſhood as matter of Faith. And if I miſtake the ſenſe of Scripture, and ſo fall into error, yet am I ſecure from any danger thereby, if but your grounds be true: becauſe endeavouring to finde the true ſenſe of Scripture, I cannot but hold my error without pertinacy, and be ready to forſake it when a more true and a more probable ſenſe ſhall appear unto mee. And then all neceſſary truth being as I have prov'd, plainly ſet down in Scripture, I am certain by believing Scripture, to believe all neceſſary Truth: And he that does ſo, if his life be anſwerable to his faith, how is it poſſible he ſhould faile of Salvation?

58 Beſides, whatſoever may be pretended to gain to your Church the credit of a Guide, all that & much more may be ſaid for the Scripture. Hath your Church been ancient? The Scripture is more ancient.

Is your Church a meanes to keep men at vnity? So is the Scripture to keep thoſe that believe it and wil obey it, in unity of belief, in matters neceſſary or very profitable, and in unity of Charity in points unneceſſary. Is your Church univerſall for time or place? Certainly the Scripture is more univerſall. For all the Chriſtians in the world (thoſe I mean that in truth deſerve this name,) doe now, and alwaies have believed the Scripture to be the word of God: whereas only you ſay that you only are the Church of God, & all Chriſtians beſides you deny it.

59 Thirdly, following the Scripture, I follow that whereby you prove your Churches infallibility, (whereof were it not for Scripture what pretence could you have, or what notion could we have?) and by ſo doing tacitely confeſſe, that your ſelves are ſurer of the truth of the Scripture then of your Churches authority. For we muſt be ſurer of the proofe then of the thing proved, otherwiſe it is no proofe.

60 Fourthly, following the Scripture, I follow that which muſt be true if your Church be true: for your Church gives atteſtation to it. Whereas if I follow your Church, I muſt follow that which, though Scripture be true, may be falſe; nay which if Scripture be true muſt be falſe, becauſe the Scripture teſtifies againſt it.

61 Fiftly, to follow the Scripture I have Gods expreſſe warrant and command, and no colour of any prohibition: But to believe your Church infallible, I have no cõmand at all, much leſſe an expreſſe cõmand. Nay I have reaſon to fear that I am prohibited to doe ſo in theſe words: *call no man Maſter on earth: They fell by infidelity, Thou ſtandeſt by faith, Bee not high minded but feare: The ſpirit of truth The world cannot receive.*

62 Following your Church I muſt hold many things not only above reaſon but againſt it, if any thing be againſt it: whereas following the Scripture I ſhall believe many myſteries but no impoſſibilities; many things above reaſon, but nothing againſt it; many things which had they not been reveal'd, reaſon could never have diſcover'd, but nothing which by true reaſon may be confuted: many things which reaſon cannot comprehend how they can be, but nothing which reaſon can comprehend that it cannot be. Nay I ſhall believe nothing which reaſon will not convince that I ought to believe it: For reaſon will convince any man, unleſſe he be of a perverſe mind, that the Scripture is the word of God: And then no reaſon can be greater then this, God ſayes ſo therefore it is true.

63 Following your Church I muſt hold many things which to any mans judgment that will give himſelf the liberty of judgment, will ſeem much more plainly contradicted by Scripture, then the infallibility of your Church appeares to be confirm'd by it; and conſequently muſt be ſo fooliſh as to believe your Church exempted from error upon leſſe evidence, rather then ſubject to the common conditi-on of mankind upon greater evidence. Now if I take the Scripture only for my Guide, I ſhall not need to doe any thing ſo unreaſonable.

64 If I will follow your Church I muſt believe impoſſibilities, and that with an abſolute certainty, upon motives which are confeſſ'd

to be but only *Prudentiall* and probable: That is, with a weak foundation I muſt firmly ſupport a heavy, a monſtrous heavy building: Now following the Scripture I ſhall have no neceſſity to undergoe any ſuch difficulties.

65 Following your Church I muſt be ſervant of Chriſt and a Subject of the King, but only-*Ad placitum Papæ.* I muſt bee prepar'd in mind to renounce my allegiance to the King, when the Pope ſhall declare him an Heretique and command me not to obey him: And I muſt be prepar'd in mind *to eſteem Vertue Vice, and Vice Vertue if the Pope ſhall ſo determine.* Indeed you ſay it is impoſſible he ſhould doe the latter; but that you know is a great queſtion, neither is it fit my obedience to God and the King ſhould depend upon a queſtionable foundation. And howſoever, you muſt grant that if by an impoſſible ſuppoſition the Popes commands ſhould be contrary to the law of Chriſt, that they of your Religion muſt reſolve to obey rather the commands of the Pope then the law of Chriſt. Whereas if I follow the Scripture, I may, nay I muſt obey my Soveraign in lawfull things, though an Heretique, though a Tyrant, and though, I doe not ſay the Pope, but the Apoſtles themſelves, nay *an Angell from heaven ſhould teach any thing againſt the Goſpell of Chriſt, I may, nay I muſt denounce Anathema to him.*

66 Following the Scripture I ſhall believe a Religion, which being contrary to fleſh and blood, without any aſſiſtance from worldly power, wit or policy; nay againſt all the power and policy of the world prevail'd and enlarg'd it ſelf in a very ſhort time all the world over. Whereas it is too too apparent, that your Church hath got and ſtill maintaines her authority over mens conſciences, by counterfeiting falſe miracles, forging falſe ſtories, by obtruding on the world ſuppoſititious writings, by corrupting the monuments of former times, and defacing out of them all which any way makes againſt you, by warres, by perſecutions, by Maſſacres, by Treaſons, by Rebellions; in ſhort, by all manner of carnall meanes whether violent or fraudulent.

67 Following the Scripture I ſhall believe a Religion, the firſt Preachers and Profeſſors whereof, it is moſt certain they could have no worldly ends upon the world, that they could not project to themſelves by it any of the profits or honours or pleaſures of this world, but rather were to expect the contrary, even all the miſeries which the world could lay upon them. On the other ſide, the Head of your Church, the pretended Succeſſor of the Apoſtles, and Guide of faith, it is even palpable, that he makes your Religion the inſtrument of his ambition, & by it ſeekes to entitle himſelfe *directly or indirectly to the Monarchy of the world.* And beſides, it is evident to any man that has but halfe an eye, that moſt of thoſe Doctrines which you adde to the Scripture doe make one way or other, for the honour or temporall profit of the Teachers of them.

68 Following the Scripture only, I ſhall embrace a Religion of admirable ſimplicity, conſiſting in a manner wholly in the worſhip of God

God in ſpirit and truth. Whereas your Church and Doctrine is even loaded with an infinity of weak, childiſh, ridiculous, unſavoury ſuperſtitions and ceremonies, and full of that *righteouſneſſe* for which *Chriſt ſhall judge the world.*

69 Following the Scripture, I ſhall believe that which Vniverſall, never-failing Tradition aſſures me, that it was by the admirable ſupernaturall worke of God confirm'd to be the word of God: whereas never any miracle was wrought, never ſo much as a lame horſe cur'd in confirmation of your Churches authority and infallibility. And if any ſtrange things have been done, which may ſeeme to give atteſtation to ſome parts of your doctrine, yet this proves nothing but the truth of the Scripture, which foretold that (Gods providence permitting it, and the wickedneſſe of the world deſerving it) *ſtrange ſignes and wonders ſhould be wrought to confirme falſe doctrine, that they which love not the truth, may be given over to ſtrange deluſions.* Neither does it ſeeme to me any ſtrange thing, that God ſhould permit ſome true wonders to be done to delude them who have forged ſo many to deceive the world.

70 If I follow the Scripture, I muſt not promiſe my ſelfe Salvation without effectuall dereliction and mortification of all vices, and the effectuall practice of all Chriſtian vertues: But your Church opens an eaſier and a broader way to Heaven, and though I continue all my life long in a courſe of ſinne, and without the practice of any vertue, yet gives me aſſurance that I may be let in to heaven at a poſterne gate, even by any act of Attrition at the houre of death, if it be joyn'd with confeſſion, or by an act of Contrition without confeſſion.

71 Admirable are the Precepts of piety and humility, of innocence and patience, of liberality, frugality, temperance, ſobriety, juſtice, meekneſſe, fortitude, conſtancy and gravity, contempt of the world, love of God and the love of man kind; In a word, of all vertues, and againſt all vice, which the Scriptures impoſe upon us, to be obeyed under pain of damnation: The ſumme whereof is in manner compriz'd in our *Saviours Sermon upon the Mount*, recorded in the 5. 6. and 7. of S. *Matthew*, which if they were generally obeyed, could not but make the world generally happy, and the goodneſſe of them alone were ſufficient to make any wiſe and good man believe that this Religion rather then any other, came from God the Fountain of all goodneſſe. And that they may be generally obeyed, our Saviour hath ratified them all in the cloſe of his Sermon, with theſe univerſall Sanctions, *Not every one that ſayeth Lord Lord, ſhall enter into the Kingdome, but he that doth the will of my Father which is in Heaven:* and again, *whoſoever heareth theſe ſayings of mine and doth them not, ſhall be likned unto a fooliſh man which built his houſe upon the ſand, and the raine deſcended, and the flood came, and the winds blew, and it fell, and great was the fall thereof.* Now your Church, notwithſtanding all this, enervates and in a manner diſſolves and abrogates many of theſe precepts, teaching men that they are not lawes for all Chriſtians, but Counſells of perfection and matters of Supererrogation: that a man

ſhall doe well if he doe obſerve them, but he ſhall not ſinne if he obſerve them not; That they are for them who ayme at high places in heaven, who aſpire with the two ſonnes of *Zebede*, to the right hand or to the left hand of Chriſt: But if a man will be content barely to goe to heaven, and to be a doore keeper in the houſe of God, eſpecially if he will be content to taſt of Purgatory in the way, he may obtaine it at any eaſier purchaſe. Therefore the Religion of your Church is not ſo holy nor ſo good as the doctrine of Chriſt delivered in Scripture, and therefore not ſo likely to come from the Fountaine of holineſſe & goodneſſe.

72 Laſtly, if I follow your Church for my Guide, I ſhall doe all one, as if I ſhould follow a Company of blind men in a judgement of colours, or in the choice of a way. For every unconſidering man is blind in that which he does not conſider. Now what is your Church but a Company of unconſidering men, who comfort themſelves becauſe they are a great company together, but all of them, either out of idleneſſe refuſe the trouble of a ſevere tryall of their Religion, (as if heaven were not worth it,) or out of ſuperſtition fear the event of ſuch a tryall, that they may be ſcrupled and ſtaggered and diſquieted by it; and therefore, for the moſt part doe it not at all. Or if they doe it, they doe it negligently and hypocritically, and perfunctorily, rather for the ſatisfaction of others then themſelves: but certainly without indifference, without liberty of judgement, without a reſolution to doubt of it, if upon examination the grounds of it prove uncertain, or to leave it, if they prove apparently falſe. My own experience aſſures me, that in this imputation I doe you no injury: but it is very apparent to all men from your ranking, *doubting of any part of your Doctrine*, among mortall ſinnes. For from hence it followes, that ſeeing every man muſt reſolve that he will never commit mortall ſinne, that he muſt never examine the grounds of it at all, for fear he ſhould be mov'd to doubt: or if he doe, he muſt reſolve that no motives, be they never ſo ſtrong ſhall move him to doubt, but that with his will and reſolution he will uphold himſelfe in a firme belief of your Religion, though his reaſon and his underſtanding faile him. And ſeeing this is the condition of all thoſe whom you eſteem good Catholiques, who can deny, but you are a Company of men unwilling and afraid to underſtand, leaſt you ſhould doe good! That have eyes to ſee and will not ſee, that have *have not the love of truth* (which is only to be known by an indifferent tryall,) & therefore deſerve *to be given over to ſtrong deluſions*; men that love darkneſſe more then light: in a word, that you are *the blind leading the blind*, and what prudence there can be, in following ſuch Guides, our Saviour hath taught us in ſaying, *If the blind lead the blind, both ſhall fall into the ditch.*

73 There remaines unſpoken to in this Section, ſome places out of S. *Auſtin*, and ſome ſayings of *Luther*, wherein he confeſſes that in the Papacy are many good things. But the former I have already conſidered, and return'd the argument grounded on them. As for *Luthers* ſpeeches, I told you, not long ſince, that we follow no privat men,

men, and regard not much what he ſaies either againſt the Church of Rome, or for it, but what he proves. He was a man of a vehement Spirit, and very often what he took in hand, he did not doe it but over doe it. He that will juſtify all his ſpeeches, eſpecially ſuch as he wrote in heat of oppoſition, I believe will have work enough. Yet in theſe ſentences, though he overreach in the particulars, yet what he ſaies in generall we confeſſe true, and confeſſe with him *that in the Papacy are many good things*, which have come from them to us, but withall we ſay there are many bad, neither doe wee think our ſelves bound in prudence either to reject the good with the bad, or to retain the bad with the good, but rather conceive it a high point of wiſdome, to ſeparate between the *pretious and the vile, to ſever the good from the bad, and to put the good in veſſels to be kept, and to caſt the bad away; to try all things, and to hold that which is good.*

74 *Ad* §. 32. Your next and laſt argument againſt the faith of Proteſtants is, becauſe *wanting Certainty and Prudence, it muſt alſo want the fourth condition, Supernaturality. For that being a humane perſwaſion, it is not in the eſſence of it ſupernaturall: and being imprudent and raſh, it cannot proceed from Divine motion, and ſo is not ſupernaturall in reſpect of the cauſe from which it proceedeth.* Anſ. This litle diſcourſe ſtands wholly upon what went before, and therefore muſt fall together with it. I have proved the Faith of Proteſtants as certain, and as prudent as the faith of Papiſts; and therefore if theſe be certain grounds of ſupernaturality, our faith may have it as well as yours. I would here furthermore be inform'd how you can aſſure us that your faith is not your perſwaſion or opinion (for you make them all one,) that your Churches doctrine is true? Or if you grant it your perſwaſion, why is it not the perſwaſion of men, and in reſpect of the ſubject of it, an humane perſwaſion? I deſire alſo to know, what ſenſe there is in pretending that your perſwaſion is, not in regard of the object only and cauſe of it, but in nature or eſſence of it ſupernaturall? Laſtly, whereas you ſay, that *being imprudent it cannot come from divine motion*: certainly by this reaſon all they that believe your own Religion, and cannot give a wiſe and ſufficient reaſon for it, (as millions amongſt you cannot) muſt be condemn'd to have no ſupernaturall faith: or if not, then without queſtion nothing can hinder, but that the imprudent faith of Proteſtants may proceed from divine motion, as well as the imprudent faith of Papiſts.

75 And thus having weighed your whole diſcourſe, and found it altogether lighter then vanity, why ſhould I not invert your concluſion, and ſay, Seeing you have not proved that whoſoever erres againſt any one point of Faith looſeth all divine Faith: nor that any error whatſoever concerning that which by the Parties litigant may be eſteem'd a matter of faith is a grievous ſinne, it followes not at all, that when two men hold different doctrines concerning Religion, that but one can be ſaved? Not that I deny, but that the ſentence of S. *Chryſoſt.* with which you conclude this Chapt. may in a good ſenſe be true: for oftimes by *the faith* is meant only that Doctrine which is *neceſſary to*

ſalvation, and to ſay that ſalvation may be had without any the leaſt thing which is neceſſary to ſalvation, implyes a repugnance and deſtroies it ſelfe. Beſides, not to believe all neceſſary points, and to believe none at all, is for the purpoſe of ſalvation all one; and therefore he that does ſo, may juſtly be ſaid to deſtroy the Goſpell of Chriſt, ſeeing he makes it uneffectuall to the end for which it was intended, the Salvation of mens ſoules. But why you ſhould conceive that all differences about Religion are concerning matters of faith, in this high notion of the word, for that I conceive no reaſon.

CHAP. VII.

In regard of the Precept of Charity towards ones ſelf, Proteſtants are in ſtate of Sinne, as long as they remain ſeparated from the Roman Church.

THAT, due *Order* is to be obſerved in the Theologicall Vertue of *Charity*, whereby we are directed to preferre ſome Objects before others, is a truth taught by all Divines, and declared in theſe words of holy Scripture: *He hath ordered (a) Charity in me*. The reaſon whereof is: becauſe the infinite Goodneſſe of God, which is the *formall Obiect*, or Motive of *Charity*, and for which all other things are loved, is differently participated by different Objects; and therefore the love we beare to them for Gods ſake, muſt accordingly be unequall. In the vertue of *Faith*, the caſe is farre otherwiſe; becauſe all the Objects, or points which we believe, doe equally participate the divine Teſtimony or Revelation, for which we believe alike all things propounded for ſuch. For it is as impoſſible for God, to ſpeake an untruth in a ſmall, as in a great matter. And this is the ground for which we have ſo often affirmed, that any leaſt errour againſt *Faith*, is injurious to God, and deſtructive of Salvation.

a *Cant.* 2. 4.

2 This order in Charity may be conſidered; Towards God; Our owne ſoule; The ſoule of our Neighbour; Our owne life, or Goods; and the life or goods of our Neighbour. God is to be beloved above all things, both *objectivè* (as the Divines ſpeake) that is, we muſt wiſh or deſire to God, a Good more great, perfect, and noble then to any, or all other things: namely, all that indeed He is, a Nature Infinite, Independent, Immenſe &c. and alſo *appretiativè*, that is, wee muſt ſooner looſe what good ſoever, then leave, and abandon Him. In the other Objects of Charity, of which I ſpake, this order is to be kept. We may, but are not bound, to preferre the life and goods of our Neigbour before our owne: we are bound to preferre the ſoule of our Neighbour before our own temporall goods or life, if he happen to be in extreme ſpirituall neceſſity, and that we by our aſſiſtance can ſuccour him, according to the ſaying of *S. John*: *In this we have knowne (b) the Charity of God, becauſe he hath yielded his life for us: and we ought to yield our life for our Brethren.* And *S. Auguſtine* likewiſe ſaith: *A Chriſtian will not doubt (c) to looſe his owne temporall life, for the eternall life of his Neighbour.* Laſtly we are to preferre the *ſpirituall* good of our own ſoule, before both the ſpirituall and temporall good of our Neighbour, becauſe as Charity doth of its own Nature, chiefly encline the perſon in whom it reſides, to love God, and to be united with him: ſo of it ſelfe it enclines him to procure thoſe things whereby the ſaid Vnion with God *is* effected, rather to himſelfe then to others. And from hence it followes, that in things neceſſary to ſalvation, no man ought in any caſe, or in any reſpect whatſoever, to preferre the ſpirituall good, either of any particular perſon, or of the whole world before his own ſoule; according to thoſe words of our Bleſſed Saviour: *What doth it (d) availe a man, if he gaine the whole world, and ſuſtaine the damage of his own ſoule?* And therefore (to come to our preſent purpoſe) it is directly againſt the *Order* of Charity, or againſt Chatity as it hath a reference to our ſelves, which Divines call *Charitas propria*, to adventure either the *omitting* of any meanes neceſſary to ſalvation, or the committing of any thing repugnant to it, for whatſoever reſpect, and conſequently, if by living out of the *Roman* Church we put our ſelves in hazard, either to want ſome thing neceſſarily required to ſalvation, or elſe to performe ſome act againſt it, wee commit a moſt grievous ſinne againſt the vertue *of Charity*, as it reſpects our ſelves, and ſo cannot hope for ſalvation without repentance.

b 1. *Ioan.* 3. *v.* 16.

c *De mendac. cap.* 6.

d Mat. 6.

3 Now, of things neceſſary to ſalvation, there are two ſorts, according to the doctrine of all Divines,

Divines. Some things (ſay they) are neceſſary to ſalvation, *neceſſitate præcepti*, neceſſary only becauſe they are commanded; For, *If thou wilt* (e) *enter into life, keepe the Commandements*. In which kind of things, as probable ignorance of the Law, or of the commandement doth excuſe the party from all faulty breach thereof; ſo likewiſe doth it not exclude ſalvation in caſe of ignorance. Some other things are ſaid to be neceſſary to ſalvation *neceſſitate medij, finis*, or *ſalutis*; becauſe they are Meanes appointed by God to attaine our *End* of eternall *ſalvation*, in ſo ſtrict a manner, that it were *preſumption* to *hope* for Salvation without them. And as the former meanes are ſaid to be *neceſſary*, becauſe they are *commanded*; ſo the latter are commonly ſaid to be *commanded*, becauſe they are *neceſſary*, that is: Although there were no other ſpeciall precept concerning them; yet ſuppoſing they bee once appointed as meanes abſolutely neceſſary to ſalvation, there cannot but ariſe an obligation of procuring to have them, in vertue of that univerſall precept of Charity, which obligeth every man to procure the ſalvation of his own ſoule. In this ſort *divine infallible Faith* is neceſſary to ſalvation; as likewiſe repentance of every deadly ſinne, and in the doctrine of Catholiques, Baptiſme *in re*, that is, in *act*, to Children, and for thoſe who are come to the uſe of reaſon, *in voto*, or *harty deſire*, when they cannot have it in act. And as Baptiſme is neceſſary for remiſſion of *Originall* and *Actuall* ſinne committed before it: ſo the Sacrament of *Confeſſion*, or Pennance is neceſſary *in re*, or *in voto*, in *act*, or *deſire*, for the remiſſion of mortall ſinnes, committed after Baptiſme. The Miniſter of which Sacrament of Pennance being neceſſarily a true Prieſt, true Ordination is neceſſary in the Church of God for remiſſion of ſinnes by this ſacrament, as alſo for other ends not belonging to our preſent purpoſe. From hence it riſeth, that no ignorance or impoſſibility can ſupply the want of thoſe means which are abſolutely neceſſary to ſalvation. As if, for example, a ſinner depart this world without repenting himſelfe of all deadly ſinnes, although he dye ſuddenly, or unexpectedly fall out of his wits, and ſo commit no new ſinne by omiſſion of repentance; yet he ſhall be eternally puniſhed for his former ſinnes committed, and never repented. If an Infant dye without Baptiſme, he cannot be ſaved, not by reaſon of any actuall ſinne committed by him in omitting Baptiſme, but for Originall ſinne, not forgiven by the meanes which God hath ordained to that purpoſe. Which doctrine, all, or moſt Proteſtants will (for ought I know) grant to be true, in the Children of Infidels, yea not only *Lutherans*, but alſo ſome other Proteſtants, as M. *Bilſon* late of *Wincheſter* (f) & others hold it to be true, even in the Children of the faithfull. And if Proteſtants in generall diſagree fom Catholiques in this point, it cannot be denyed but that our diſagreement is in a point very *fundamentall*. And the like I ſay of the Sacrament of Pennance, which they deny to be neceſſary to ſalvation, either in act, or in deſire; which error is likewiſe fundamentall, becauſe it concernes (as I ſaid) a thing neceſſary to ſalvation: And for the ſame reaſon, if their Prieſthood and Ordination be doubtfull, as certainly it is, they are in danger to want a meanes without which they cannot be ſaved. Neither ought this rigour to ſeeme ſtrange, or unjuſt: For Almighty God having of his own *Goodneſſe*, without our *merit*, firſt ordained Man to a *ſupernaturall* end of eternall felicity; and then, after our fall in *Adam* vouchſafed to reduce us to the attaining of that End, if his bleſſed *Will* be pleaſed to limit the attaining of that End, to ſome meanes which in his infinite Wiſdome he thinks moſt fit; who can ſay, why doſt thou ſo? Or who can *hope* for that *End*, without ſuch *meanes*? Bleſſed be his divine Majeſty, for vouchſafing to ordaine us, baſe creatures, to ſo ſublime an End; by any *meanes* at all!

e Math. 19. 17.

f In his true difference *&c. Part. 4. pag.* 168. *&* 369.

4 Out of the foreſaid difference followeth another, that (generally ſpeaking) in things neceſſary only, becauſe they are commanded, it is ſufficient for avoiding ſinne, that we proceed prudently, and by the conduct of ſome probable opinion, maturely weighed and approved by men of vertue, learning and wiſdome. Neither are we alwaies obliged to follow the moſt ſtrict, and ſevere, or ſecure part, as long as the doctrine which wee embrace, proceeds upon ſuch reaſons, as may warrant it to be truly probable, and prudent, though the contrary part want not alſo probable grounds. For in humane affaires, and diſcourſe, evidence and certainty cannot be alwaies expected. But when wee treat not preciſely of avoiding ſinne, but moreover of procuring ſome thing without which I cannot bee ſaved; I am obliged by the *Law*, and *Order* of *Charity* to procure as great certainty as morrally I am able; and am not to follow euery probable opinion or dictamen, but *tutiorem partem*, *the ſafer part*, becauſe if my *probability* prove falſe, I ſhall not *probably*, but *certainly* come ſhort of Salvation. Nay in ſuch caſe, I ſhall incurre a new ſinne againſt the *Vertue* of *Charity* towards my *ſelfe*, which obligeth every one not to expoſe his ſoule to the hazard of eternall perdition, when it is in his power, with the aſſiſtance of Gods grace, to make the matter ſure. From this very ground it is, that although ſome Divines be of opinion, that it is not a ſinne to uſe ſome *Matter*, or *Form* of Sacraments, only probable, if we reſpect preciſely the reverence or reſpect which is due to Sacraments, as they belong to the *Morall infuſed* Vertue of *Religion*; yet when they are ſuch Sacraments, as the invalidity thereof may endanger the ſalvation of ſoules, all doe with one conſent agree, that it is a grievous offence to uſe a doubtfull, or onely probable *Matter* or *Forme*, when it is in our power to procure certainty. If therefore it may appeare, that though it were not certaine that Proteſtancy unrepented deſtroyes Salvation (as we have proved to be very certaine) yet at leaſt that is *probable*, and with all, that there is a way more ſafe; it will follow out of the grounds already laid, that they are obliged by the law of Charity to imbrace that ſafe way.

5 Now, that Proteſtants have reaſon at leaſt to doubt in what caſe they ſtand, is deduced

from

from what we have ſaid, and proved about the univerſall infallibility of the Church, and of her being Iudge of Controverſies, to whom all Chriſtians ought to ſubmit their Iudgement (as even ſome Proteſtants grant,) and whom to oppoſe in any one of her definitions, is a grievous ſinne: As alſo from what we have ſaid of the *Vnity*, *Univerſality*, and *Viſibility* of the Church, and of Succeſſion of Perſons, and Doctrine; Of the Conditions of Divine Faith, *Certainty*, *Obſcurity*, *Prudence*, and *Supernaturality*, which are wanting in the faith of Proteſtants; Of the frivolous diſtinction of points fundamentall & not fundamentall, (the confutation whereof proveth that *Heretiques* diſagreeing among themſelves in any leaſt point, cannot have the ſame faith, nor be of the ſame Church:) Of Schiſme; of Hereſy; of the Perſons who firſt revolted from *Rome*, and of their Motives; of the Nature of Faith, which is deſtroyed by any leaſt errour, & it is Certaine that ſome of thē muſt be in error & want the ſubſtance of true faith; & ſince all pretend the like certainty, it is cleer that none of them have any certainty at all, but that they want true faith, which is a meanes *moſt abſolutely neceſſary* to Salvation. Moreover, as I ſaid heretofore, ſince it is granted that every Error in fundamentall points is damnable, and that they cannot tell in particular, what points be fundamentall, it followes that none of them knowes whether he, or his Brethren doe not erre damnably, it being certain that amongſt ſo many diſagreeing perſons ſome muſt erre. Vpon the ſame ground of not being able to aſſigne what points be fundamentall, I ſay, they cannot be ſure whether the difference among them be fundamentall or no, and conſequently whether they agree in the ſubſtance of faith and hope of Salvation. I omit to adde that you want the Sacrament of Pennance, inſtituted for remiſſion of ſinnes, or at leaſt you muſt confeſſe that you hold it not neceſſary; and yet your own Brethren, for example, the *Century Writers* doe (g) acknowledg that in times of *Cyprian*, and *Tertullian*, *Private Confeſſion* even of *Thoughts was uſed*; and that, it was then *commanded, and thought neceſſary*. The like, I ſay, concerning your Ordination, which at leaſt is very doubtfull, and conſequently all that depends thereon.

g *Cent. 3. cap. 6. Col. 127.*

6 On the other ſide, that the *Roman* Church is the the ſafer way to Heaven (not to repeat what hath been already ſaid upon divers occaſions) I will again put you in mind, that unleſſe the *Roman* Church was the true Church there was no viſible true Church upon earth. A thing ſo manifeſt, that Proteſtants themſelves confeſſe that more then one thouſand years the *Roman* Church poſſeſſed the whole world, as we have ſhewed heretofore, out of their own (h) words: from whence it follows, that unleſſe Ours be the true Church, you cannot pretend to any perpetuall viſible Church of your Own; but Ours doth not depend on yours, before which it was. And here I with you to conſider with feare and trembling, how all *Roman* Catholiques, not one excepted; that is, thoſe very men whom you muſt hold not to erre damnably in their belief, unleſſe you will deſtroy your own Church, and ſalvation, doe with unanimous conſent believe, and profeſſe that Proteſtancy unrepented deſtroyes Salvation; and then tell me, as you will anſwer at the laſt day, Whether it be not more ſafe, to live and die in that Church, which even your ſelves are forced to acknowledg *not to be cut off from hope of Salvation*, (which are your own words) then to live in a Church, which the ſaid confeſſedly true Church doth firmly believe, and conſtantly profeſſe not to be capable of Salvation. And therefore I conclude that by the moſt ſtrict obligation of *Charity* towards your own ſoule, you are bound to place it in ſafety, by returning to that Church, from which your Progenitors Schiſmatically departed; leaſt too late you find that ſaying of the holy Ghoſt verified in your ſelves: *He that loves* (i) *the danger, ſhall periſh therein.*

h *Chap. 5. Num. 9.*

i *Eccl. 3. 27.*

7 Againſt this laſt argument of the greater ſecurity of the Roman Church drawn from your own confeſſion, you bring an Objection; which in the end will be found to make for us, againſt your ſelfe. It is taken from the words of the Donatiſts, ſpeaking to Catholiques in this manner: *Your ſelves confeſſe* (k) *our Baptiſme, Sacraments, and Faith* (here you put an Explication of your own, and ſay, *for the moſt part*, as if any ſmall error in faith did not deſtroy all Faith) *to be good, and available. We deny yours to be ſo, and ſay there is no Church, no ſalvation amongſt you; Therefore it is ſafeſt for all to joyn with us.*

k *Pag. 112.*

8 By your leave our Argument is not (as you ſay) for ſimple people alone, but for all them who have care to ſave their ſoules. Neither is it grounded upon your *Charitable Iudgement* (as you (l) ſpeak) but upon an inevitable neceſſity for you, either to grant ſalvation to our Church, or to entaile certaine damnation upon your owne: becauſe yours can have no being till *Luther*, unleſſe ours be ſuppoſed to have been the true Church of Chriſt. And ſince you term this Argument a charme, take heed you be none of thoſe, who according to the Prophet *David*, doe not heare *the voice of him* (m) *who charmeth wiſely*. But to come to the purpoſe: Catholiques never granted that the Donatiſts had a true Church, or might be ſaved: And therefore you having cited out of *S. Auguſtine*, the words of the Catholiques, that the Donatiſts had true *Baptiſme*, when you come to the contrary words of the *Donatiſts*, you adde, *No Church, No Salvation*; making the Argument to have *quinq; terminos*; without which Addition you did ſee it made nothing againſt us: For, as I ſaid, the Catholiques never yielded, that among the Donatiſts there was a true Church, or hope of ſalvation. And your ſelfe, a few leaves after, acknowledge that the Donatiſts *maintained an error*, which *was in the Matter and Nature of it properly hæretical, againſt that Article of the Creed, wherein we profeſſe to believe the holy* (n) *Catholique Church*: and conſequently, you cannot allow ſalvation to them, as you doe, and muſt doe to us. And therefore the *Donatiſts* could not make the like argument againſt Catholiques, as Catholiques make againſt you, who grant us Salvation, which we deny to you. But at leaſt (you will ſay) this Argument for the

l *Pag. 81.*

m *Pſ. 57. 6.*

n *Pag. 126.*

Certainty

Certainty of their Baptiſme, was like to Ours touching the Security and Certainty of our ſalvation; and therefore that Catholiques ſhould have eſteemed the Baptiſme of the Donatiſts more certain then their own, and ſo have allowed Rebaptization of ſuch as were baptized by Heretiques, or ſinners, as the Donatiſts eſteemed all Catholiques to be. I anſwer, no. Becauſe it being a matter of faith, that Baptiſme adminiſtred by Heretiques, obſerving due Matter, form &c. is valide; to rebaptize any ſo baptized, had been both a ſacriledg in reiterating a Sacramẽt not reiterable, and a profeſſion alſo of a damnable Herely, and therefore had not been more *ſafe*, but certainly *damnable*. But you confeſſe that in the doctrine or practice of the *Roman* Church, there is no belief, or profeſſion of any damnable error, which if there were, even your Church ſhould certainly be no Church. To believe therefore and profeſſe as we doe, cannot exclude Salvation, as Rebaptization muſt have done. But if the *Donatiſts* could have affirmed with truth, that in the opinion both of Catholiques and themſelves, their Baptiſme was good, yea and good in ſuch ſort as that unleſſe theirs was good, that of the Catholiques could not be ſuch; but theirs might be good, though that of the Catholiques were not: and further that it was no damnable error to believe, that Baptiſme adminiſtred by the Catholiques was not good, nor that it was any Sacriledg to reiterate the ſame Baptiſme of Catholiques: If, I ſay, they could have truly affirmed theſe things, they had ſaid ſomewhat, which at leaſt had ſeemed to the purpoſe. But theſe things they could not ſay with any colour of truth, and therefore their argument was fond, and impious. But we with truth ſay to Proteſtants: You cannot but confeſſe that our doctrine containes no damnable error, and that our Church is ſo certainly a true Church, that unleſſe ours be true you cannot pretend any; Yea you grant, that you ſhould be guilty of Schiſme, if you did cut off our Church from the Body of Chriſt, and the hope of ſalvation: But we neither doe, nor can grant that yours is a true Church, or that within it there is hope of ſalvation: *Therefore it is ſafeſt* for you *to joyn With us.* And now againſt whom hath your Objection greateſt force?

9 But I wonder not a little, and ſo I think will every body elſe, what the reaſon may be, that you doe not ſo much as goe about to anſwer the argument of the *Donatiſts*, which you ſay is all one with Ours, but referre us to *S. Auguſtine* there to read it; as if every one carried with him a Library, or were able to examine the places in *S. Auguſtine*: and yet you might be ſure your Reader would be greedy to ſee ſome ſolid anſwer to an argument ſo often urged by us, and which indeed, unleſſe you can confute it, ought alone to move every one who hath care of his ſoule, to take the ſafeſt way, by incorporating himſelf in our Church. But we may eaſily imagine the true reaſon of your ſilence: For the anſwer which *S. Auguſtine* gives to the *Donatiſts*, is directly againſt your ſelf, and the ſame which I have given, Namely, that Catholiques (o) approve the Baptiſme of Donatiſts, but abhorre their hereſy of Rebaptization. And that as gold is good (which is the ſimilitude uſed by (p) *S. Auguſtine*) yet not to be ſought in company of theeves; ſo though Baptiſme be good, yet it muſt not be ſought for in the Conventicle of *Donatiſts*. But you free us from damnable hereſy, and yield us ſalvation, which I hope is to be imbraced in whatſoever Company it is found; or rather that Company is to be imbraced before all other, in which all ſides agree, that ſalvation may be found. We therefore muſt inferre, that it is ſafeſt for you to ſeeke ſalvation among us. You had good reaſon to conceal *S. Auguſtins* anſwer to the *Donatiſts*.

o *Adlit. Petil. l. 2. cap. 108.*

p *Contra Creſc. lib. 2. cap. 21.*

10 You frame another argument in our behalf, and make us ſpeake thus: If Proteſtants *believe the* (q) *Religion* of Catholiques *to be a ſafe way to Heaven, why doe they not follow it?* which wiſe argument of your own, you anſwer at large, and confirm your anſwer by this inſtance: *The Ieſuits and Dominicans hold different Opinions touching Predetermination, and the Immaculate Conception of the Bleſſed Virgin: Yet ſo, that the Ieſuits hold the Dominicans way ſafe, that is, his error not damnable, and the Dominicans hold the ſame of the Ieſuits; Yet neither of them with good Conſequence can preſſe the other to believe his opinion, becauſe by his own Confeſſion it is no damnable error.*

q *Pag. 79.*

11 But what Catholique maketh ſuch a wiſe demaund as you put into our mouths? If our Religion be a ſafe way to heaven, that is, not damnable; why doe you not follow it? As if every thing that is good, muſt be of neceſſity imbraced by every body! But what think you of the Argument framed thus? Our Religion is ſafe even by your Confeſſion, therefore you ought to grant that all *may* imbrace it. And yet further, thus: Among different Religions and *contrary* waies to heaven, one only can be ſafe: But ours, by your own Confeſſion, is ſafe, whereas we hold that in yours there is no hope of ſalvation: Therefore you *may* and *ought* to imbrace ours. This is our Argument. And if the Dominicans and Ieſuits did ſay one to another as we ſay to you; then one of them might with good conſequence preſſe *the other to believe his opinion*. You have ſtill the hard fortune to be beaten with your own weapon.

12 It remaineth then, that both in regard of *Faith*, and *Charity*, Proteſtants are obliged to unite themſelves with the Church of Rome. And I may adde alſo, in regard of the *Theologicall* Vertue of *Hope*, without which none can hope to be ſaved, and which you want, either by exceſſe of *Confidence*, or defect by *Deſpair*, not unlike to your *Faith*, which I ſhewed to be either deficient in *Certainty*, or exceſſive in *Evidẽce*; as likewiſe according to the rigid Calviniſts, it is either ſo ſtrong, that once had, it can never be loſt; or ſo more then weak, and ſo much nothing; that it can never be gotten. For the trve Theologicall *Hope* of Chriſtians, is a *Hope* which keeps a mean between *Preſumption*, and *Deſperation*; which moves us to work our ſalvation with feare, and trembling; which conducts us to make ſure our ſalvation by good works, as holy Scripture adviſeth. But contrarily,

Proteſtants doe either exclude *Hope* by *Deſpaire*, with the Doctrine that our Saviour died not for all, and that ſuch want grace ſufficient to ſalvation; or elſe by vaine *Preſumption* grounded upon a fantaſticall perſuaſion, that they are Predeſtinate; which Faith muſt exclude all feare, and trembling. Neither can they make their Calling *certain by good works*, who doe certainly beleeve that before any good works they are juſtified, and juſtified even by Faith alone, and that by Faith whereby they certainly believe that they are juſtified. Which points ſome Proteſtants doe expreſly affirme to be *the ſoule of the Church*, *the principall Origen of ſalvation*, *Of all other points of Doctrine the chiefeſt and weightieſt*; as already I have noted *Chap. 3. n. 19.* And if ſome Proteſtants doe now relent from the rigour of the aforeſaid doctrine, we muſt affirme, that at leaſt ſome of them want the Theologicall Vertue of *Hope*: yea that none of them can have true *Hope*, while they hope to be ſaved in the Communion of thoſe, who defend ſuch doctrines, as doe directly overthrow all true Chriſtian *Hope*. And for as much as concernes *Faith*, we muſt alſo infer, that they want *Unity* therein (and conſequently have none at all) by their diſagreement about *the ſoule of the Church*; *the principall Origen of ſalvation*, *of all other points of Doctrine the chiefeſt and weightieſt*. And if you want true *Faith*, you muſt by conſequence want *Hope*, or if you hold that this *point* is not to be ſo indiviſible on either ſide, but that it hath latitude ſufficient to imbrace all parties, without prejudice to their ſalvation; notwithſtanding that your Brethren hold it to be *the ſoule of the Church &c.* I muſt repeat what I have ſaid heretofore, that, even by this Example, it is cleer, you cannot agree what points be *fundamentall*. And ſo (to whatſoever anſwer you fly) I preſſe you in the ſame manner, and ſay, that you haue no Certainty whether you agree in fundamentall points, or Vnity and ſubſtance of Faith, which cannot ſtand with difference in fundamentalls. And ſo upon the whole matter, I leave it to be conſidered, whether, *Want of Charity can be iuſtly charged* on us, becauſe we affirme, that they cannot (without repentance) be ſaved, who want of all other the moſt neceſſary meanes to ſalvation, which are, the three *Theologicall* Vertues, FAITH, HOPE, *and* CHARITY.

13 And now I end this *firſt part*, having as I conceive, complyed with my firſt deſigne, (in that meaſure, which Time, Commodity, ſcarcity of Books, and my own ſmall Abilities could afford) which was to ſhew, that *Amongſt men of different Religions*, *one ſide only can be ſaved*. For ſince there muſt be ſome *infallible Meanes* to decide all Controverſies concerning Religion, and to propound truth revealed by Almighty God; and this *Meanes* can be no other, but the *Viſible Church of Chriſt*, which at the time of *Luthers* appearance was only the Church of *Rome*, and ſuch as agreed with her: We muſt conclude, that whoſoever oppoſeth himſelf to her definitions, or forſaketh her Communion, doth reſiſt God himſelf, whoſe Spouſe ſhe is, and whoſe divine truth ſhe propounds; and therefore becoms guilty of *Schiſme*, and *Hereſie*, which ſince *Luther*, his Aſſociates, and Proteſtants have done, and ſtill continue to doe; it is not *Want* of *Charity*, but abundance of evident cauſe that forceth us to declare this neceſſary Truth, *PROTESTANCIE VNREPENTED DESTROIES SALVATION.*

THE ANSVVER TO THE SEAVENTH CHAPTER.

That Proteſtants are not bound by the Charity which they owe to themſelves, to re-unite themſelves to the Roman Church.

THE *firſt foure Paragraphs* of this Chapter are wholly ſpent in an un-neceſſary introduction unto a truth, which I preſume, never was, nor will be by any man in his right wits, either denied or queſtion'd; and that is, That *every man in wiſdome and charity to himſelfe, is to take the ſafeſt way to his eternall Salvation.*

2 The *fift and ſixt* are nothing in a manner, but references to diſcourſes already anſwered by me, and confuted in their proper places.

3 The *ſeaventh, eight, ninth, tenth, and eleventh,* have no other foundation but this falſe pretence, That *we confeſſe the Roman Church free from damnable error.*

4 In the *twelfth* there is ſomething that has ſome probability to perſwade ſome Proteſtants to forſake ſome of their opinions, or others to leave their communion; but to prove Proteſtants in ſtate of ſinne while they remain ſeparate from the Roman Church, there is not one word or ſyllable: and beſides, whatſoever argument there is in it for any purpoſe, it may be as forcibly return'd upon Papiſts, as it is urg'd againſt Proteſtants; in as much as all Papiſts, either hold the doctrine of Predetermination, and abſolute Election, or communicate with thoſe that doe hold it. Now from this doctrine, what is more prone and obvious, then for every naturall man (without Gods eſpeciall prevẽting grace) to make this practicall collection, Either I am elected or not elected; If I be, no impiety poſſible can ever damne me: If not, no poſſible induſtry can ever ſave me? Now whether this diſiunctive perſwaſion be not as likely (as any doctrine of any Proteſtants,) to extinguiſh Chriſtian hope, and filiall feare, and to lead ſome men to deſpaire, others to preſumption, all to a wretchleſſe and impious life, I deſire you ingenuouſly to informe me! and if you deny it, aſſure your ſelfe you ſhall be contradicted and confuted by men of your own Religion and your own Society, and taught at length this charitable Doctrine, that though mens opinions may be charg'd with the abſurd conſequences which naturally flow from them, yet the men themſelves are not; I meane, if they perceive not the conſequence of theſe abſurdities, nor doe not own and acknowledge, but diſclaim and deteſt them. And this is all the anſwer which I ſhould make to this diſcourſe, if I ſhould deale rigidly and ſtrictly with you. Yet that you

may not think your ſelfe contemn'd, nor have occaſion to pretend, that your arguments are evaded, I will entreat leave of my Reader to bring to the teſt every particle of it, and to cenſure what deſerves a cenſure, and to anſwer what may any way ſeeme to require an anſwer: and then I doubt not, but what I have affirm'd in generall will appear in particular.

Ad §. 1. To the *Firſt* then I ſay. 1. It was needleſſe to prove, that due Order is to be obſerved in any thing; much more in Charity, which being one of the beſt things, may be ſpoil'd by being diſordered! Yet if it ſtood in need of proofe, I fear this place of the Canticles, *He hath ordered Charity in me*, would be no enforcing demonſtration of it. 2. The reaſon alleaged by you why we ought *to love one object more then another, becauſe one thing participates the Divine Goodneſſe more then another*, is phantaſticall, and repugnant to what you ſay preſently after. For by this rule no man ſhould love himſelfe more then all the world; unleſſe he were firſt vainely perſwaded that he doth more participate the Divine Goodneſſe then all the world. But the true reaſon why one thing ought to be lov'd more then another is, becauſe one thing is better then another, or becauſe it is better to us, or becauſe God commands us to doe ſo, or becauſe God himſelfe does ſo, and we are to conforme our affections to the will of God. 3. It is not true that *all objects which we believe, doe equally participate the Divine Teſtimony or Revelation*: For ſome are teſtified more evidently, and ſome more obſcurely; and therefore whatſoever you have built upon this ground, muſt of neceſſity fall together with it. And thus much for the firſt number.

6 *Ad* §. 2. In the *Second* many paſſages deſerve a cenſure. For 1. it is not true that *we are to wiſh or deſire to God a nature infinite, independent, immenſe*: For it is impoſſible I ſhould deſire to any perſon that which he hath already, if I know that he hath it; nor the perpetuity of it, if I know it impoſſible but he muſt have it for perpetuity. And therefore, rejoycing only and not *welwiſhing* is here the proper work of love. 2. Whereas you ſay, That *in things neceſſary to ſalvation, no man ought in any caſe or in any reſpect whatſoever, to preferre the ſpirituall good of the whole world before his own ſoule:* In ſaying this you ſeeme to me to condemne one of the greateſt acts of Charity, of one of the greateſt Saints that ever was, I mean S. *Paul*, who *for his brethren deſir'd to be an Anathema from Chriſt*. And as for the Text alleaged by you in confirmation of your ſaying, *what doth it availe a man if he gaine the whole world, and ſuſtaine the damage of his owne ſoule!* it is nothing to the purpoſe: For without all queſtion it is not profitable for a man to doe ſo; but the queſtion is, whether it be not lawfull for a man to forgoe and part with his own particular profit, to procure the univerſall, ſpirituall, and eternall benefit of others? 3. Whereas you ſay, *it is directly againſt Charity to our ſelves, to adventure the omitting of any meanes neceſſary to ſalvation*, this is true: But ſo is this alſo, that it is directly againſt the ſame Charity, to adventure the omitting any thing, that may any way helpe or conduce to

my

my ſalvation, that may make the way to it more ſecure or leſſe dangerous. And therefore if the errors of the Roman Church doe but hinder me in this way, or any way endanger it, I am in Charity to my ſelfe bound to forſake them, though they be not deſtructive of it. 4. Whereas you conclude, That *if by living out of the Roman Church we put our ſelves in hazard to want ſomething neceſſary to Salvation, we commit a grievous ſinne againſt the vertue of Charity as it reſpects our ſelves*: This conſequence may be good in thoſe which are thus perſwaded of the Roman Church, and yet live out of it. But the ſuppoſition is certainly falſe. We may live and dye out of the Roman Church, without putting our ſelves in any ſuch hazard: Nay to live and dye in it is as dangerous as to ſhoote a gulfe, which though ſome good ignorant ſoules may doe and eſcape, yet it may well be feared that not one in a hundred but miſcarries.

7 *Ad* §. 3. I proceed now to the *third Section*; & herein firſt I obſerve this acknowledgement of yours, *That in things neceſſary only becauſe commanded, a probable ignorance of the commandement excuſes the Party from all fault, and doth not exclude Salvation.* From which Doctrine it ſeemes to me to follow, that ſeeing obedience to the Roman Church cannot be pretended to be neceſſary, but only becauſe it is commanded, therefore not only an invincible, but even a probable ignorance of this pretended command, muſt excuſe us from all faulty breach of it, and cannot exclude Salvation. Now ſeeing this command is not pretended to be expreſly delivered, but only to be deduced from the word of God, and that not by the moſt cleere and evident conſequences that may be; and ſeeing an infinity of great objections lies againſt it, which ſeeme ſtrongly to prove that there is no ſuch command; with what Charity can you ſuppoſe, that our ignorance of this command, is not at the leaſt probable, if not, all things conſidered, plainly invincible? Sure I am, for my part, that I have done my true endeavour to finde it true, and am ſtill willing to doe ſo; but the more I ſeeke, the farther I am from finding, and therefore if it be true, certainly my not finding it is very excuſable, and you have reaſon to be very charitable in your cenſures of me. 2. Whereas you ſay, That *beſides theſe things neceſſary becauſe commanded, there are other things, which are commanded becauſe neceſſary: of which number you make Divine infallible faith, Baptiſme in Act for Children, and in Deſire for thoſe who are come to the uſe of Reaſon, and the Sacrament of Confeſſion, for thoſe who have committed mortall ſinne:* In theſe words you ſeeme to me to deliver a ſtrange Paradoxe *viz.* That Faith, and Baptiſme, and Confeſſion are not therefore neceſſary for us, becauſe God appointed them, but are therefore appointed by God becauſe they were neceſſary for us, antecedently to his appointment; which if it were true, I wonder what it was beſide God that made them neceſſary, and made it neceſſary for God to command them! Beſides, in making faith one of theſe neceſſary meanes, you ſeem to exclude Infants from Salvation: For *Faith comes by hearing*, and they have not heard. In requiring that this Faith ſhould be *divine and infallible*, you caſt your *Credentes* into

infinite perplexity, who cannot poſſibly by any ſure marke diſcerne whether their Faith be Divine or humane, or if you have any certain ſigne, whereby they may diſcerne, whether they believe your Churches infallibility with Divine or only with humane faith, I pray produce it, for perhaps it may ſerve us to ſhew, that our faith is divine as well as yours. Moreover in affirming that *Baptiſme in act is neceſſary for Infants, and for men onely in deſire*, You ſeeme to me in the latter to deſtroy the foundation of the former. For if a deſire of Baptiſme will ſerve men in ſtead of Baptiſme, then thoſe words of our Saviour, *Vnleſſe a man be borne again of water &c.* are not to be underſtood literally and rigidly of externall Baptiſme; for a deſire of Baptiſme is not Baptiſme, and ſo your foundation of the Abſolute neceſſity of Baptiſme is deſtroied. And if you may gloſſe the Text ſo farre, as that men may be ſaved by the deſire, without Baptiſme it ſelfe, becauſe they cannot have it, why ſhould you not gloſſe it a little farther, that there may be ſome hope of the ſalvation of unbaptized infants: to whom it was more impoſſible to have a deſire of Baptiſme, then for the former to have the thing it ſelfe? Laſtly, for your *Sacrament of Confeſſion*, we know none ſuch, nor any ſuch abſolute neceſſity of it. They that confeſſe their ſinnes and forſake them ſhall finde mercy, though they confeſſe them to God only and not to men. They that confeſſe them both to God and men, if they doe not effectually and in time forſake them, ſhall not finde mercy. 3. Whereas you ſay, that *ſuppoſing theſe meanes once appointed as abſolutely neceſſary to ſalvation, there cannot but ariſe an obligation of procuring to have them*; you muſt ſuppoſe I hope, that we know them to be ſo appointed, and that it is in our power to procure them: otherwiſe though it may be our ill fortune to faile of the end, for want of the meanes, certainly we cannot be obliged to procure them. For the rule of the law is alſo the dictate of common reaſon and equity, That *no man can be obliged to what is impoſſible*. We can be obliged to nothing but by vertue of ſome command: now it is impoſſible that God ſhould command in earneſt any thing which he knowes to be impoſſible. For to command in earneſt, is to command with an intent to be obeyed; which is not poſſible he ſhould doe, when he knowes the thing commanded to be impoſſible. Laſtly, whoſoever is obliged to doe any thing, and does it not, commits a fault; but Infants commit no fault in not procuring to have Baptiſme; therefore no obligation lies upon them to procure it. 4. Whereas you ſay, that *if Proteſtants diſſent from you in the point of the neceſſity of Baptiſme for Infants, it cannot be denied but that our diſagreement is in a point fundamentall*; If you mean a point eſteemed ſo by you, this indeed cannot be denied: But if you mean a point that indeed is fundamentall, this may certainly be denied, for I deny it, and ſay, that it doth not appear to me any way neceſſary to Salvation to hold the truth, or not to hold an error, touching the condition of theſe Infants. This is certain, and we muſt believe that God will not deale unjuſtly with them, but how in particular he will deale with them concernes not us, and therefore we need not much regard it.

5. Where-

5. Whereas you ſay the like of your *Sacrament of Penance*, you only ſay ſo, but your proofes are wanting. Laſtly, whereas you ſay, *This rigour ought not to ſeeme ſtrange or uniuſt in God, but that we are rather to bleſſe him for ordaining us to Salvation by any meanes*: I anſwer, that it is true, we are not to queſtion the known will of God, of injuſtice; yet whether that which you pretend to be Gods will, be ſo indeed, or only your preſumption, this I hope may be queſtion'd lawfully & without preſumption; and if we have occaſion we may ſafely put you in mind of *Ezekiel's* commination, againſt all thoſe who ſay, *thus ſaith the Lord*, when they have no certain warrant or authority from him to doe ſo.

8 *Ad* §.4. In the *fourth Paragraph* you deliver this falſe & wicked Doctrine, *that for the procuring our own ſalvation we are allwaies bound under pain of mortall ſinne to take the ſafeſt way, but for avoiding ſinne we are not bound to doe ſo, but may follow the opinion of any probable Doctors*, though the contrary may be certainly free from ſinne, and theirs be doubtfull. Which doctrine in the former part of it is apparēt. ly falſe: For though wiſdome and Charity to our ſelves would perſwade us alwaies to doe ſo, yet many times, that way which to our ſelves and our ſalvation is more full of hazard, is notwithſtanding not only lawfull, but more charitable and more noble. For example, to fly from a perſecution and ſo to avoid the temptation of it, may be the ſafer way for a mans own ſalvation; yet I preſume no man ought to condemne him of impiety, who ſhould reſolve not to uſe his liberty in this matter, but for Gods greater glory, the greater honor of truth, & the greater confirmation of his brethren in the faith, chooſe to ſtand out the ſtorme and endure the fiery tryall, rather then avoid it; rather to put his own ſoule to the hazard of a temptation, in hope of Gods aſſiſtance to goe through with it, then to baulke the opportunity of doing God and his brethren ſo great a ſervice. This part therefore of this Doctrine is manifeſtly untrue. The other not only falſe but impious; for therein you plainly give us to underſtand, that in your judgement, a reſolution to avoid ſinne, to the uttermoſt of our power, is no neceſſary meanes of Salvation, nay that a man may reſolve not to doe ſo, without any danger of damnation. Therein you teach us, that we are to doe more for the love of our ſelves, and our own happineſſe then for the love of God; and in ſo doing contradict our Saviour, who expreſly commands us, *to love the Lord our God with all our heart, with-all our ſoule, and with all our ſtrength*; and hath taught us *that the loue of God conſiſts in avoiding ſinne and keeping his commandements*. Therein you directly croſſe S. *Pauls* doctrine, who though he were a very probable Doctor, and had delivered his judgement for the *lawfulneſſe of eating meats offered to Idols*; yet he aſſures us that he which ſhould make ſcruple of doing ſo, and forbear upon his ſcruple, ſhould not ſinne, but only be *a weak brother*; whereas he, who ſhould doe it with a doubtfull conſcience, (though the action were by S. *Paul* warranted lawfull, yet) *ſhould ſinne and be condemn'd for ſo doing*. You pretend indeed to be rigid defenders and ſtout champions for the neceſſity of

good

good workes; but the truth is, *you ſpeak lies in hypocriſy*, and when the matter is well examin'd, will appear to make your ſelves and your own functions neceſſary, but obedience to God unneceſſary: Which will appear to any man who conſiders what ſtrict neceſſity the Scripture impoſes upon all men, of effectuall mortification of the habits of all vices, and effectuall converſion to newneſſe of life, and univerſall obedience, and withall remembers that an act of Attrition, which you ſay with Prieſtly abſolution is ſufficient to ſalvation, is not mortification, which being a work of difficulty and time, cannot be perform'd in an inſtant. But for the preſent, it appears ſufficiently out of this impious aſſertion, which makes it abſolutely neceſſary for men, either in Act if it be poſſible, or if not, in Deſire, to be Baptiz'd and Abſolv'd by you, and that with Intention: and in the mean time warrants them that for avoiding of ſinne, they may ſafely follow the uncertain guidance of a vain man, who you cannot deny may either be deceiv'd himſelfe, or out of malice deceive them, & neglect the certain direction of God himſelfe, and their own conſciences. What wicked uſe is made of this Doctrine, your own long experience can better informe you, then it is poſſible for me to doe: yet my own litle converſation with you affords one memorable example to this purpoſe. For upon this ground I knew a young Scholar in *Doway*, licenc'd by a great Caſuiſt to ſwear a thing as upon his certain knowledge, whereof he had yet no knowledge but only a great preſumption, *becauſe* (forſooth) *it was the opinion of one Doctor that he might doe ſo.* And upon the ſame ground, whenſoever you ſhall come to have a prevailing party in this Kingdome, and power ſufficient to reſtore your Religion, you may doe it by depoſing or killing the King, by blowing up of Parliaments, and by rooting out all others of a different faith from you. Nay this you may doe, though in your own opinion it be unlawfull, becauſe *Bellarmine*, a man with you of approved vertue, learning and judgement, hath declared his opinion for the lawfulneſſe of it, in ſaying, that *want of power to maintaine a rebellion, was the only reaſon that the Primitive Chriſtians did not rebell againſt the perſecuting Emperors.* By the ſame rule, ſeeing the Prieſts and Scribes and Phariſees, men of greateſt repute among the Iewes for vertue, learning and wiſdome, held it a lawfull and a pious work to perſecute Chriſt and his Apoſtles, it was lawfull for the people to follow their leaders: for herein, according to your Doctrine, they proceeded prudently, and according to the conduct of opinion, maturely weighed and approved by men as it ſeem'd to them of vertue, learning and wiſdome; nay by ſuch as ſate in *Moſes* chaire, and of whom it was ſaid, *whatſoever they bid you obſerve, that obſerve and doe:* which univerſall you pretend is to be underſtood univerſally, and without any reſtriction or limitation. And as lawfull was it for the Pagans to perſecute the Primitive Chriſtians, becauſe *Traian* & *Pliny*, men of great vertue and wiſdome were of this opinion. Laſtly, that moſt impious & deteſtable Doctrine, (which by a foule calumny you impute to me, who abhorre and deteſt it,) that *men may be ſaved in any Religion*, followes from this ground unavoidably. For certainly

Bellar. Contr. Barcl. c. 7. In 7. c. refutare conatur Barcl. verba illa Romuli. Veteres illos Imperatores Conſtantium Valentem & Cæteros non ideo toleravit Eccleſia quod legitimè ſucceſſiſſent, ſed quod illos ſine populi detrimento coercere non poterat. Et miratur hoc idem ſcripſiſſe Bellarminum. l. 5. de Pontif. c. 7. Sed ut magis miretur, ſciat hoc idem ſenſiſſe S. Thomam. 2. 2. q. 12. art. 2. ad 1. Vbi dicit Eccleſiam toleraſſe ut fideles obedirent Iuliano Apoſtatæ, quia in ſui novitate nondum habebant vires cõpeſcendi Principes terrenos. Et poſtea, Sanctus Gregorius dicit, nullum adverſus Iuliani perſecutionem fuiſſe remedium præter lachrimas, quoniam non habebat Eccleſia vires, quibus illius tyrannidi reſiſtere poſſet.

ly

ly Religion is one of thoſe things which is neceſſary only becauſe *it is* commanded: for if none were commanded under pain of damnation, how could it be damnable to be of any? Neither can it be damnable to be of a falſe Religion, unleſſe it be a ſin to be ſo. For neither are men ſaved by good luck, but only by obedience; neither are they damned for their ill fortune but for ſin and diſobedience. Death is the wages of nothing but ſin: and S. *Iames* ſure intended to deliver the adequate cauſe of ſin and death in thoſe words, ***Luſt when it hath conceived bringeth forth ſin, and ſin when it is finiſhed bringeth forth death.*** Seeing therefore in ſuch things, according to your doctrine, it is ſufficient for avoiding of ſin, that we proceed prudently, & by the conduct of ſome probable opinion, maturely weighed & approv'd by men of learning, vertue and wiſdome: and ſeeing neither Iews want their *Gamaliels*, nor Pagans their *Antoninus'es*, nor any ſect of Chriſtians ſuch profeſſors and maintainers of their ſeverall ſects, as are eſteem'd by the people, which know no better (and that very reaſonably) men of vertue, learning, and wiſdome, it followes evidently that the embracing their religion proceeds upon ſuch reaſon as may warrant their action to bee prudent, and this is ſufficient for avoiding of ſin, and therefore certainly for avoiding damnation, for that in humane affaires and diſcourſe, evidence and certainty cannot be alwaies expected. I haue ſtood the longer upon the refutation of this doctrine, not only becauſe it is impious, and becauſe bad uſe is made of it, and worſe may be, but only becauſe the contrary poſition, ***That men are bound for avoiding ſin alwaies to take the ſafeſt way***, is a faire and ſure foundation, for a cleer confutation of the main concluſion, which in this Chapter you labour in vain to prove, and a certain proof that in regard of the precept of charity towards ones ſelfe, and of obedience to God, Papiſts (unleſſe ignorance excuſe them) are in ſtate of ſin as long as they remain in ſubjection to the Roman Church.

9 For if the ſafer way for avoiding ſin, be alſo the ſafer way for avoiding damnation, then certainly whether the way of Proteſtants muſt be more ſecure, and the Roman way more dangerous, take but into your conſideration theſe enſuing controverſies: Whether it be lawfull to worſhip Pictures? to picture the Trinity? to invocate Saints and Angels? to deny Lay-men the Cup in the Sacrament? to adore the Sacrament? to prohibite certain Orders of men and woemen to marry? to celebrate the publique ſervice of God in a language which the aſſiſtants generally underſtand not? and you will not chooſe but confeſſe that in all theſe you are on the more dangerous ſide for the committing of ſin, and we on that which is more ſecure. For in all theſe things, if we ſay true, you doe that which is impious: on the other ſide if you were in the right, yet we might be ſecure enough, for we ſhould only not doe ſomething which you confeſſe not neceſſary to be done. We pretend, and are ready to juſtifie out of principles agreed upon between us, that in all theſe things, you violate the manifeſt commandements of God; and alleage ſuch texts of Scripture againſt you, as, if you would weigh them with any indifference, would put the matter

out of queſtion, but certainly you cannot with any modeſty deny, but that at leaſt they make it queſtionable. On the other ſide, you cannot with any face pretend, and if you ſhould, know not how to goe about to proue, that there is any neceſſity of doing any of theſe things; that it is unlawfull not to worſhip pictures, not to picture the Trinity, not to invocate Saints & Angels, not to giue all men the entire Sacrament, not to adore the Euchariſt, not to prohibite marriage, not to celebrate divine ſervice in an unknown tongue: I ſay you neither doe nor can pretend that there is any law of God which enjoynes us, no nor ſo much as an Evangelicall Counſell that adviſes us to doe any of theſe things. Now *where no law is there can be no ſin, for ſin is the trangreſſion of the law*; It remaines therefore that our forbearing to doe theſe things, muſt be free from all danger & ſuſpicion of ſin; whereas your acting of them, muſt be, if not certainly impious, without all contradiction queſtionable and dangerous. I conclude therefore that which was to be concluded, that if the ſafer way for avoiding ſin, be alſo (as moſt certainly it is,) the ſafer way for avoiding damnation, then certainly the way of Proteſtants muſt bee more ſafe, and the Roman way more dangerous. You will ſay, I know, that *theſe things being by your Church concluded lawfull, we are obliged by God, though not to doe, yet to approue them; at leaſt in your iudgement we are ſo, and therefore our condition is as queſtionable as yours.* I anſwer. The Authority of your Church is no common principle agreed upon between us, and therefore upon that you are not to diſpute againſt us. We might preſſe you with our judgement as well and as juſtly as you doe us with yours. Beſides, this very thing that your Church hath determin'd theſe things lawfull, and commanded the approbation of them, is that whereof ſhe is accuſed by us, and we maintain you haue done wickedly, or at leaſt very dangerouſly in ſo determining; becauſe in theſe very determinations, you haue forſaken that way which was ſecure from ſinne, and haue choſen that which you cannot but know to be very queſtionable and doubtfull; & conſequently haue forſaken the ſafe way to heaven, and taken a way which is full of danger. And therefore, although if your obedience to your Church were queſtioned, you might fly for ſhelter to your Churches determinations, yet when theſe very determinations are accuſed, me thinks they ſhould not be alleag'd in defence of themſelues. But you will ſay, your Church is infallible, & therefore her determinations not unlawfull. Anſ. They that accuſe your Church of error, you may be ſure doe queſtion her infallibility: ſhew therefore where it is written, that your Church is infallible, and the diſpute will be ended. But till you doe ſo, give mee leaue rather to conclude thus, your Church in many of her determinations, chooſes not that way which is more ſecure from ſin, and therefore not the ſafeſt way to ſalvation; then vainly to imagine her infallible, and there upon to believe, though ſhe teach not the ſecureſt way to avoid ſin, yet ſhee teaches the certainſt way to obtain ſalvation.

10 In the cloſe of this Number, you ſay as followes, *If it may appeare though not certain, yet at leaſt probable, that Proteſtancy unrepented*

ted deſtroies ſalvation, and withall that there is a ſafer way, it will follow that they are obliged by the law of Charity to that ſafe way. Anſ. Make this appear and I will never perſwade any man to continue a Proteſtant, for if I ſhould, I ſhould perſwade him to continue a fool. But after all theſe prolix diſcourſes, ſtill we ſee you are at, *If it may appeare:* From whence without all Ifs and Ands that appeares ſufficiently which I ſaid in the beginning of the *Chapter*, that the *foure firſt Paragraphs* of this Chap. are wholly ſpent in an unneceſſary introduction, unto that which never by any man in his right wits was denied, That *men in wiſdome and charity to themſelves are to take the ſafeſt way to eternall ſalvation.*

11 *Ad* § 5. In the *fift* you begin to make ſome ſhew of arguing, & tells us, that *Proteſtants haue reaſon to doubt in what caſe they ſtand, from what you haue ſaid about the Churches univerſall infallibility, & of her being Iudge of Controverſies, &c.* Anſ. From all that which you haue ſaid, they have reaſon only to conclude that you haue nothing to ſay. They haue as much reaſon to doubt, whether there can bee any Motion, from what *Zeno* ſaies in *Ariſtotles* Phyſicks, as to doubt from what you haue ſaid, whether the Roman Church may poſſibly erre. For this I dare ſay, that not the weakeſt of *Zeno's* arguments but is ſtronger then the ſtrongeſt of yours, and that you would be more perplext in anſwering any one of them, then I haue been in anſwering all yours. You are pleas'd to repeat two or three of them in this Section, and in all probability ſo wiſe a man as you are, if he would repeat any, would repeat the beſt, and therefore if I deſire the Reader by theſe to judge of the reſt, I ſhall deſire but ordinary juſtice.

12 The firſt of them being put into form ſtands thus; *Every leaſt errour in faith deſtroies the nature of faith; It is certain that ſome Proteſtants doe erre, and therefore they want the ſubſtance of Faith.* The Major of which Syllogiſme I haue formerly confuted by unanſwerable argumẽts out of one of your own beſt Authors, who ſhewes plainly that he hath amongſt you, as ſtrange as you make it, many other abettors. Beſides, if it were true, it would conclude that either you or the Dominicans haue no faith, in as much as you oppoſe one another as much as Arminians and Calviniſts.

13 The ſecond Argument ſtands thus, *Since all Proteſtants pretend the like certainty, it is cleer that none of them haue any certainty at all:* Which argument if it were good, then what can hinder but this muſt alſo be ſo, Since Proteſtants and Papiſts pretend the like certainty; it is cleer that none of them haue any certainty at all! And this too: Since all Chriſtians pretend the like certainty it is cleer that none of them haue any certainty at all! And thirdly this: Since men of all religions pretend a like certainty, it is cleer that none of them haue any at all! And laſtly this: Since oft-times they which are abuſed with a ſpecious Paralogiſme, pretend the like certainty with them which demonſtrate, it is cleer that none of them haue any certainty at all! Certainly Sir, Zeal and the Divell did ſtrangely blind you, if you did not ſee that theſe horrid impieties were the immediate conſequences of your poſi-

tions, if you did ſee it, & yet would ſet them down, you deſerve worſe cenſure. Yet ſuch as theſe, are all the arguments wherewith you conceive your ſelfe to have prov'd undoubtedly, that *Proteſtants haue reaſon at leaſt to doubt in what caſe they ſtand.* Neither am I afraid to venture my life upon it, that your ſelfe ſhall not chooſe ſo much as one out of all the pack, which I will not ſhew before indifferent Iudges, either to be impertinent to the queſtion, inconſequent in the deduction, or grounded upon ſome falſe, or at leaſt uncertain foundation.

14 Your third and fourth argument may bee thus put into one; *Proteſtants cannot tell what points in particular be fundamentall; therefore they cannot tell whether they or their brethren doe not erre fundamentally, and whether their difference be not fundamentall.* Both which deductions I haue formerly ſhewed to be moſt inconſequent; for knowing the Scripture to contain all fundamentalls, (though many more points beſides, which makes it difficult to ſay preciſely what is fundamentall and what not,) knowing this I ſay and believing it, what can hinder but that I may be well aſſured, that I belieue all fundamentalls, and that all who believe the Scripture ſyncerely as well as I, doe not differ from me in any thing fundamentall?

15 In the cloſe of this Section, you ſay, that *you omit to adde that we want the Sacrament of Repentance inſtituted for the remiſſion of ſins, or at leaſt we muſt confeſſe that we hold it not neceſſary: and yet our own brethren the Century writers acknowledge that in the times of Cyprian and Tertullian, private Confeſſion even of thoughts was uſed, and that it was then commanded and thought neceſſary; and then our Ordination,* you ſay *is very doubtfull and all that depends upon it.* Anſ. I alſo omit to anſwer, 1. That your brother *Rhenanus*, acknowledges the contrary, & aſſures us that the Confeſſion then required and in uſe, was publique, and before the Church, and that your auricular Confeſſion was not then in the world; for which his mouth is ſtopped by your *Index Expurgatorius.* 2. That your brother *Arcudius* acknowledges, that the Euchariſt was in *Cyprians* time given to Infants, and eſteemed neceſſary, or at leaſt profitable for them, and the giving it ſhewes no leſſe; & now I would know whether you will acknowledge your Church bound to giue it, and to eſteem ſo of it? 3. That it might be then commanded, and being commanded be thought neceſſary, and yet be but a Church Conſtitution. Neither will I deny, if the preſent Church, could, and would ſo order it, that the abuſes of it might bee prevented, and conceiving it profitable, ſhould enjoyn the uſe of it, but that being commanded it would be neceſſary. 4. Concerning our Ordinations, beſides that I haue prou'd it impoſſible that they ſhould be ſo doubtfull as yours, according to your own principles; I anſwer, that experience ſhewes them certainly ſufficient to bring men to faith and repentance, and conſequently to ſalvation; and that if there were any ſecret defect of any thing neceſſary, which we cannot help, God will certainly ſupply it.

16 *Ad § 6.* In the *ſixt*, you ſay, *you will not repeat, but only put us again in minde that unleſſe the Roman Church were the true Church there*

was

was no viſible Church upon earth, a thing ſo manifeſt that Proteſtants themſelves confeſſe, &c. Anſ. Neither will I repeat, but only put you in minde that you haue not prov'd that there is any neceſſity that there ſhould be any viſible true Church; nor if there were, that there was no other beſides the Roman. For as for the confeſſion of Proteſtants which here you inſiſt upon, it is evident out of their own words cited by your ſelfe, that by the *whole world*, they meant onely the *greateſt part of it*, which is an uſuall figure of ſpeech; and never intended to deny that beſides the Church then reigning & triumphing in this world, there was another militant Church, other Chriſtians viſible enough though perſecuted and oppreſſed. Nor thirdly doe you here make good ſo much as with one fallacy, that if the Roman Church were then the viſible Church, it muſt needs be now the only or the ſafer way to heaven; and yet the connexion of this conſequence was very neceſſary to be ſhewne. For, for ought I know, it was not impoſſible that it might then be the only Viſible Church, & yet now a very dangerous way to heaven, or perhaps none at all.

17 Afterwards you vainly pretend that *all Roman Catholiques, not one excepted, profeſſe, that Proteſtancy unrepented deſtroies ſalvation.* Frō which generality wee may except two at leaſt to my knowledge, and thoſe are, *your ſelfe*, and *Franciſcus de Sancta Clara*, who aſſures us that *Ignorance and Repentance may excuſe a Proteſtant from damnation though dying in his errour.* And this is all the charity, which by your own confeſſion alſo, the moſt favourable Proteſtants allow to Papiſts; and therefore with ſtrange repugnance to your ſelfe you ſubjoyne, that *theſe are the men whom we muſt hold not to erre damnably, unleſſe we will deſtroy our owne Church and ſalvation.* Whereas, as I have ſaid before, though you were Turks, and Pagans, we might bee good Chriſtians. Neither is it neceſſary for the perpetuating of a Church before *Luther*, that your errours even then ſhould not be *damnable*, but only not *actually damning* to ſome ignorant ſoules among you. In vaine therefore doe you make ſuch tragedies as here you doe! In vaine you conjure us with *feare and trembling to conſider theſe things*! We have conſidered them againe and againe, and look't upon them on both ſides, & finde neither terrour nor truth in them. Let children and fooles bee terrified with bug-beares, men of underſtanding will not regard them.

* *In Problem.* 15. & 16.

18 *Ad §. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11.* Your whole diſcourſe in your *five next Paragraphs*, I have in the beginning of this Chapter fully confuted, by ſaying, that it ſtands altogether upon the falſe foundation of this affected miſtake, that *we doe and muſt confeſſe the Roman Church free from damnable error*; which will preſently be apparent, to any one who conſiders, that the *ſeaventh and tenth* are nothing but D. *Potters* words; and that in the *other three*, you obtrude upon us this *Crambe* no fewer then ſeven times. May you be pleaſed to look back to your own Book, & you ſhall find it ſo as I have ſaid: & that at leaſt in a hundred other places you make your advantage of this falſe imputation: which when you have obſerv'd, and withall conſidered that your ſelfe plainly intimate, that D. *Potters* diſcourſes which here you cenſure, would

be good and concluding, if we did not (as we doe not) free you from damnable errour, I hope you will acknowledge that my vouchſafing theſe *Sections* the honour of any farther anſwer, is a great ſupererrogation in point of civility. Nevertheleſſe partly that I may the more ingratiate my ſelfe with you, but eſpecially, that I may ſtop their mouthes who will be apt to ſay, that every word of yours which I ſhould omit to ſpeak to, is an unanſwerable argument, I will hold my purpoſe of anſwering them more punctually and particularly.

19 Firſt then, to your little parentheſis, which you interline among D. *Potters* words, §. 7. *That any ſmall error in faith deſtroies all faith*, (To omit what hath been ſaid before,) I anſwer here what is proper for this place; that S. *Auſtine*, whoſe authority is here ſtood upon, thought otherwiſe: He conceived the Donatiſts to hold ſome error in faith and yet not to have no faith. His words of them to this purpoſe are moſt pregnant and evident, *you are with us* (ſaith he to the Donatiſts. Ep. 48.) *in Baptiſme, in the Creed, in the other Sacraments*: And again. *Super geſtis cum emerit: Thou haſt proved to me that thou haſt faith; prove to me likewiſe that thou haſt charity.* Paralell to which words are theſe of *Optatus*, *Amongſt us and you is one Eccleſiaſticall converſation, common leſſons, the ſame faith, the ſame Sacraments.* Where by the way we may obſerve, that in the judgements of theſe Fathers, even the Donatiſts, though Heretiques and Schiſmatiques, gave true Ordination, the true Sacrament of Matrimony, true Sacramentall Abſolution, Confirmation, the true Sacrament of the Euchariſt, true extream Vnction; or elſe (chooſe you whether) ſome of theſe were not then eſteem'd Sacraments. But for Ordination, whether he held it a Sacrament or no, certainly he held that it remain'd with them entire: for ſo he ſaies in expreſſe tearmes, in his book againſt *Parmenianus* his Epiſtle. Which Doctrine if you can reconcile with the preſent Doctrine of the Roman Church, *Eris mihi magnus Apollo.*

Lib. 5. prope initium.

Lib. 2. c. 3.

20 Whereas in the beginning of the 8. Sect. *you deny that your argument drawn from our confeſſing the Poſſibility of your Salvation, is for ſimple people alone, but for all men:* I anſwer, certainly whoſoever is moved with it, muſt be ſo ſimple as to think this a good and a concluding reaſon; Some ignorant men in the Roman Church may be ſav'd, by the confeſſion of Proteſtants, (which is indeed all that they confeſſe,) therefore it is ſafe for me to be of the Roman Church; and he that does think ſo, what reaſon is there why he ſhould not think this as good, Ignorant Proteſtans may be ſaved, by the confeſſion of Papiſts, (by name Mr K.) therefore it is ſafe for me to be of the Proteſtant Church? Whereas you ſay, that *this your argument is grounded upon an inevitable neceſſity for us, either to grant Salvation to your Church, or to entail certain damnation upon our own, becauſe ours can have no being till Luther, unleſſe yours be ſuppoſed to have been the true Church.* I anſwer, this cauſe is no cauſe: For firſt, as *Luther* had no being before *Luther*, and yet he was when he was, though he was not before; ſo there is no repugnance in the termes, but that there might be a true Church after *Luther*, though there were none for ſome ages before

before; as ſince *Columbus* his time, there have been Chriſtians in *America*, though before there were none for many ages. For neither doe you ſhew, neither does it appear, that the generation of Churches is univocall, that nothing but a Church can poſſibly beget a Church; nor that the preſent being of a true Church, depends neceſſarily upon the perpetuity of a Church in all ages; any more then the preſent being of Peripateticks or Stoicks depends upon a perpetuall pedigree of them. For though I at no hand deny the Churches perpetuity, yet I ſee nothing in your book to make me underſtand, that the truth of the preſent depends upon it, nor any thing that can hinder, but that a falſe Church, (Gods providence overwatching and overruling it,) may preſerve the meanes of confuting their own Hereſies, and reducing men to truth, and ſo raiſing a true Church, I mean the integrity and the authority of the word of God with men. Thus the Iewes preſerve meanes to make men Chriſtians, and Papiſts preſerve means to make men Proteſtants, and Proteſtants (which you ſay are a falſe Church) doe, as you pretend, preſerve means to make men Papiſts; that is, their own Bibles, out of which you pretend to be able to prove that they are to be Papiſts. Secondly, you ſhew not, nor does it appear that the perpetuity of *the Church* depends on the truth of *yours*. For though you talke vainly, as if you were the only men in the world before *Luther*, yet the world knowes that this is but talke, and that there were other Chriſtians beſides you, which might have perpetuated the Church though you had not beene. Laſtly, you ſhew not, neither doth it appear, that your being acknowledged in ſome ſenſe a true Church, doth neceſſarily import, that we muſt grant ſalvation to it, unleſſe by it you underſtand the ignorant members of it, which is a very unuſuall *Sinechdoche*.

21 Whereas you ſay, *that Catholiques never granted that the Donatiſts had a true Church or might be ſaved*. I anſw. S. *Auſtin* himſelfe granted that thoſe among them, who ſought the Truth, being *ready when they found it to correct their error were not Heretiques, and therefore notwithſtanding their error might be ſaved*. And this is all the Charity that Proteſtants allow to Papiſts.

22 Whereas you ſay, that D. *Potter* having cited out of S. *Auſtine* the words of the Catholiques, *that the Donatiſts had true Baptiſme*, when he comes to the contrary words of the Donatiſt, addes, *no Church, no Salvation*! Anſ. You wrong D. *Potter*, who pretends not to cite S. *Auſtines* formall words but only his ſenſe, which in him is compleat and full for that purpoſe whereto it is alleaged by D. *Potter*. His words are, *Petilianus dixit, venite ad Eccleſiam Populi & aufugite Traditores, ſi perire non vultis: Petilian ſaith, come to the Church yee people, and fly from the Traditours if ye will not be damn'd, for that yee may know that they being guilty, eſteeme very well of our Faith, Behold I Baptize theſe whom they have infected, but they receive thoſe whom we have baptized*. Where it is plain, that *Petilian* by his words makes the Donatiſts the Church, and excludes the Catholiques from ſalvation abſolutely. And therefore *no Church, no Salvation* was not D. *Potters* addi-

Cont. lit. Petil. l. 2. c. 108.

addition. And whereas you ſay, the *Catholiques never yeelded that among the Donatiſts there was a true Church and hope of Salvation*, I ſay it appears by what I have alleaged out of S. *Auſtine*, that they yeelded both theſe were among the Donatiſts, as much as we yeeld them to be among the Papiſts. As for D. *Potters* acknowledgement, that *they maintained an error in the matter & nature of it Heretical*: This proves them but Materiall Heretiques, whom you doe not exclude from poſſibility of Salvation. So that all things conſidered, this argument muſt be much more forcible from the Donatiſts againſt the Catholiques, then from Papiſts againſt Proteſtants, in regard Proteſtants grant Papiſts no more hope of ſalvation then Papiſts grant Proteſtants: whereas the Donatiſts excluded abſolutely all but their own Part from hope of Salvation, ſo farre as to account them no Chriſtians that were not of it: the Catholiques mean while accounting them Brethren, and freeing thoſe among them, from the imputation of Hereſy, who being in error *quærebant cautâ ſollicitudine veritatem corrigi parati cùm invenerint*.

23 Whereas you ſay, *That the Argument for the certainty of their Baptiſme (becauſe it was confeſſed good by Catholiques, whereas the Baptiſme of Catholiques was not confeſſed by them to be good,) is not ſo good as yours, touching the certainty of your Salvation grounded on the confeſſion of Proteſtants, becauſe wee confeſſe there is no damnable error in the Doctrine or practice of the Roman Church*: I Anſ. no: we confeſſe no ſuch matter, and though you ſay ſo a hundred times, no repetition will make it true. We profeſſe plainly, that many damnable errors plainly repugnant to the precepts of Chriſt both Ceremoniall and Morall, more plainly then this of Rebaptization, and therefore more damnable, are believed and profeſſed by you. And therefore ſeeing this is the only diſparity you can deviſe, and this is vaniſhed, it remaines that as good an anſwer as the Catholiques made touching the certainty of their Baptiſme, as good may we make, and with much more evidence of Reaſon, touching the ſecurity and certainty of our Salvation.

24 By the way I deſire to be inform'd, ſeeing you affirme that *Rebaptizing thoſe whom Hereticks had baptized was a ſacriledge, and a profeſſion of a damnable Hereſie*, when it began to be ſo? If from the beginning it were ſo, then was *Cyprian* a ſacrilegious profeſſor of a damnable hereſy, and yet a Saint and a martyr. If it were not ſo, then did your Church excommunicate *Firmilian* and others, and ſeparate from them without ſufficient ground of Excommunication or Separation, which is Schiſmaticall. You ſee what difficulties you runne into on both ſides; chooſe whether you will, but certainly both can hardly be avoided.

25 Whereas again in this §. you obtrude upon us, *That we cannot but confeſſe that your doctrine containes no damnable error, and that yours is ſo certainly a true Church, that unleſſe yours be true we cannot pretend any*: I anſwer, there is in this neither truth nor modeſty to outface us, that we cannot but confeſſe what indeed we connot but deny.

ny. For my part, if I were upon the rack, I perſwade my ſelfe I ſhould not confeſſe the one nor the other.

26 Whereas again preſently you adde, that *D. Potter grants we ſhould be guilty of Schiſme, if we did cut off your Church from the body of Chriſt and the hope of Salvation*: I have ſhewed above that he grants no ſuch matter. He ſaies indeed, *that our not doing ſo frees us from the imputation of Schiſme*, & from hence you ſophiſtically interre, that he *muſt grant, If we did ſo, wee were Schiſmatiques*, and then make your Reader believe, that this is D. *Potters* confeſſion, it being indeed your own falſe collection. For as every one that is not a Papiſt, is not a Ieſuit, and yet not every one that is a Papiſt is a Ieſuit: As whoſoever comes not into England, comes not to London, and yet many may come to England, and not come to London: As whoſoever is not a man, is not a King, and yet many are men that are not Kings: So likewiſe it may be certain, that whoſoever does not ſo is free from Schiſme, and yet they that doe ſo (if there be ſufficient cauſe,) may be not guilty of it.

27 Whereas you *pretend to wonder that the Doctor did not anſwer the argument of the Donatiſts, which he ſaies is all one with yours, but referres you to S. Auſtine there to read it, as if every one carried with him a Library, or were able to examin the places in S. Auſtin*: I anſwer, the parity of the Arguments was that which the Doctor was to declare, whereto it was impertinent what the anſwer was: But ſufficient it was to ſhew that the Donatiſts argument which you would never grant good, was yet as good as yours, and therefore yours could not be good. Now to this purpoſe as the concealing the anſwer was no way advantagious, ſo to produce it was not neceſſary; and therefore he did you more ſervice then he was bound to, in referring you to S. *Auſtin* for an anſwer to it. Whereas you ſay, *he had reaſon to conceale it becauſe it makes directly againſt himſelfe*: I ſay it is ſo farre from doing ſo, that it will ſerve in proportion to the argument, as fitly as if it had been made for it: for as S. *Auſtine* ſaies, *that Catholiques approve the Doctrine of Donatiſts, but abhorre their Hereſy of Re-baptization*: ſo we ſay, that we approve thoſe fundamentall and ſimply neceſſary Truths which you retaine, by which ſome good ſoules among you may be ſaved, but abhorre your many Superſtitions and Hereſies. And as he ſaies, that as gold is good, yet ought not to be ſought for among a company of Theeves, and Baptiſme good but not to be ſought for in the Conventicles of Donatiſts: ſo ſay we, that the Truths you retaine are good, and as we hope ſufficient to bring good ignorant ſoules among you to ſalvation, yet are not to be ſought for in the Conventicle of Papiſts, who hold with them a mixture of many vanities, and many impieties. For, *as for our freeing you from damnable Hereſy, and yeelding you Salvatiõ*, (which ſtone here again you ſtumble at,) neither he nor any other Proteſtant is guily of it; and therefore you muſt confeſſe that this very anſwer will ſerve Proteſtants againſt this charme of Papiſts, as well as S. *Auſtine* againſt the Donatiſts, and that indeed it was not *D. Potter* but *You*, that, without a Sarcaſme, *had reaſon to conceale*-

ceale this Anſwer.

28 The laſt piece of D.*Potters* book, which you are pleaſed to take notice of in this *firſt Part* of yours, is an argument he makes in your behalfe p.79. of his book, where he makes you ſpeak thus, *If Proteſtants believe the Religion of Papiſts to be a ſafe way to heaven, why doe they not follow it?* This argument you like not, becauſe *many things may be good and yet not neceſſary to be embraced by every body*, & therefore ſcoffe at it, and call it an *argument of his own, a wiſe argument, a wiſe demand*: and then aske of him, what he thinkes of it being fram'd thus, *Our Religion is ſafe, even by your confeſſion, and therefore you ought to grant that all may embrace it.* And yet farther thus, *Among different Religions one only can be ſafe: But yours by our own confeſſion is ſafe: whereas you hold that in ours there is no hope of ſalvation, therefore we ought to embrace yours.* Anſ. I have adviſed with him, & am to tell you frō him, that he thinks reaſonable well of the arguments, but very ill of him that makes them, as affirming ſo often without ſhame and conſcience, what he cannot but know to be plainly falſe: and his reaſon is becauſe he is ſo farre from confeſſing, or giving you any ground to pretend he does confeſſe, *that your Religion is ſafe for all that are of it*, from whence only it will follow that all may ſafely embrace it, that in this very place, from which you take theſe words, he profeſſeth plainly, *that it is extreamly dangerous, if not certainly damnable to all ſuch as profeſſe it, when either they doe, or if their hearts were upright and not perverſly obſtinat might believe the contrary, and that for us who are convinc'd in conſcience that ſhe (the Roman Church) erres in many things, it lies upon us, even under pain of damnation to forſake her in thoſe errors.* And though here you take upon you a ſhew of great rigour, and will ſeem to hold *that in our way there is no hope of Salvation*; yet formerly you have been more liberall of your charity towards us, and will needs vye and contend with D.*Potter* which of *the two ſhall be more Charitable*, aſſuring us that *you allow Proteſtants as much Charity as D.Potter ſpares you, for whom he makes Ignorance the beſt hope of Salvation.* And now I appeale to any indifferent reader, whether our diſavowing to confeſſe you free from damnable error, were not (as I pretend) a full confutation of all that you ſay in theſe *five foregoing Paragraphs*: And as for you I wonder, what anſwer, what evaſion, what ſhift you can deviſe to cleere your ſelfe from diſhoneſty, for imputing to him almoſt a hundred times, this acknowledgment which he never makes, but very often, and that ſo plainly that you take notice of it, profeſſeth the contrary!

Chap.1.§.4.

29 The beſt defence that poſſibly can be made for you, I conceive, is this, that you were led into this error, by miſtaking a ſuppoſition of a confeſſion, for a confeſſion; a Rhetoricall conceſſion of the Doctors, for a poſitive aſſertion. He ſaies indeed of your errors, *Though of themſelves they be not damnable to them which believe as they profeſſe, yet for us to profeſſe what we believe not, were without queſtion damnable.* But, to ſay, *Though your errors be not damnable, we may not profeſſe them*, is not to ſay, your errors are not damnable, but *only though they be not.*

As

As if you ſhoul ſay, though the Church erre in points not fundamentall, yet you may not ſeparate from it: Or, though we doe erre in believing Chriſt really preſent, yet our error frees us from Idolatry: Or, as if a Proteſtant ſhould ſay, Though you doe not commit Idolatry in adoring the Hoſt, yet being uncertain of the Prieſts Intention to conſecrate, at leaſt you expoſe your ſelfe to the danger of it: I preſume you would not think it fairely done, if any man ſhould interpret either this laſt ſpeech as an acknowledgemẽt, that you doe not commit Idolatry, or the former as confeſſions, that you doe erre in points not fundamentall, that you doe erre in believing the reall preſence. And therefore you ought not ſo to have miſtaken D. *Potters* words, as if he had confeſſed the errors of your Church not damnable, when he ſaies no more but this, *Though they be ſo*, or, ſuppoſe, or put the caſe they be ſo, yet being errors, we that know them may not profeſſe them to be divine truths. Yet this miſtake might have been pardonable, had not D. *Potter* in many places of his book, by declaring his judgement touching the quality and malignity of your errors, taken away from you all occaſion of error. But now that he ſaies plainly, *That your Church hath many waies played the Harlot, and in that regard, deſerv'd a Bill of divorce from Chriſt, and the deteſtation of Chriſtians p.11. That for that Maſſe of Errors and abuſes in judgement and practice which is proper to her, and wherein ſhe differs from us, we judge a reconciliation impoſſible, and to us (who are convicted in conſcience of her corruptions) damnable. pag.20. That Popery is the contagion or plague of the Church. p.60. That we cannot, we dare not communicate with her in her publique Liturgy, which is manifeſtly polluted with droſſe of Superſtition. p. 68. That they who in former ages dyed in the Church of Rome died in many ſinfull errors. p.78. That they that have underſtanding and means to diſcover their errors and neglect to uſe them, he dares not flatter them with ſo eaſy a cenſure, as to give them hope of ſalvation p.79. That the way of the Roman Religion is not ſafe, but very dangerous, if not certainly damnable, to ſuch as profeſſe it, when they believe (or if their hearts were upright and not perverſely obſtinate might believe) the contrary, p.79. That your Church is but (in ſome ſenſe) a true Church, and your errors only to ſome men not damnable, & that we who are convinc'd in conſcience that ſhe erres in many things, are under pain of damnation to forſake her in thoſe errors.* Seeing I ſay, he ſaies all this ſo plainly and ſo frequently, certainly your charging him falſely with this acknowledgement, and building a great part not only of your diſcourſe in this Chapter, but of your whole book upon it, poſſibly it may be palliated with ſome excuſe, but it can no way be defended with any juſt apology. Eſpecially ſeeing you your ſelfe more then once or twice, take notice of theſe his ſeverer cenſures of your Church, and the errors of it, and make your advantage of them. In the firſt number of your firſt Chapter, you ſet down three of the former places; and from thence inferre, That *as you affirme Proteſtancy unrepented deſtroies Salvation, ſo D. Potter pronounces the like heavy doome againſt Roman Catholiques:* and again §.4. of the ſame Chap. *We allow Proteſtants as much charity*

as D. Potter ſpares us, for whom he makes ignorance the beſt hope of ſalvation. And c. 5. §. 41. you have theſe words: *It is very ſtrange that you iudge us extreamly uncharitable in ſaying Proteſtants cannot be ſaved, while your ſelfe avouch the ſame of all Learned Catholiques, whom Ignorance cannot excuſe!* Thus out of the ſame mouth you blow hot and cold; and one while, when it is for your purpoſe, you profeſſe D. *Potter cenſures your errors as heavily as you doe ours*; which is very true, for he gives hope of Salvation to none among you, but to thoſe whoſe ignorance was the cauſe of their error, and no ſinne cauſe of their ignorance: and preſently after, when another project comes in your head, you make his words ſofter then oile towards you; you pretend he does and muſt confeſſe, *That your Doctrine containes no damnable error, that your Church is certainly a true Church, that your way to heaven is a ſafe way*, and all theſe acknowledgements you ſet down ſimple and abſolute, without any reſtriction or limitation; whereas in the Doctor they are all ſo qualified, that no knowing Papiſt can promiſe himſelfe any ſecurity or comfort from them. *We confeſſe* (ſaith he) *the Church of Rome to be* (*in ſome ſenſe*) *a true Church, and her errors* (*to ſome men*) *not damnable: we believe her Religion ſafe, that is, by Gods great mercy not damnable, to ſome ſuch as believe what they profeſſe: But we believe it not ſafe but very dangerous, if not certainly damnable to ſuch as profeſſe it, when they believe* (*or if their hearts were upright and not perverſly obſtinate might believe*) *the contrary.* Obſerve I pray theſe reſtraining termes which formerly you have diſſembled, *A true Church in ſome ſenſe, not damnable to ſome men, a ſafe way, that is by Gods great mercy not damnable to ſome*: And then ſeeing you have pretended theſe confeſſions to be abſolute, which are thus plainly limited, how can you avoid the imputation of an egregious Sophiſter? You quarrell with the Doctor, in the end of your Preface, for uſing in his Book ſuch ambiguous tearmes as theſe, *in ſome ſort, in ſome ſenſe, in ſome degree:* and deſire him if *he make any reply, either to forbear them, or to tell you roundly in what ſort, in what ſenſe, in what degree, he underſtands theſe and the like mincing phraſes.* But the truth is he hath not left them ſo ambiguous and undetermin'd as you pretend; but told you plainly, in what *ſenſe, your Church may paſſe for a true Church, viz.* In regard we may hope that ſhe retaines thoſe truths which are ſimply, abſolutely, and indiſpenſably neceſſary to Salvation, which may ſuffice to bring thoſe good ſoules to heaven, who wanted meanes of diſcovering their errors; this is the charitable conſtruction in which you may paſſe for a Church: And *to what men your Religion may be ſafe, and your errors not damnable, viz.* to ſuch whom Ignorance may excuſe, and therefore he hath more cauſe to complain of you, for quoting his words without thoſe qualifications, then you to finde fault with him for uſing of them.

30 That your Diſcourſe in the 12. §. preſſeth you as forcibly as Proteſtants, I have ſhewed above: I adde here, 1. Whereas you ſay that *faith, according to rigid Calviniſts, is either ſo ſtrong, that once had, it can never be loſt, or ſo more then weak, and ſo much nothing that it can*

never

never be gotten: That, theſe are words without ſenſe. Never any Calviniſt affirmed that faith was ſo weak, and ſo much nothing that it can never be gotten: but it ſeemes you wanted matter to make up your Antitheſis, and therefore were reſolved to ſpeak empty words rather then looſe your figure, *Crimina raſis*
Librat in antithetis, doctas poſuiſſe Figuras
Laudatur. 2. That there is no Calviniſt that will deny the Truth of this propoſition, Chriſt died for all, nor to ſubſcribe to that ſenſe of it, which your Dominicans put upon it; neither can you with coherence to the received Doctrine of your own Society, deny that they as well as the Calviniſts, take away the diſtinction of ſufficient and effectuall grace, and indeed hold none to be ſufficient, but only that which is effectuall. 3. Whereas you ſay, *They cannot make their calling certain by good workes, who doe certainly believe that before any good works they are juſtified, and juſtified by faith alone, and by that faith whereby they certainly believe they are juſtified:* I anſ. There is no Proteſtant but believes that Faith, Repentance, and univerſall Obedience, are neceſſary to the obtaining of Gods favour and eternall happineſſe. This being granted, the reſt is but a ſpeculative Controverſy, a Queſtion about words which would quickly vaniſh, but that men affect not to underſtand one another. As if a company of Phyſitians were in conſultation, and ſhould all agree, that three medicines and no more were neceſſary for the recovery of the Patients health, this were ſufficient for his direction towards the recovery of his health; though concerning the proper and ſpecificall effects of theſe three medicines, there ſhould be amongſt them as many differences as men: So likewiſe being generally at accord that theſe three things, Faith, Hope, & Charity, are neceſſary to ſalvation, ſo that whoſoever wants any of them cannot obtain it, and he which hath them all cannot faile of it, is it not very evident that they are ſufficiently agreed for mens directions to eternall Salvation? And ſeeing Charity is a full comprehenſion of all good workes, they requiring Charity as a neceſſary qualification in him that will be ſaved, what ſenſe is there in ſaying, *they cannot make their calling certain by good workes?* They know what ſalvation is as well as you, and have as much reaſon to deſire it: They believe it as heartily as you, that there is no good worke but ſhall have its proper reward, and that there is no poſſibility of obtaining the eternall reward without good workes: and why then may not this Doctrine be a ſufficient incitement and provocation unto good workes?

31 You ſay, that *they certainly believe that before any good works they are juſtified:* But this is a calumny. There is no Proteſtant but requires to Iuſtification, Remiſſion of ſinnes, and to Remiſſion of ſinnes they all require Repentance, and Repentance I preſume may not be denied the name of a good worke, being indeed, if it be rightly underſtood, and according to the ſenſe of the word in Scripture, an effectuall converſion from all ſinne to all holineſſe. But though it be taken for meer ſorrow for ſinnes paſt, and a bare purpoſe of amendment, yet even this is a good worke, and therefore Proteſtants requiring this to

Remiſſion of ſinnes, and Remiſſion of ſinnes to juſtification, cannot with candor be pretended to believe, that they are juſtified before any good worke.

32 You ſay, *They believe themſelves iuſtified by faith alone, and that by that faith whereby they believe themſelves iuſtified:* Some peradventure doe ſo, but withall they believe that that faith which is alone, and unaccompanied with *ſincere* and univerſall obedience, is to be eſteem'd not faith but preſumption, and is at no hand ſufficient to juſtification: that though Charity be not imputed unto juſtification, yet is it required as a neceſſary diſpoſition in the perſon to be juſtified, and that though in regard of the imperfection of it, no man can be juſtified by it, yet that on the other ſide, no man can be juſtified without it. So that upon the whole matter, a man may truly and ſafely ſay, that the Doctrine of theſe Proteſtants, taken altogether, is not a Doctrine of Liberty, not a Doctrine that turnes hope into preſumptiō, and carnall ſecurity, though it may juſtly be feared, that many licentious perſons, taking it by halfes, have made this wicked uſe of it. For my part, I doe heartily wiſh, that by publique Authority it were ſo ordered, that no man ſhould ever preach or print this Doctrine that Faith alone juſtifies, unleſſe he joynes this together with it, that univerſall obedience is neceſſary to ſalvation. And beſides that thoſe Chapters of S. *Paul* which intreat of juſtification by faith, without the works of the Law, were never read in the Church, but when the 13. Chap. of the 1. Epiſt. to the *Corinth.* concerning the abſolute neceſſity of Charity ſhould be, to prevent miſpriſion, read together with them.

33 Whereas you ſay, that *ſome Proteſtants doe expreſly affirme the former point to be the ſoule of the Church, &c. and that therefore they muſt want the Theologicall vertue of Hope, and that none can have true hope, while they hope to be ſaved in their Communion.* I Anſ. They have great reaſon to believe the Doctrine of Iuſtification by faith only, a Point of great weight and importance, if it be rightly underſtood: that is, they have reaſon to eſteeme it a principall and neceſſary duty of a Chriſtian, to place his hope of juſtification and ſalvation, not in the perfection of his own righteouſneſſe (which if it be imperfect will not juſtify,) but only in the mercies of God through Chriſts ſatisfaction: and yet notwithſtanding this, nay the rather for this, may preſerve themſelves in the right temper of good Chriſtians, which is a happy mixture and ſweet compoſition of confidence and feare. If this Doctrine be otherwiſe expounded then I have here expounded, I will not undertake the juſtification of it, only I will ſay (that which I may doe truly) that I never knew any Proteſtant ſuch a ſoli-fidian, but that he did believe theſe divine truths; *That he muſt make his calling certain by good workes: That he muſt work out his ſalvation with Fear and Trembling, and that while he does not ſo, he can have no well-grounded hope of Salvation*: I ſay I never met with any who did not believe theſe divine Truths, and that with a more firme, and a more unſhaken aſſent, then he does that himſelfe is predeſtinate, and that he is

juſtified

juſtified by believing himſelfe juſtified. I never met with any ſuch, who if he ſaw there were a neceſſity to doe either, would not rather forgoe his beliefe of theſe Doctrines then the former: theſe which he ſees diſputed and contradicted and oppoſed with a great multitude of very potent Arguments; then thoſe, which being the expreſſe words of Scripture, whoſoever ſhould call into queſtion, could not with any modeſty pretend to the title of Chriſtian. And therefore there is no reaſon but we may believe, that their full aſſurance of the former Doctrines doth very well qualify their perſwaſion of the latter, and that the former (as alſo the lives of many of them doe ſufficiently teſtify) are more effectuall to temper their hope, and to keep it at a ſtay of a filiall and modeſt aſſurance of Gods favour, built upon the conſcience of his love and fear, then the latter can be to ſwell and puffe them up into vain confidence and ungrounded preſumption. This reaſon, joyn'd with our experience of the honeſt and religious converſation of many men of this opinion, is a ſufficient ground for Charity, to hope well of their hope: and to aſſure our ſelves that it cannot be offenſive, but rather moſt acceptable to God, if notwithſtanding this diverſity of opinion, we embrace each other with the ſtrict embraces of love & communion. To you and your Church we leave it, to ſeparate Chriſtians from the Church, and to proſcribe them from heaven upon triviall and trifling cauſes: As for our ſelves, we conceive a charitable judgement of our Brethren and their errors, though untrue, much more pleaſing to God then a true judgement, if it be uncharitable; and and therefore ſhall alwaies chooſe (if we doe erre) to erre on the milder and more mercifull part, and rather to retain thoſe in our Communion which deſerve to be ejected, then eject thoſe that deſerve to be retain'd.

34 Laſtly, whereas you ſay, that *ſeeing Proteſtants differ about the point of Juſtification, you muſt needs inferre that they want Vnity in faith, and conſequently all faith, and then that they cannot agree what points are fundamentall*; I Anſwer, to the firſt of theſe inferences, that as well might you inferre it upon *Victor* Biſhop of Rome and *Policrates*; upon *Stephen* Biſhop of Rome and S. *Cyprian:* in aſmuch as it is indeniably evident, that what one of thoſe eſteemed neceſſary to ſalvation the other eſteemed not ſo. But points of Doctrine (as all other things) are as they are, and not as they are eſteemed: neither can a neceſſary point be made unneceſſary by being ſo accounted, nor an unneceſſary point be made neceſſary by being overvalued. But as the ancient Philoſophers, (whoſe different opinions about the ſoule of man you may read in *Ariſtotle de Anima*, and *Cicero's Tuſculan Queſtions*,) notwithſtanding their divers opinions touching the nature of the ſoule, yet all of them had ſoules, and ſoules of the ſame nature: Or as thoſe Phyſitians who diſpute whether the braine or heart be the principall part of a man, yet all of them have braines and have hearts, and herein agree ſufficiently: So likewiſe, though ſome Proteſtants eſteeme that Doctrine the ſoule of the Church, which others doe not ſo highly value, yet this hinders not but that which is indeed the ſoule

of

of the Church may be in both ſorts of them; and though one account that a neceſſary truth which others account neither neceſſary nor perhaps true, yet this notwithſtanding, in thoſe truths which are truly & really neceſſary they may all agree. For no Argument can be more ſophiſticall then this; They differ in ſome points which they eſteeme neceſſary; Therefore they differ in ſome that indeed and in truth are ſo.

35 Now as concerning the other inference, *That they cannot agree what points are fundamentall*: I have ſaid and prov'd formerly that there is no ſuch neceſſity as you imagin or pretend, that men ſhould certainly know what is, and what is not fundamentall. They that believe all things plainly delivered in Scripture, believe all things fundamentall, and are at ſufficient Vnity in matters of faith, though they cannot preciſely and exactly diſtinguiſh between what is fundamentall and what is profitable: nay though by error they miſtake ſome vaine, or perhaps hurtfull opinions for neceſſary and fundamentall Truths. Beſides, I have ſhewed above, that as Proteſtants doe not agree (for you overreach in ſaying they cannot) touching what points are fundamentall; ſo neither doe you agree what points are defin'd & ſo to be accounted, and what are not: nay, nor concerning the ſubject in which God hath placed this pretended Authority of defining: ſome of you ſetling it in the Pope himſelfe, though alone without a Councell: Others in a Councell, though divided from the Pope: Others only in the conjunction of Councell and Pope: Others not in this neither, but in the acceptation of the preſent Church Vniverſall: Laſtly, others not attributing it to this neither, but only to the perpetuall Succeſſion of the Church of all ages: of which divided Company it is very evident and undeniable, that every former may be and are obliged to hold many things defin'd and therefore neceſſary, which the latter, according to their own grounds, have no obligation to doe, nay cannot doe ſo upon any firme and ſure and infallible foundation.

c.3.§.53.& alibi.

THE CONCLVSION.

AND thus, by Gods aſſiſtance and the advantage of a good cauſe, I am at length through a paſſage rather tireing then difficult, arriv'd at the end of my undertaken voyage; and have, as I ſuppoſe, made appear to all diſ-intereſſed and unprejudicate readers what in the begining I undertook, that a vein of Sophiſtry and Calumny runs clean through this firſt Part of your Book: wherein though I never thought of the *directions* you have been pleas'd to give mee *in your Pamphlet entitled a Direction to N.N.* yet upon conſideration of my anſwer, I finde that I have proceeded as if I had had it alwaies before my eyes, and ſteer'd my courſe by it as by a card and compaſſe.

For firſt, *I have not proceeded by a meere deſtructive way* (as you call it,) *nor objected ſuch difficulties againſt your Religion, as upon examination tend to the overthrow of all Religion*, but have ſhewed that the truth of Chriſtianity is cleerely independent upon the truth of Popery: and that on the other ſide, the arguments you urge, and the courſes you take for the maintenance of your Religion, doe manifeſtly tend (if they be cloſely and conſequently followed) to the deſtruction of all religion, and lead men by the hand to Atheiſme and impiety; whereof I have given you ocular demonſtrations in divers places of my book, but eſpecially, in my anſwer to your direction to N.N.

Neither can I *diſcover any repugnance between any one part of my anſwer and any other*, though I have uſed many more judicious and more ſearching eyes then mine owne to make, if it were poſſible, ſuch a diſcovery: and therefore am in good hope that, though the muſicke I have made be but dull and flat, and even downright plain-ſong, yet your curious and criticall eares ſhall diſcover no diſcord in it; but on the other ſide, I have charg'd you frequently and very juſtly, with manifeſt contradiction and retractation of your own aſſertions, and not ſeldome of the main grounds you build upon, and the principall concluſions which you endeavour to maintain: which I conceive my ſelfe to have made apparent even to the eye, c.2.§.5. c.3.§.88. c.4.§. 14. & 24. c.5.§.93. c.6.§.6.7.12.17. c.7.§.29. and in many other parts of my anſwer.

And though I did never pretend to defend D. *Potter* abſolutely and in all things, but only ſo farre as he defends truth; (neither did D. *Potter* deſire me, nor any law of God or man oblige me to defend him any farther,) yet I doe not finde that I have cauſe to differ from him in any matter of moment: particularly, *not concerning the infallibility of Gods Church*, which I grant with him to be infallible in fundamentalls, becauſe if it ſhould erre in fundamentalls, it were not the Church: *Nor concerning the ſupernaturality of Faith*, which I know & believe as well as you *to be the gift of God*, and *that fleſh & blood reveal'd it not unto us, but our Father which is in Heaven*. But now if it were demanded

what defence you can make for deſerting *Ch. Miſtaken* in the main queſtion diſputed between him and D. *Potter, Whether Proteſtancy, without a particular repentance and dereliction of it, deſtroy Salvation,* whereof I have convinc'd you? I believe your anſwer would be much like that which *Vlyſſes* makes in the Metamorphoſis for his running away from his friend *Neſtor*, that is, none at all.

For *Oppoſing the Articles of the Church of England*, the Approbation, I preſume, cleeres my book from this imputation.

And whereas you give me a Caution, *that my grounds deſtroy not the belief of diverſe Doctrines which all good Chriſtians believe, yea and of all verities that cannot be prov'd by naturall reaſon:* I profeſſe ſyncerely that I doe not know nor believe, that any ground laid by me in my whole Book, is any way inconſiſtent with any one ſuch Doctrine, or with any verity revealed in the word of God, though neuer ſo improbable or incomprehenſible to Naturall Reaſon: and if I thought there were, I would deale with it, as thoſe primitive converts dealt with their curious Books in the *Acts of the Apoſtles*

For the Ep. *of S. Iames, and thoſe other Books which were anciently controverted, and are now received by the Church of England as Canonicall*, I am ſo farre from relying upon any Principles which muſt (to my apprehenſion) bring with them the deniall of the authority of them, that I my ſelfe believe them all to be Canonicall.

For the *overthrowing the Infallibility of all Scripture*, my Book is ſo innocent of it, that the Infallibility of Scripture is the chiefeſt of all my grounds.

And laſtly for Arguments *tending to prove an impoſſibility of all Divine, Supernaturall, Infallible Faith and Religion*, I aſſure my ſelf that if you were ten times more a ſpider then you are, you could ſuck no poyſon from them. My heart, I am ſure, is innocent of any ſuch intention: and the ſearcher of all hearts knowes that I had no other end in writing this Book, but to confirm to the uttermoſt of my ability the truth of the Divine and Infallible Religion of our deareſt Lord and Saviour Chriſt Ieſus, which I am ready to ſeale and confirm not with my arguments only, but my bloud!

Now theſe are directions which you have been pleas'd to give me, whether out of a fear that I might otherwiſe deviate from them, or out of a deſire to make others think ſo: But howſoever, I have not, to my underſtanding, ſwarved from them in any thing, which puts me in good hope that my Anſwer to this firſt Part of your Book will give even to you your ſelf indifferent good ſatisfaction.

I have alſo provided, though this were more then I undertook, a juſt and punctuall examination and refutation of your *ſecond Part*: But (if you will give your conſent) am reſolv'd to ſuppreſſe it, and that for divers ſufficient and reaſonable conſiderations.

Firſt, becauſe the diſcuſſion of the Controverſies entreated of in the *firſt Part* (if we ſhall think fit to proceed in it, as I for my part ſhall, ſo long as I have truth to reply,) will, I conceive, be ſufficient employment for us, though wee caſt off the burden of thoſe many leſſer diſputes

which

which remain behind in the Second. And perhaps wee may doe God and his Church more ſervice by exactly diſcuſſing and fully clearing the truth in theſe few, then by handling many after a ſleight and perfunctory manner.

Secondly, becauſe the additiō of the Second Part whether for your purpoſe or mine is clearly unneceſſary: there being no underſtanding man Papiſt or Proteſtant, but will confeſſe that (for as much as concernes the main Queſtion now in agitation, about the ſaveableneſſe of Proteſtants) if the firſt Part of your Book be anſwered, there needes no reply to the Second: as on the other ſide I ſhall willingly grant, if I have not anſwered the Firſt, I cannot anſwer a great part of the Second.

Thirdly, becauſe the addition of the Second not only is unneceſſary, but in effect by your ſelf confeſs'd to bee ſo. For in your preamble to your Second Part you tell us, *That the ſubſtance of the preſent Controverſie is handled in the firſt: and therein alſo you pretend to have anſwered the chief grounds of D. Potters book*: So that in replying to your Second Part I ſhall doe little elſe but purſue ſhadowes.

Fourthly, becauſe your Second Part (letting aſide Repetitions and References) is in a manner made up of diſputes about particular matters, which you are very importunate to have forborn, as ſuſpecting, at leaſt pretending to ſuſpect, that they *were brought in purpoſely by D. Potter to dazle the Reader's eyes and diſtract his mind, that hee might not ſee the clearneſſe of the reaſons brought in defence of the Generall Doctrine delivered in Charity Miſtaken.* All which you are likely enough (if there bee occaſion) to ſay again to mee; and therefore I am reſolv'd for once even to humour you ſo farre as to keepe my diſcourſe within thoſe very liſts and limits which your ſelf have preſcrib'd, and to deal with you upon no other arguments, but only thoſe wherein you conceive your chief advantage and principall ſtrength, and, as it were, your Sampſon's lock to lye: wherein if I gain the cauſe clearly from you (as I verily hope by Gods help I ſhall doe) it cannot but redound much to the honour of the truth maintain'd by me, which by ſo weak a Champion can overcome ſuch an *Achilles* for error even in his ſtrongeſt holds.

For theſe reaſons, although I have made ready an anſwer to your Second Part, and therein have made it ſufficiently evident: That for ſhifting evaſions from *D. Potters* arguments; for impertinent cavills, and frivolous exceptions, and injurious calumnies againſt him for miſalleaging of Authors: For proceeding upon falſe and ungrounded principles; for making inconſequent and ſophiſticall deductions, and, in a word, for all the vertues of an ill anſwer your Second Part is no way ſecond to the Firſt. Yet notwithſtanding all this anvantage, I am reſolv'd, if you will give me leave, either wholly to ſuppreſſe it, or at leaſt to deferre the publication of it, untill I ſee what exceptions, upon a twelve-months examinatiō (for ſo long I am well aſſur'd you have had it in your hands) you can take at this which is now publiſhed, that ſo if my grounds bee diſcovered falſe I may give over building on them: or

(if it ſhall be thought fit) build on more ſecurely when it ſhall appeare that nothing materiall and of moment is or can bee objected againſt them. This I ſay, upon a ſuppoſition that your ſelf will allow theſe reaſons for ſatisfying and ſufficient, and not repent of the motion which your ſelf has made, of reducing the Controverſy between us to this ſhort Iſſue. But in caſe your mind be altered, upon the leaſt intimation you ſhall give mee, that you doe not deſire to have it out, your deſire ſhall prevail with me above all other reaſons, and you ſhall not fail to receive it with all convenient ſpeed.

Only that my Anſwer may be compleat, and that I may have all my work together, and not be troubled my ſelf, nor enforc'd to trouble you with after-reckonings, I would firſt entreat you to make good your Promiſe of not *omitting to anſwer all the particles of D. Potters book, which may any way import*, and now at leaſt to take notice of ſome (as it ſeemes to me) not unconſiderable paſſages of it, which between your firſt and ſecond Part, as it were betweene two ſtooles, have beene ſuffer'd hitherto to fall to the ground, and not beene vouchſaf'd any anſwer at all.

For after this neglectfull faſhion you have paſſed by in ſilence, Firſt his diſcourſe, wherein he proves briefly but very effectually, that *Proteſtants may be ſav'd, and that the Roma Church, eſpecially the Ieſuits are very uncharitable. S.* 1. *p.* 6. 7. 8. 9. Secondly the authorities whereby he juſtifies, That *the ancient Fathers, by the Roman underſtood alwaies a particular, and never the Catholique Church*: to which purpoſe he alleageth the words of *Ignatius, Ambroſe, Innocentius, Celeſtine, Nicolaus. S.* 1. *p.* 10, Whereunto you ſay nothing, neither doe you infringe his obſervation with any one inſtance to the contrary.

Thirdly, the greateſt and moſt ſubſtantiall part of his anſwers to the Arguments of *Charity Miſtaken*, built upon *Deut.* 17. *Numb.* 16. *Mat.* 28. 20. *Mat.* 18. 17. and in particular many pregnant and convincing Texts of Scripture, quoted in the margent of his book, *p.* 25. to prove that the Iudges of the Synagogue (whoſe Infallibility yet you make an Argument of yours, and therefore muſt be more credible then yours) are vainly pretended to have been infallible: but as they were oblig'd to judg according to the Law, ſo were obnoxious to deviations from it. *S.* 2. *p.* 23. 24. 25. 26. 27.

Fourthly his diſcourſe wherein hee ſhewes the difference betweene the Prayers for the Dead uſed by the Ancients, and thoſe now in uſe in the Roman Church.

Fiftly, the Authority of three Ancient, and above twenty moderne Doctors of your own Church alleag'd by him, to ſhew that in their opinion even Pagans, and therefore much more erring Chriſtians (if their lives were morally honeſt) may by Gods extraordinary mercy and Chriſts merit may be ſaved. *S.* 2. *p.* 45.

Sixtly, a great part of his diſcourſe whereby he declares that actuall and externall communion with the Church is not of abſolute neceſſity to Salvation: nay that thoſe might be ſaved whom the Church utterly refus'd to admit to her Communion. *S.* 2. *p.* 46. 47. 48. 49.

Seaventh-

Seaventhly, his diſcourſe concerning the Churches latitude, which hath in it a cleare determination of the maine Controverſy againſt you: For therein he proves plainly, that all appertain *to the Church, who believe that Ieſus* is the Chriſt the ſonne *of God and Saviour of the world with ſubmiſſion to his Doctrine* in mind and will: which hee irrefragably demonſtrates by many evident Texts of Scripture containing the ſubſtance of his Aſſertion even in termes. *S.4.p.*114.115.116.117.

Eightly, that wherein he ſhewes by many pertinent examples, that *groſſe error and true Faith may bee lodged together in the* ſame mind: And that men are not *chargeable with the damnable conſequences of their erroneous opinions. S.4.p.*122.

Ninthly, a very great part of his Chapter touching *the diſſenſions of the Roman Church*, which he ſhewes (againſt the pretences of *Charity Miſtaken*) *to bee no leſſe then ours for the importance of the matter, and the purſuite of them to bee exceedingly uncharitable. S.6.p.*188.189.190.191.193.194.195.196.197.

Tenthly, his clear refutation and juſt reprehenſion of *the Doctrine of implicite Faith as it is deliver'd by the Doctors of your Church:* which he proves very conſonant to the Doctrine of Heretiques and Infidels, but evidently repugnant to the word of God. *Ibid.p.*201.202.203.204.205.

Laſtly, his diſcourſe wherein hee ſhewes that *it is unlawfull for the Church of after Ages to adde any thing to the Faith of the Apoſtles:* And many of his Arguments whereby hee proves that in the *judgment of the Ancient Church the Apoſtles Creed was eſteem'd a ſufficient ſummary of the neceſſary* Points of ſimple belief, and a great number of great authorities, to juſtifie the Doctrine of the Church of England touching the Canon of Scripture, eſpecially the Old Teſtament. *S.7.p.*221,223.228.229.

All theſe parts of *Doctor Potter's* book, for reaſons beſt known to your ſelf, you have dealt with as the Prieſt and Levite in the Goſpell did with the wounded Samaritan, that is, *only look't upon them and paſs'd by:* But now at leaſt when you are admoniſh't of it, that my Reply to your ſecond part (if you deſire it,) may be perfect, I would entreat you to take them into your conſideration, and to make ſome ſhew of ſaying ſomething to them, leaſt otherwiſe the world ſhould interpret your obſtinate ſilence a plaine confeſſion that you can ſay nothing.

FINIS.

GOod reader, through the Authors neceſſary abſence for ſome weekes while this Book was printing, and by reaſon of an uncorrected Copy ſent to the Preſſe, ſome errors have eſcap'd, notwithſtanding the Printers ſollicitous and extraordinary care, and the Correctors moſt aſſiduous diligence: which I would intreat thee to correct according to this following direction.

Pag.	Lin.	Err.	Corr.
6.	1.	To the firſt and ſecond	Adde §.
21.	Vlt.	To the ninth, to the ninteenth.	To the ninteenth, To the ninth.
64.	21.	Principall	*prudentiall.*
67.	29.	Canoniz'd	diſcanoniz'd.
73.	In marg.	poſuit	potuit.
108.	21.	our	one.
134.	9.	In	for.
136.	9.	ſome	ſome thing.
146.	6.	a truth	truths.
150.	19.	ſhe	there.
157.	13.	vowed	avowed.
158.	Penult.	beſt	leaſt.
168.	11,	*cauſa pro non cauſa*	*non cauſa pro cauſa.*
176.	3.	Atheiſts	Antitheſis.
ib.	11.	*dele* with.	
180.	Antepen.	government	communion.
193.	19.	that	the.
198.	33.	continue the	immortall: the
218.	44.	profeſſion	perfection.
220.	Poſt 53.	ſcribe	Ad §. 19.
Ib.	11.	Faire	Farce.
Ib.	33.	inſtruct	miſtruſt.
221.	38.	which is	which is the Church.
225.	27.	nay	now.
293.	43.	ſo farre from	farre from ſo.
351.	11.	exception	expoſition.
361.	Vlt.	Canons	Canon.
372.	17.	Foundation	Foundation of.
393	32.	dele whether	
402.	44.	of themſelves	in the iſſue.