XEROX MICROFORMS SYSTEMS
University Microfilms
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106
(313) 761-4700

*Mandetur Typis hic Liber, cui Titulus,* The Religion of Protestants a safe way to Salvation: *In quo nihil occurrit à bonis Moribus, à Doctrina & Disciplina in Ecclesia Anglicana assertis, alienum.*

RICH. BAILY 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 acute, perspicue, & modeste dissipant.*

JO. PRIDEAUX S.T.P. Regius Oxon.

---

*EGO* Samuel Fell *Publicus Theol. Professor in Univer.* 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 & modeste eventilata contra Adversarios nostræ Ecclesiæ & veritatis Catholicæ, quam feliciter tuetur.*

Dat. 14. Octob. 1637.

SAM. FELL.

---

*Fiat secunda Editio juxta hoc Exemplar.*

Ex Ædib. Londin. Feb. 6. 1637.

SAM. BAKER.

---

*Perlegi hunc Librum, cui Tit.* The Religion of Protestants a safe way to Salvation; *item,* Novem Conciones nuperrime additas: *In quibus omnibus nihil reperio Doctrinæ vel Disciplinæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ contrarium, quo minus cum summa omnium utilitate Imprimatur,*

Ex Æd. Lambeth. 16. Octob. 1663.

G. STRADLING *S.T.P. Reverendiss. in Christo Pat. D.* Gilb. *Archiep.* Cant. *à Sac. Dom.*

# THE RELIGION OF PROTESTANTS A Safe way to Salvation.

*OR,*

An ANSWER to a Book Entituled

*Mercy and Truth,* or, *Charity maintain'd by Catholiques:*

Which pretends to prove the Contrary.

*To which is Added*

## The Apostolical Institution of Episcopacy.

*AS ALSO,*

## IX. SERMONS,

The *First* Preached before His Majesty King *CHARLES* the First, the other *Eight* upon special and eminent Occasions.

*BY*

# William Chillingworth

*Master of Arts of the University of OXFORD.*

The Fourth Edition.

Isaac. Casaubon. *in Epist. ad Card.* Perron. *Regis* JACOBI *nomine scripta.*

*Rex arbitratur, virum absolutè necessariorum ad salutem, non magnum esse numerum. Quare existimat ejus Majestas, nullam ad ineundam concordiam breviorem viam fore, quàm si diligenter, sepaventur necessaria à non necessariis, & ut de necessariis conveniat, omnis opera insumatur: in non necessariis libertati Christianæ locus detur. Simpliciter necessaria Rex appellat, quæ vel expressè verbum Dei præcipit credenda faciendave, vel ex verbo Dei necessariò consequentia certus Ecclesiæ cœcuit.---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 vivos, longa aut acris contentio futura. Nam & pauca illa sunt, ut modo dicebamus, & forè ex æquo omnibus probantur, qui se Christianos dici postulant. Atque illam distinctionem Serenissimus Rex tanti putat esse momenti ad minuendas Controversias, quæ hodiè Ecclesiam Dei tantopere exercent, ut omnium pacis studiosorum judicet officium esse, diligentissimè hanc explicare, docere, ingere.*

*LONDON:*

Printed by *Andrew Clark,* for *Richard Chiswell* at the Rose and Crown in St. *Paul's* Church-yard, MDCLXXIV.

TO THE

Moſt HIGH and MIGHTY PRINCE,

# CHARLES

By the Grace of GOD,

KING of *Great-Britain, France,* and *Ireland,*

Defender 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 and ought to be infinitely dearer to You than all the World: Not doubting but upon this Dedication I ſhall be cenſured for a double boldneſs; both for undertaking ſo great a Work, ſo far beyond my weak abilities; and again, for preſenting it to ſuch a Patron, whoſe judgment I ought to fear more than any Adverſary. But for the firſt, it is a ſatisfaction to my ſelf, and may be to others, that I was not drawn to it out of any vain opinion of my ſelf, (whoſe perſonal 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 St. *Peter* only, but to all men: being encouraged alſo to it by the goodneſs 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 prejudice 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

ving with the greateſt equality and indifferency, made enquiry and grounds on both Sides, I was willing to impart to others, that ſatisfaction which was given to my ſelf. For my inſcribing to it Your Majeſties Sacred Name, I ſhould labour much in my excuſe of it from high preſumption, had it not ſome appearance of Title to Your Majeſties Patronage and protection, as being a Defence of that Book, which by ſpecial Order from Your Majeſty was written ſome years ſince, chiefly for the general good, but peradventure not without ſome aim at the recovery of One of Your meaneſt Subjects from dangerous deviation; and ſo due unto Your Majeſty, as the fruit of Your own High Humility and moſt Royal Charity. Beſides, it is in a manner nothing elſe, but a purſuance of, and a ſuperſtruction upon that bleſſed Doctrine, wherewith I have adorned and armed the Frontiſpiece of my Book, which was ſo earneſtly recommended to Your Royal Father of happy memory, to all the lovers of Truth and Peace; that is, to all that were like Himſelf, as the only hopeful means of healing the Breaches of Chriſtendom, whereof the Enemy of Souls makes ſuch peſtilent advantage. The luſtre of this bleſſed Doctrine I have endeavoured to uncloud and unvail, and to free it from thoſe miſts and fumes which have been raiſed to obſcure it, by one of that Order, which envenoms even Poyſon it ſelf, and makes the *Roman* Religion much more malignant and turbulent than 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 than it ſhall pleaſe the Pope. So that whether Your Majeſty be conſidered, either as a Pious



a Pious Son towards Your Royal Father King *James*, or as a tender-hearted and compaſſionate Son towards Your diſtreſſed Mother, the Catholick Church, or as a King of Your Subjects, or as a Servant unto Chriſt, this Work, (to which I can give no other commendation, but that it was intended to do 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 profeſs, it could not be ſo proper to any Patron as to the great Defendor of it; which Style Your Majeſty 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 foul aſperſions both of Domeſtick and Foreign enemies, of which they can have no ground, but their own want of Judgment, or want of Charity. But it is an Argument of a deſpairing and loſt cauſe to ſupport it ſelf with theſe impetuous out-cries and clamours, the faint refuges of thoſe that want better Arguments; like that Stoick in *Lucian* that cried Ὦ παπαῖ! *O damned villain!* 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 goodneſs ſhould damn to Eternal 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 damning us, and our not being ſo peremptory in damning them, becauſe we hope unaffected Ignorance may excuſe them, would be loſt: And therefore they are engaged to act on this Tragical part, only to fright the Simple and Ignorant, as we do little Children,

by

by telling them that bites, which we would not have them meddle with. And truly that herein they do but act a part, and know themſelves to do ſo, and deal with us here, as they do with the King of *Spain* at *Rome*, whom they accurſe and Excommunicate for faſhion ſake on *Maundy-Thurſday*, for detaining part of St. *Peters* Patrimony, and abſolve him without ſatisfaction on *Good-Friday*; methinks their faltring and inconſtancy herein, makes it very apparent: For though for the moſt part, they ſpeak nothing but Thunder and Lightning to us, and damn us all without mercy or exception; yet ſometimes to ſerve other purpoſes, they can be content to ſpeak to us in a milder ſtrain, and tell us, as my Adverſary does more than once, *That they allow Proteſtants as much Charity as Proteſtants allow them.* Neither is this the only contradiction which I have diſcovered in this uncharitable Work; but have ſhewed that by forgetting himſelf, and retracting moſt of the principal grounds he builds upon, he hath ſaved me the labour of a Confutation: which yet I have not in any place found any ſuch labour 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 ſelf, that it needs only light to diſcover it; whereas it concerns Falſhood and Error to uſe diſguiſes and ſhadowings, and all the fetches of Art and Sophiſtry; and therefore it ſtands in need of abler men, to give that a colour at leaſt, which hath no real 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 me the moſt part



part of them diſaffect, only becauſe it hath not been well repreſented to them) I have the fruit of my labour, and my wiſh, who deſire to live to no other end, than to do ſervice to Gods Church, and Your moſt Sacred Majeſty, in the quality of

*Your* MAJESTIES

*Moſt faithful Subject,*

*and moſt humble*

*and devoted Servant*

William Chillingworth.

The

# The CONTENTS of the Chapters, with the Answers thereunto.

*THE Author of* Charity Maintain'd, *his Preface to the Reader* Page 1
*The Answer to the Preface* 5

## The FIRST PART.

### CHAP. I.

*THE State of the Question; with a Summary of the Reasons for which men of different Religions, one side only can be saved* Page 20

The Answer to the First Chapter.

*Shewing, that the Adversary grants the Former Question, and proposeth a New One: And that there is no reason, why among men of different Opinions and Communions, one side only can be saved* 22

### CHAP. II.

*What is that means, whereby the revealed Truths of God are conveyed to our understanding, and which must determine Controversies in Faith and Religion* 32

The Answer to the Second Chapter.

*Concerning the means, whereby the revealed Truths of God are conveyed to our understanding; and which must determine Controversies in Faith and Religion* 39

### CHAP. III.

*That the distinction of Points* Fundamental *and* not Fundamental, *is neither pertinent, nor true in our present Controversie: And that the Catholique visible Church cannot err, in either kind of the said Point* 92

The Answer to the Third Chapter.

*Wherein is maintained, That the distinction of Points* Fundamental *and* not Fundamental, *is in this present Controversie good and pertinent: And that the Catholique Church may err in the later kind of the said Points* 99

### CHAP. IV.

*To say, that the Creed contains all Points necessary to be believed, is neither* pertinent *to the Question in hand, nor in it self* true 142

The Answer to the Fourth Chapter.

*Wherein is shewed, that the Creed contains all necessary Points of meer Belief* 148

CHAP.

# The Contents.

### CHAP. V.

*That* Luther, Calvin, *their Associates, and all who began or continue the Separation from the external Communion of the Roman Church, are guilty of the proper, and formal Sin of Schism* 180

The Answer to the Fifth Chapter.

*The Separation of Protestants from the Roman Church, being upon just and necessary causes, is not any way guilty of Schism* 196

### CHAP. VI.

*That* Luther *and the rest of the Protestants have added Heresie unto Schism* 240

The Answer to the Sixth Chapter.

*That Protestants are not Heretiques* 249

### CHAP. VII.

*In regard of the Precept of Charity towards ones self, Protestants are in a state of Sin, as long as they remain separate from the* Roman *Church* 295

The Answer to the Seventh Chapter.

*That Protestants are not bound by the Charity which they owe to themselves, to reunite themselves to the* Roman *Church* 299

*The Conclusion* 315

A Table

# A Table of the Texts of the SERMONS.


SERMON I. on 2 TIM. III. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.

*This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come, For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to Parents, unthankful, unholy, Without natural affection, truce-breakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, Traitors, heady, high-minded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God; Having a form of Godliness, but denying the power thereof* Page 329

SERMON II. III. on PSAL. XIV. 1.

*The Fool hath said in his heart, There is no God* 343 & 356

SERMON IV. on LUKE IX. 23.

*——Let him deny himself* 367

SERMON V. on ROM. VIII. 34.

*Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather that is risen again——* 379

SERMON VI. on LUKE XVI. 9.

*Make to your selves friends of the Mammon of unrighteousness, that when you fail, they may receive you into everlasting habitations* 393

SERMON VII. on LUKE XIX. 8.

*——And if I have defrauded any man by forged cavillation, I restore unto him fourfold* 406

SERMON VIII. on GAL. V. 5.

*For we through the Spirit wait for the hope of Righteousness by Faith* 418

SERMON IX. on 1 COR. X. 13.

*——God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able——* 437


FINIS.

THE

# PREFACE

To the AUTHOR of

## *CHARITY MAINTAINED:*

WITH

An Answer to his Pamphlet, entituled *A Direction to N. N.*

SIR,

UPon the first news 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 than 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 hac defensa videbo.* For I conceived that among the Champions of the Roman Church, the English in reason must be the best, or equal to the best, as being by most expert Masters trained up purposely for this war, and perpetually practised in it. Among the English, I saw the Jesuites would yield the first place to none; and men so wise in their generation as the Jesuites were, if they had any *Achilles* among them, I presumed, 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 choise materials towards it; nor of many careful and watchful eyes, to correct the errors of your Work, 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 self, 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 deceitful appearances, now the wind and storm and floods were coming, 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 go the right way to *eternal happiness*. But whether this way lie on the right hand or the left, or straight forwards; whether it be by following a living Guide, or by seeking my direction in a Book, or by hearkning to the secret whisper of some private Spirit, to me it is indifferent. And he that is otherwise affected, and hath 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 humane consideration, that one way should be true rather than another; it is odds but he will take his desire that it should be so, for an assurance that it is so. But, I for my part, unless I deceive my self, was, and still am so affected, as I have made profession, not willing I confess to take any thing upon trust, and to believe it without asking my self why; no, nor able to command my self (were I never so willing) to follow, like a sheep, every Shepherd that should take upon him to guide me; or every flock that should chance to go 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

hath said so, therefore it is true. Nor yet was I so unreasonable as to expect Mathematical 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 than 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 turned the scale, and have made your Religion more credible than the contrary; certainly, I should have despised the shame of one more alteration, and with both mine arms 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.

3. Would you know now what the event was, what effect was wrought in me, by the perusal and consideration of it? To deal truly and ingenuously with you, I fell somewhat in my good opinion both of your sufficiency and sincerity: but was exceedingly confirmed 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 discern 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 Judges, that a vein of sophistry and calumny did run clean thorow it from the beginning to the end. And letting some Friends understand so much, I suffered my self to be perswaded by them, that it would not be either unproper for me, nor unacceptable 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 employed in particular disputes, repetitions and references, and in wranglings with D. *Potter* about the sense of some supernumerary quotations, and whereon the main question no way depends, I would make a fair and ingenuous answer to the First, wherein the substance of the present Controversie 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 bears me witness that I have, according to your advice, *proceeded always 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 careful for the matter of my Book to defend truth only, and only by Truth. And then, scrupulously fearful 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 do it ignorantly, I have not only my self examined mine own Work, (perhaps with more severity than I have done yours, as conceiving it a base and unchristian thing to go about to satisfie others with what I my self am not fully satisfied;) but have also made it pass the fiery tryal of the exact censures of many understanding Judges, always heartily wishing that you your Self had been of the *Quorum*. But they who did undergo this burthen, as they wanted not sufficiency to discover any heterodox Doctrine, so I am sure, they have been very careful to let nothing slip dissonant from truth or from the authorized Doctrine of the Church of *England*: and therefore whatsoever causeless or groundless jealousie, 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 escaped so many eyes, which being weighed in the balance of the Sanctuary, will be found too light. And in this hope



hope I am much confirmed, by your strange carriage of your self in this whole business. For though by some crooked and sinister arts, you have got my Answer into your hands, now a year since and upwards, as I have been assured by some that profess to know it, and those of your own party; though you could not want every day fair opportunities of sending to me, and acquainting me with any Exceptions, which, you conceived, might be justly taken to it, or any part of it (than which nothing could have been more welcome to me) yet hitherto you have not been pleased to acquaint me with any one. Nay more, though you have been at sundry times, and by several ways, entreated and sollicited, nay pressed and importuned by me, to joyn with me in a private discussion of the Controversie 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 protested to you, and sent 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 fair meeting, and choose out of your whole Book any one argument, whereof you were most confident, and by which you would be content the rest should be judged of, and make it appear 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 trial, in particular by assuring you that if you refused it, the World should be informed of your tergiversation: notwithstanding all this, you have perpetually, and obstinately declined it; which to my understanding is a very evident sign that there is not any truth in your Cause, nor (which is impossible there should be) strength in your Arguments, especially considering what our Saviour hath told us, *Every one that doth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved; but he that doth truth, cometh to the light that his deeds may be made manifest that they are wrought in God.*

5. In the mean 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 Work should come to light, my inconstancy in Religion* (so you miscall my constancy in following that way to heaven which for the present seems to me the most probable) *should be to my great shame painted to the life*; that *my own Writings should be produced against my self*; that *I should be urged to answer my own Motives against Protestantism, and that such things should be published to the World touching my belief*, (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 supernatural Verities, as should endanger all my Benefices present or future*: that *this warning was given me, not out of fear of what I could say (for that Catholiques if they might wish any ill would beg the Publication of my Book, 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 mind to answer* Charity Maintain'd; *If not, no harm 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 supernatural 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 *Terribles visu formæ*, those carnal and base fears which you presented to me, which were very proper motives for the Devil 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 ago matriculated) to harken to, with any regard. But

if you were indeed desirous that I should not answer *Charity Maintain'd*, one way there was, and but one, whereby you might obtain your desire; and that was, by letting me 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 resolved 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 assured was delivered: but Reply from you I received none but this, That you would have no conference with me but in Print; and soon after finding me of proof against all these batteries, and thereby (I fear) very much enraged, you took up the resolution of the furious Goddess in the Poet, madded with the unsuccessfulnes of her malice,

*Flectere si nequeo superos, Acheronta movebo!*

6. For certainly, those indign contumelies, that mass 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 general, 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 Atheism and 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 Atheism; I am sure I could make my assertion much more probable than you have done, or can make this horrible imputation.

8. For to pass by, *First*, that which experience justifies, That where and when your Religion hath most absolutely commanded, there and then Atheism 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 suspicious men to question the truth of all: Nor to object to you, *Thirdly*, the abundance of your weak and silly Ceremonies, and ridiculous observances in your Religion; which, in all probability, cannot but beget secret contempt and scorn of it, in wise and considering men; and, consequently, Atheism and Impiety, if they have this perswasion setled in them (which is too rife among you, and which you account a piece of *wisdom 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 temporal ends of the Teachers of it; which yet, I fear, is a great scandal to many *Beaux Esprits* among you: Only I should desire you to consider attentively, when you conclude so often from the Differences of Protestants, that they have no certainty of any part of their Religion, no not of those points wherein they agree, Whether you do not that which so Magisterially you direct me not to do, 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 in any thing? Again, I should desire you to tell me ingenuously, Whether it be not too probable that your portentous Doctrine of Transubstantiation joyned with your fore-mentioned perswasion of, *No Papists no Christians*, hath brought a great many others, as well as himself, to *Averroes* his resolution, *Quandoquidem Christiani adorant quod comedunt, sit anima mea cum Philosophis*? Whether your requiring men upon only *probable* and *prudential Motives*, to yeild





a *most certain assent* unto things in humane reason impossible; and telling them, as you do 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 scorn 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, joyned with your pretending no ground for this but some texts of Scripture, be not a fair way to make them that understand themselves, believe neither Church nor Scripture?

9. Your calumnies against Protestants in general, are set down in these words, Chap. 2. §. 2. *The very doctrine of Protestants if it be followed closely, and with coherence to it self, must of necessity induce* Socinianism. *This I say confidently, and evidently prove, by instancing in one error which may well be tearmed the Capital, and mother-Heresie, from which all other must follow at ease; I mean, their Heresie in affirming, That the perpetual 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 remains, but that every man is given over to his own* wit, *and* discourse? *And talk not here of Holy Scripture. For if the true Church may erre, in defining what Scriptures be Canonical; 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* Socinianism;) *or else upon natural wit, and judgment, 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 God's Church, no man can be assured, that any one Book, or parcel 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 eternal salvation of his soul, would live or dye in* Protestancy, *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 jointly he must be left to his own wit and wayes; and must abandon all* infused faith, *and true Religion, if he do but understand himself 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 denyal of the Churches infallibility is the Mother-Heresie, from which all other must follow at ease:* Which is so far 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 denyal 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, *Ergo*, The doctrine of *Arrius*, *Pelagius*, *Eutyches*, *Nestorius*, *Photinus*, *Manichæus*, was true Doctrine? On the other side, it may be truly said and justified by very good and effectual reason, that he that affirms, with you, the Pope's infallibility, puts himself into his hands and power, to be led by him at his ease and pleasure into all Heresie, 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 daub and disguise it, is indeed to make men Apostate from Christ to his pretended Vicar, but real Enemy. For that name and no better

(if

(if we may ſpeak truth without offence) I preſume He deſervs, who under pretence of interpreting the Law of Chriſt, (which Authority without any word of expreſs warrant he hath taken upon himſelf,) doth in many parts evacuate and diſſolve it: So dethroning Chriſt from his dominion over mens conſciences, and inſtead of Chriſt, ſetting up Himſelf; Inaſmuch as he that requires that his interpretations of any Law ſhould be obeyed as true and genuine, ſeem 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 judgement they ſeem unreaſonable, is indeed congruouſly diſpoſed to hold Adultery a venial ſin, and Fornication no ſin, 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 Law-maker both ſtales, and obeyes only the Interpreter. As if I ſhould pretend that I ſhould ſubmit to the Laws of the King of *England*, but ſhould indeed reſolve to obey them in that ſenſe which the King of *France* ſhould put upon them, whatſoever 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 ſenſe which the chief Muſty ſhould put upon it, Who would not ſay that I were a Chriſtian in pretenſe 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 go 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 fowl 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 unqueſtioned, and made expedite and ready for uſe, by being contracted to the Pope) ſhe may do what ſhe pleaſeth with it. Who that had lived 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 Senſe may not be accorded, as well as the whole 14. *Ch.* of the 1 *Ep.* of S. *Paul* to the *Corinth.* is reconciled to the Latine-Service? How is it poſſible any thing ſhould be plainer forbidden, than the *worſhip of Angels*, in the *Ep.* to the *Coloſſians*? than *the teaching for Doctrines mens commands* in the Goſpel of S. *Mark*? And therefore ſeeing we ſee theſe things done, which hardly any man would have believed, that had not ſeen them, Why ſhould we not fear that this unlimited power may not be uſed hereafter with as little moderation? Seeing devices have been invented how men may worſhip Images without Idolatry, and kill innocent men, under pretence of Hereſie, without murder; Who knows that ſome tricks may not be hereafter deviſed, 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 Hereſie, The *denial* of the *Churches*, 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 ſelf 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;



men; and 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, and reaſonable, and neceſſary that men, as in all their actions, ſo eſpecially in that of greateſt importance, the choice of their way to happineſs, ſhould be left unto it: and he that follows this in all his opinions and actions, and does not only ſeem to do ſo, follows always God; whereas he that followeth a Company of men, may oft-times follow a company of beaſts. And in ſaying this, I ſay no more than S. *John* 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 tryal by, is, to conſider, Whether they *confeſs Jeſus to be Chriſt*; that is, the Guid of their Faith, and Lord of their Action; not, whether they acknowledge the Pope to be his Vicar: I ſay no more than S. *Paul*, in exhorting all Chriſtians, *To try all things, and hold faſt that which is good*: then S. *Peter* in commanding all Chriſtians, *To be ready to give a reaſon of the hope that is in them*: than *our Saviour* himſelf, in forewarning all his Followers, that *if they blindly followed blind guids, both leaders and followers ſhould fall into the ditch*: and again, in ſaying even to the people, *Yea and why of your ſelves judge yee not what is right*? And though by paſſion, or precipitation, or prejudice, by want of reaſon, or not uſing what they have, men may be, and are oftentimes, led into error and miſchief; yet, that they cannot be miſguided by *Diſcourſe*, truly ſo called, ſuch as I have deſcribed, you your ſelf 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 yon have told us in the fourth Chap. of this Pamphlet, That *from truth no man can, by good conſequence, infer falſhood*; Therefore, by *Diſcourſe*, no man can poſſibly be led to Error: but if he err in his Concluſions, he muſt of neceſſity, either err in his Principles, (which here cannot have place) or commit ſome error in his Diſcourſe; that is, indeed, not Diſcourſe, but ſeem to do ſo.

13. You ſay, Thirdly, with ſufficient confidence, That *if the true Church may erre in defining what Scriptures be Canonical, or in delivering the ſenſe thereof, then we muſt follow either the private Spirit, or elſe natural wit and judgment; and by them examine what Scriptures contain true or falſe Doctrine, and in that reſpect ought to be received or rejected.* All which is apparently untrue, neither can any proof of it be pretended. For though the preſent Church may poſſibly err in her judgment touching this matter, yet have we other directions in it, beſides the private 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 contains 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, and that is, The teſtimony of the Primitive Chriſtians.

14. You ſay, Fourthly, with convenient boldneſs, That *this infallible Authority of your Church being denyed, no man can be aſſured, that any parcel of Scripture was written by Divine inſpiration*: Which is an untruth, for which no proof 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 aſſured, that the Scripture is divinely inſpired, and yet deny the infallible authority of your Church, or any other. The ſecond, becauſe if I have not ground to be aſſured of the Divine authority of Scripture, unleſs 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*, unleſs I firſt believe the Scripture Divine.

15. Fifthly and laſtly, You ſay, with confidence in abundance, that *none can deny*

*deny the infallible authority of your Church, but he must abandon all infused faith and true religion, if he do but understand himself*: Which is to say, agreeable to what you had said before, and what out of the abundance of your heart you speak very often, *That all Christians besides you, are open Fools, or concealed Atheists.* All this you say with notable confidence (as the maner of Sophisters is, to place their confidence of prevailing in their confident maner of speaking,) but then for the *evidence* you promised to maintain this confidence, that is quite vanished and become invisible.

16. Had I a mind to recriminate now, and to charge Papists (as you do Protestants) that they lead men to Socinianism, I could certainly make a much fairer shew of evidence than you have done. For I would not tell you, You deny the infallibility of the Church of *England*; *ergo*, you lead to Socinianism, which yet is altogether as good an Argument as this; Protestants deny the infallibility of the *Roman*-Church; *ergo*, they induce Socinianism: Nor would I resume my former Argument, and urge you, that by holding the Popes infallibility, you submit your self to that Capital and Mother-Heresie, by advantage whereof, he may lead you at ease to believe *vertue vice*, and *vice vertue*; to believe Antichristianity Christianism, and Christianity Antichristian; he may lead you to Socinianism, to Turcism, nay to be Devil himself if he have a mind to it: But I would shew you that divers ways the Doctors of your Church do the principal and proper work of the Socinians for them, 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 Cardinal *Hosius*, *De Author. Sac. Scrip. l. 3. p. 53.* By *Gordonius Huntlæus. Tom. 1. Controv. 1. De verbo Dei C. 19.* by *Gretserus* and *Tannerus, in Colloquio Ratisbon.* And also by *Vega, Possevin, Wickus*, and *Others.*

18. And then for *the Consent of the Ancients*; That that also delivers 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, Cardinal Perron*, in his 3. Book 2. Chap. of his Reply to K. *James*? Who is it that informs us that *Origen* (who never was questioned for any error in this matter, in or neer his time) *denied the Divinity of the Son and the Holy Gost*? Is it not the same great Cardinal, 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 esteemed an Arrian*? Is it not the same *Perron*, in his Reply to K. *James*, in the fifth Chapter of his fourth Observation? And doth he not in the same place peach *Tertullian* also, and in a manner give him away to the Arrians? And pronounce generally of the *Fathers before the Councel* of Nice, That *the Arrians would gladly be tried by them*? And are not your fellow-Jesuits also, even the prime men of your Order, prevaricators in this point as well as others? Doth not your Friend M. *Fisher*, or M. *Floyd*, in his book of the Nine Questions proposed to him by K. *James*, 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 clearly see, that to common people they are unanswerable, yea that common people are not capable of the answers that learned men yield unto such obscure passages.* And hath not your great Antiquary *Petavius*, in his Notes upon *Epiphanius in Hær. 69.* been very liberal to the Adversaries of the Doctrine of the Trinity, and in a manner given them for Patrons and Advocates? first *Justin Martyr*, and then almost all the Fathers before the Councel of *Nice*, whose speeches, he says, touching this point, *cum Orthodoxæ fidei regula minimè consentiunt.* Hereunto I might add, that the Dominicans and Jesuits between them in another



another matter of great importance, viz. *God's 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 Jesuits on the other Side, that *he doth not decree all things*: And from hence the Socinians conclude (as it is obvious for them to do) 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 infer Falshood*, which is to say in effect, that Reason can never lead any man to Error: And after you have done so, you proclaim to all the world (as you in this Pamphlet do very frequenly,) that *if men follow their Reason and discourse*, they will (if they understand themselves) be lead to Socinianism. And thus you see with what probable matter I might furnish out and justifie my accusation, if I should charge you with leading men to Socinianism! Yet I do not conceive that I have ground enough for this odious imputation. And much less should you have charged Protestants with it, whom you confess 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 by *Abimelech, Non est sicut iste, There is none comparable to it.*

19. Thus Protestants in general, I hope, are sufficiently vindicated from your calumny. I proceed now to do 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 profess, and inclining to Popery. Their Learning (you say) consists only in *some superficial talent of preaching, languages, and elocution, and not in any deep knowledge of Philosophy, especially of Metaphysicks, and much less of that most solid, profitable, subtile, and* (O rem ridiculam, *Cato*, & jocosam!) *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 substantial learning, you disparage them as insufficient in all things else. As if forsooth, because they dispute not eternally, *Utrum Chimæra bombinans in vacuo, possit comedere secundas intentiones? whether a Million of Angels may not sit upon a Needle's point?* Because they fill not their brains with notions that signifie nothing, to the utter extermination of all reason and common sense, and spend not an Age in weaving and unweaving subtile Cobwebs, fitter to catch flyes than Souls; therefore they have no deep knowledge in the Acroamatical part of Learning! But I have too much honoured the poorness of this detraction, to take notice of it.

20. The other Part of your accusation strikes deeper, and is more considerable: And that tels us, that, *Protestantism 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, than 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, Universal Grace*: That *all our works are not sins*: *Merit of good works*: *Inherent Justice*: *Faith alone doth not justifie*: *Charity to be preferred before knowledge*; *Traditions*: *Commandments possible to be kept*: That *their thirty nine Articles are patient, nay ambitious, of some sense wherein they may seem Catholique*: That to *alledge the necessity of wife and children in these days, is but a weak plea for a married Minister to compass a Benefice*: That *Calvinism is at*

 *length*

*length accounted Herefie, and little leſs than Treaſon*: That *men in talk and writing uſe willingly the once fearful 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 do with ſincerity, it is eaſie to tell what doom will paſs 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 remained convinced*: In fine, as the Samaritans ſaw in the Diſciples countenances that they meant to go to *Jeruſalem*, 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 Libel void of all truth, diſcretion and honeſty, what effect it may have wrought, what credit it may have gained with credulous Papiſts, (who dream what they deſire, and believe their own dreams,) or with ill-affected, jealous, and weak Proteſtants, I cannot tell: But one thing I dare boldly ſay, that you your ſelf 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 friends and favourers of your Religion, and inclinable to your Party, Can any imagine that you would proclaim it, and bid the world take heed of them? *Sic notus Ulyſſes*? Do we know the Jeſuits no better than 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 Jealouſie, and to raiſe the clamor of the people againſt them? Certainly, your Zeal to the See of *Rome*, teſtified by your *fourth Vow of ſpecial obedience to the Pope*, proper to your Order, and your cunning carriage of all affairs for the greater advantage and advancement of that See, 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 down 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 deal with: whereas upon men of temper and moderation, ſuch as will oppoſe nothing becauſe you maintain it, but will draw as neer 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 damn no Man nor Doctrine without expreſs and certain warrant from God; 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 weakneſs 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 than they do.

22. In which perſwaſion alſo I am much confirmed by conſideration of the ſillineſs and poorneſs 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 holineſs*? What if out of fear that too much ſimplicity and nakedneſs 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-diſpoſed and wiſely moderated, may ingender, quicken, increaſe and nouriſh, the inward reverence, reſpect, and devotion which is due unto God's Soveraign Majeſty and Power? what if out of a perſwaſion and deſire that Papiſts may be won over to us the ſooner, by the removing of this ſcandal out of their way; and out of an holy jealouſie, 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 Governours of our Church, more of late than formerly, have ſet themſelves to adorn and beautifie the



the places *where God's Honour dwels*, and to make them as heaven-like as they can with earthly ornaments? Is this a ſign that they are warping towards Popery? Is this devotion in the Church of *England*, an argument that ſhe is coming 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: Little thinking that they who would follow his counſel, and endeavour to take away this diſparagement of Proteſtants, and this glorying of Papiſts, ſhould have been cenſured 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 practiſed was approved by zealous Proteſtants ſo long ago, I will here ſet them down.

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 pomp and magnificence that can be deviſed. And although, for the moſt part, much baſeneſs and childiſhneſs 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 or the poor, (yet with an eye perhaps that themſelves would be his quarter-Almoners) notwithſtanding I muſt confeſs, 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 meer neceſſity, (a proportion ſo low, that nature to other moſt bountiful, in matter of neceſſity hath not failed, 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 pomp we liſt: Or that God himſelf had ſo enriched the lower parts of the world with ſuch wonderful varieties of beauty and glory, that they might ſerve only to the pampering of mortal 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 far off burning gloriouſly in it) only the ſimpler, baſer, cheaper, leſs noble, leſs beautiful, leſs 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 diſpoſed, 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 confeſs; 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 imbecillity of a friend.* 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 reſumed and more commonly uſed in *England* than of late times they were: that ſo the colourable argument of their conformity, which is but nominal, with the ancient Church, and our inconformity, which the Governours of the Church would not have ſo much as nominal, 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* than 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 corporal 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 ſincerity, it is utterly impoſſible, he ſhould be a Papiſt? And it is moſt falſly

said by you, that you know, that to some Protestants I clearly demonstrated, or ever so much as undertook, or went about to demonstrate, the contrary. What if the Centurists be censured somewhat roundly by a Protestant Divine for affirming, that *the keeping of the Lord's day was a thing indifferent for two hundred years*? Is there in all this or any part of it any kind of proof of this scandalous Calumny?

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 always 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 Justice, though so imperfect that it cannot justifie: That there are Traditions, though none necessary: That charity is to be preferred before knowledge: That good Works are not properly meritorious. 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 Pope's being the Antichrist, The lawfulness of some kind of prayers for the dead; The Estate of the Fathers Souls, before Christ's Ascension; Freewill, Predestination, Universal grace: The possibility of keeping God's Commandments; The use of Pictures in the Church: Wherein that there hath been anciently diversity of opinion amongst Protestants, it is justified to my hand by a Witness, with you, beyond exception, even your great friend M. *Breerly*, *whose care, exactness, 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 self proved an egregious Calumniator, for charging Protestants with innovation and inclining to Popery, under pretence forsooth, that their Doctrine begins of late to be altered in these points. Whereas, M. *Breerly* will inform you, They have been anciently, and even from the beginning of the Reformation, controverted amongst them, though perhaps the stream and current of their Doctors run one way, and only some brook or rivulet of them the other.

27. And thus my Friends, I suppose, are clearly vindicated from your scandals and calumnies: It remains now that in the last place I bring my self fairly off from your foul aspersions, that so my Person may not be (as indeed howsoever it should not be) any disadvantage or disparagement to the Cause, nor any scandal to weak 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 hearsay, and refusing to give me opportunity 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 far in the spreading of my own undeserved defamation: but whosoever teaches or holds them, *let him be Anathema*! The sum of them all cast up by your self, in your first Chapter, is this, *Nothing ought or can be certainly believed, farther than it may be proved by evidence of Natural Reason*, (where I conceive, Natural reason is opposed to supernatural Revelation;) and whosoever holds so, *let him be Anathema*! And moreover to clear my self once for all, from all imputations of this nature, which charge me injuriously with denial of Supernatural Verities, I profess sincerely, that I believe all those Books of Scripture, which the Church of *England* accounts Canonical, 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 Heresie, which by the Act of Parliament *primo* of Q. *Eliz.* is declared to be so, and only to be so: And though in such points which may be held diversly of divers men *salvâ Fidei compage*, I would not take any man's liberty from him, and



and humbly beseech all men, that they would not take mine from me: Yet thus much I can say (which I hope, will satisfie 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, measured 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 do verily believe and embrace.

29. Another great and manifest injury you have done me, in charging me to have forsaken your Religion, *because it conduced not to my temporal ends*, and suted not with my desires and designs: Which certainly is an horrible crime, and whereof if you could convince me, by just and strong presumptions, I should then acknowledge my self to deserve that Opinion, which you would fain induce your Credents unto, that I changed not your Religion for any other, but for none at all. But of this great fault my conscience acquits me, and God, who only knows the hearts of all men, knows 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 do, nor can produce any proof or presumption for it, but forgetting your self (as it is God's will oft times that Slanderers should do,) have let fall some passages, which being well weighed, will make considering men apt to believe, that you did not believe your self. For how is it possible you should believe that I deserted your Religion for ends, and 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 door, which here in *England* leads to preferment? Again, How incredible is it that you should believe, that I forsook the profession of your Religion, as not suting with my desires and designs, which yet reconciles the enjoying of the pleasures and profits of sin here, with the hope of happiness hereafter, and proposes as great hope of great temporal advancements to the capable servants of it, as any, nay more then any Religion in the world; and instead of this should choose Socinianism, a Doctrine, which howsoever erroneous in explicating the Mysteries of Religion, and allowing greater liberty of opinion in speculative matters, than any other Company of Christians doth, or they should do; yet certainly which you, I am sure, will pretend and maintain to explicate the Laws of Christ with more rigor, and less indulgence and condescendence to the desires of flesh and blood than 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 clearly demonstrates that this foul and false aspersion, which you have cast upon me, proceeds from no other fountain, but a heart abounding with the gall and bitterness of uncharitableness, and even blinded with malice towards me; or else from a perverse zeal to your superstition, which secretly suggests this perswasion to you, That for the Catholique cause nothing is unlawful, but that you may make use of such indirect and crooked Arts, as these, to blast my reputation, and to possess mens minds with disaffection to my Person, lest otherwise peradventure they might with some indifference hear reason from me. God, I hope, which bringeth light out of darkness, will turn your counsels to foolishness, 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 Personal matters, which hitherto you have spoke of, to the business in hand? If it could be proved that Cardinal *Bellarmine* was indeed a Jew, or that Cardinal *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

Truth is nevertheleſs Truth, nor Reaſon ever the leſs Reaſon, becauſe I ſpeak it. And therefore the Chriſtian Reader, knowing that his Salvation or damnation depends upon his impartial and ſincere judgement 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 ſpeaks, but what is ſpoken: Which is all the favour I deſire of him, as knowing that I am deſirous not to perſwade him, unleſs 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 profeſs 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 premiſed unto it, it is very eaſie for me 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 contained in Scripture?* Or, what one Concluſion almoſt of importance is there in your Book, which is not by this one clearly confutable?

31. Grant this, and it will preſently follow in oppoſition to your firſt Concluſion, and the Argument of your *firſt Chap.* that amongſt men of different opinions, touching the obſcure and controverted Queſtions of Religion, ſuch as may with probability be diſputed on both Sides (and ſuch are the diſputes of Proteſtants;) Good men and lovers of truth of all Sides may be ſaved; becauſe all neceſſary things being ſuppoſed evident concerning them, with men ſo qualified, there will be no difference: There being no more certain ſign that a Point is not evident, than that honeſt and underſtanding and indifferent men, and ſuch as give themſelves liberty of judgement after a mature conſideration of the matter, differ about it.

32. 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, 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*.

33. Grant this, and the diſtinction of Points Fundamental and not Fundamental, will appear very good and pertinent. For thoſe truths will be Fundamental, which are evidently delivered in Scripture, and commanded to be preached to all men; Thoſe not Fundamental, which are obſcure. And nothing will hinder but that the Catholique Church may err in the latter kind of the ſaid Points: becauſe Truths not neceſſary to the Salvation, cannot be neceſſary to the Beeing of a Church; and becauſe it is not abſolutely neceſſary that God ſhould aſſiſt his Church any farther than to bring her to Salvation; neither will there be any neceſſity at all of any infallible Guide, either to conſign 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 conſigned. Nor for the latter, becauſe nothing that is obſcure can be neceſſary to be underſtood, or not miſtaken. And ſo the diſcourſe of your whole *Third Chap.* will preſently vaniſh.

34. Fourthly, for the Creed's containing the Fundamentals of ſimple belief, though I ſee not how it may be deduced from this Principle, 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 confeſſed to be clearly contained in Scripture, What imports it whether thoſe of one ſort be contained in the Creed?

35. Fifthly, let this be granted, and the immediate Corollary in oppoſition to your *fifth Chap.* 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 Churche's peace, and dividing Unity for ſuch matters, is in a high degree preſumptuous and Schiſmatical.

36. Grant



36. Grant this ſixthly, and it will follow unavoidably that Proteſtants cannot poſſibly be Hereticks, ſeeing they believe all things evidently contained in Scripture, which are ſuppoſed to be all that is neceſſary to be believed: and ſo your *Sixth Chapter* is clearly confuted.

37. Grant this laſtly, and it will be undoubtedly conſequent, in contradiction of your *Seventh Chapter*, that no man can ſhew more charity to himſelf than by continuing a Proteſtant; ſeeing Proteſtants are ſuppoſed to believe, and therefore may accordingly practiſe, at leaſt by their Religion are not hindered from practiſing and performing all things neceſſary to Salvation.

38. 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 baſis, and adequate foundation of my Anſwer; and which while it ſtands firm and unmoveable, cannot but be the ſupporter of my Book, and the certain ruine of Yours, is ſo far from being, according to your pretence, deteſted by all Proteſtants, that all Proteſtants whatſoever, as you may ſee in their harmony of Confeſſions, unanimouſly profeſs and maintain it. And you your ſelf, Chap. 6. §. 30. plainly confeſs as much, in ſaying, *The whole Edifice of the Faith of Proteſtants is ſetled on theſe two Principles: Theſe particular Books are Canonical Scripture: And the ſenſe and meaning of them is plain and evident, at leaſt, in all Points neceſſary to Salvation.*

39. And thus your Venom againſt me is in a manner ſpent, ſaving only that there remain two little Impertinencies, whereby you would diſable me from being a fit Advocate for the cauſe of Proteſtants. The firſt, becauſe I refuſe to ſubſcribe the Articles of the Church of *England*: The ſecond, becauſe I have ſet down in writing, Motives which ſometime induced me to forſake Proteſtantiſm, and hitherto have not anſwered them.

40. By the former of which Objections it ſhould ſeem, 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 groſs Miſtakes. And yet why he who makes ſcruple of ſubſcribing the truth of one or two Propoſitions, may not yet be fit enough to maintain that thoſe who do ſubſcribe them are in a ſavable condition, I do not underſtand. Now though I hold not the Doctrine of all Proteſtants abſolutely true, (which with reaſon cannot be required of me 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 *Proteſtancy deſtroys not Salvation*. For the Church of *England*, I am perſwaded, that the conſtant Doctrine of it is ſo pure and Orthodox, 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 diſturb the peace, or renounce the Communion of it. This in my opinion is all intended by Subſcription; and thus much if you conceive me not ready to ſubſcribe, your *Charity* I aſſure you is much *Miſtaken*.

41. Your other objection againſt me, is yet more impertinent and frivolous than the former: Unleſs perhaps it be a juſt exception againſt a Phyſitian, that himſelf was ſometimes in, and recovered himſelf from, that diſeaſe which he undertakes to cure; or againſt a Guide in a way, that at firſt, before he had experience himſelf, miſtook it, and afterwards found his error and amended it. That noble Writer *Michael de Montaigne*, was ſurely of a far different mind; for he will hardly allow any Phyſitian competent, but only for ſuch diſeaſes as himſelf had paſſed through: And a far greater than *Montaigne*, even he that ſaid, *Tu converſus confirma fratres*, gives us ſufficiently to underſtand that they which have

themſelves

themſelves been in ſuch a ſtate as to need converſion, are not thereby made incapable of, but rather engaged and obliged unto, and qualified for, this charitable function.

42. Neither am I guilty of that ſtrange and prepoſterous zeal (as you eſteem it) which you impute to me; for having been ſo long careleſs in removing this ſcandal 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 maner wholly imployed: And beſides, though you Jeſuits take upon you to have ſuch large and univerſal intelligence of all State-affairs and matters of importance; yet I hope ſuch a contemptible matter, as an Anſwer of mine to a little piece of paper, may very probably have been written and eſcaped your Obſervation. The truth is I made an Anſwer to them three years ſince and better, which perhaps might have been publiſhed, but for two reaſons: One, becauſe the Motives were never publique, until you made them ſo: The other, becauſe I was loath to proclaim to all the world ſo much weakneſs as I ſhewed, in ſuffering my ſelf to be abuſed by ſuch ſilly Sophiſms; 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.

43. The Motives then were theſe.

1. *Becauſe perpetual viſible profeſſion, which could never be wanting to the Religion of Chriſt, nor any part of it, is apparently wanting to Proteſtant Religion, ſo far as concerns 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 fail 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 Catholiques hath been frequently confirmed; and the oppoſite Doctrine of Proteſtants confounded, with ſupernatural and divine Miracles.*

4. *Becauſe many points of Proteſtant doctrine, are the damned opinions of Heretiques, 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 Catholique* 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 mean, thoſe Fathers, who lived within the compaſs of the firſt 600. years; to whom Proteſtants themſelves do very frequently and very confidently appeal.*

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 Maſs (which contains the moſt material points now in Controverſie) was perſwaded by reaſons ſuggeſted to him by the Devil himſelf, diſputing with him. So himſelf profeſſeth in his Book* de Miſſa Privata: *That all men might take heed of following him, who profeſſeth himſelf to follow the Devil.*

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

10. *Becauſe by denying all humane authority, either of Pope, or Councels or Church,*





*to determine Controverſies of Faith, they have aboliſhed all poſſible means of ſuppreſſing Hereſie, or reſtoring Unity to the Church.*

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

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

To the ſecond: God hath neither decreed nor foretold, that there ſhall be always a viſible company of men free from all error in it ſelf damnable. Neither is it always of neceſſity Schiſmatical to ſeparate from the external communion of a Church, though wanting nothing neceſſary. For if this Church ſuppoſed to want nothing neceſſary, require me to profeſs againſt my conſcience, that I believe ſome error, though never ſo ſmall and innocent, which I do not believe, and will not allow me her Communion but upon this condition; In this caſe the Church for requiring this condition is Schiſmatical, and not I for ſeparating from the Church.

To the third: If any credit may be given to Records far more creditable than theſe, the Doctrine of Proteſtants, that is, the Bible, hath been confirmed, and the Doctrine of Papiſts, which is in many points plainly oppoſite to it, confounded with ſupernatural and divine Miracles, which for number and glory out ſhine Popiſh pretended Miracles, as much as the Sun 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 confirmed by innumerous Miracles, foretels me plainly, that in after-ages great ſigns and wonders ſhall be wrought in confirmation of falſe doctrine, and that I am not to believe any doctrine which ſeems to my underſtanding repugnant to the firſt, though an Angel 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 ſigns of falſe doctrine, than much to regard them as certain Arguments of the Truth. Beſides, ſetting aſide the Bible, and the Tradition of it, there is as good ſtory for Miracles wrought by thoſe who lived and dyed 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 ſeems to me no ſtrange thing that God in his Juſtice 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. *Auſtin* were put in the Catalogue of Heretiques.

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

To the ſixth: The Doctrine of Papiſts, is confeſſed by Papiſts contrary to the Fathers in many points.

To the ſeventh: 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 do a neceſſary work of Charity after a peaceable manner, when there is no body elſe that can or will do it. In extraordinary caſes, extraordinary courſes are not to be diſallowed. If ſome Chriſtian Layman ſhould come into a Countrey of Infidels, and had ability to perſwade them to Chriſtianity, Who would ſay, he might not uſe it for want of Commiſſion?

To the eighth: *Luther's* conference with the Devil might be, for ought I know, nothing but a melancholy Dream. If it were real, the Devil might perſwade *Luther* from the Maſs, hoping by doing ſo to keep him conſtant to it: Or that others would make his diſſwaſion from it an Argument for it, (as wee ſee

[a] See this acknowledged by *Bellar. de Script. Eccleſ. in Philaſtrio. By Petavius Animad in Epiph de inſcrip. operis By S. Auſtin Lib. de Her. 30.*

Papists do) and be afraid of following *Luther*, as confessing himself to have been perswaded by the Devil.

To the ninth: *Iliacos intra muros peccatur & extra.* Papists are more guilty of this fault than 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 find this not only a better, but the only means to suppress Heresie, 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 than this were required 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.

The



# The AUTHOR of *CHARITY MAINTAINED*, His Preface to the READER.

GIve me leave (good Reader) to inform thee, by way of Preface, of three Points. The first concerns D. *Potters Answer*, to *Charity Mistaken*. The second relates to this *Reply* of mine. And the third contains some *Premonitions*, or *Prescripions*, in case D. *Potter*, or any in his behalf, think fit to Rejoyn.

2. For the first point, concerning D. *Potters Answer*, I say, in general, reserving particulars to their proper places, that in his whole Book 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 several professions? And therefore *Charity Mistaken* judiciously pressing those particulars, wherein the difficulty doth precisely consist, proves in general, that there is but one true Church; that all Christians are obliged to hearken to her; that she must be ever visible, and infallible; that to separate ones self from her communion is Schism; and to dissent from her Doctrin 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 Fundamental, and not Fundamental, is wholly vain, as it is applyed by Protestants. These (I say) and some other general grounds, *Charity Mistaken* handles, and out of them doth clearly 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 *destroyes 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 disguiseth this truth, is an enemy to souls, which he deceives with ungrounded false hopes of Salvation, in different Faiths, and Religions. And this *Charity Mistaken* performed exactly, according to that which appears to have been his design, 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 less, Whether general Councels be infallible; whether the Pope may erre in his Decrees common to the whole Church; whether he be above a General Council; whether all points of Faith be contained in Scripture; whether Faith be resolved into the authority of the Church, as into his last *formal 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 Mass, Indulgences, and *Index Expurgatorius*: All which, and divers other articles, D. *Potter* (as I said) draws by violence into his Book: and he might have brought in Pope *Joan*, or Antichrist, or the *Jews* who are permitted to live in *Rome*, which are common Themes for men that want better matter, as D. *Potter* was fain 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 answer he uttereth 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 affirm plainly, 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 less excusable, because he must grant, that those very particulars to which he digresseth, are not Fundamental errors, though it should be granted that they be Errors, which indeed are Catholique Verities. For since they be not Fundamental, nor destructive of Salvation, what imports it, Whether we hold them or no, for as much as concerns our possibility to be saved?

3. In one thing only he will perhaps seem to have touched the point in question, to wit, in his distinction of points Fundamental, and not Fundamental: because some may think, that a difference in points which are not Fundamental, breaks not the Unity 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 says, That there are some points so Fundamental, as that all are obliged to know and *believe* them explicitely; but never tels us, whether there be any other points of Faith, which a man may deny or *disbelieve*, though they be sufficiently prefented 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 Fundamental, as I declare at large in divers places of my first Part. So that it is clear, D. *Potter* even in this his last refuge and distinction, never comes to the point in question; to say nothing that he himself doth quite overthrow it, and plainly contradict his whole design, as I shew in the third Chapter of my *first Part*.

4. And as for D. *Potter*'s 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 clearly answered even in *Charity Mistaken*; but he takes no knowledge at all of any such answers, and much less doth he apply himself to confute them. He alledgeth also Authors with so great corruption and fraud, as I would not have believed, if I had not found it by clear and frequent experience. In his second *Edition*, he hath indeed left out one or two gross corruptions, amongst many others no less notorious, having, as it seems, 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 withal he read the *Second*. For preventing of which inconvenience, I have thought it necessary to take notice of them, and discover them in my *Reply*.

5. And for conclusion of this point I will only say, that D. *Potter* might well have spared his pains if he had ingeniously acknowledged, where the whole substance, yea and sometime the very words and phrases of his Book may be found in far briefer manner, namely, in a *Sermon* of D. *Usher*'s preached before our late Soveraign Lord *King James*, the 20. of June 1620. at *Wansted*, containing *A Declaration of the Universality of the Church of Christ, and the Unity of Faith professed therein*; which Sermon having been roundly and wittily confuted by a Catholique Divine, under the name of *Paulus Veridicus*, within the compass of about four sheets of Paper, D. *Potter*'s *Answer to Charity Mistaken* was in effect confuted before it appeared. And this may suffice for a general Censure of his Answer to *Charity Mistaken*.

Concerning my Reply.

6. For the second, touching my *Reply*: if you wonder at the Bulk thereof, compared either with *Charity Mistaken*, or D. *Potter's Answer*, 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 meer 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 design, 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 coming forth, if it had not been prevented by the Treatise of *Charity Mistaken*, which seemed to make the other intended work a little less seasonable at that time. But *Charity Mistaken* proves only in General out of some Universal Principles, well backed and made good by choice and solid Authorities, that of two disagreeing in points of Faith, one only without repentance can be saved; which aim exacted no great bulk. And as for D. *Potter's Answer*, even that also is not so short, as it may seem. For if his marginal 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 himself 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 Heresie, or rather indeed ground of Atheism, than a perswasion that men of different Religions may be saved, if otherwise, forsooth, they lead a kind of civil and moral life: I conceive, that my chief endeavour was not to be employed in answering D. *Potter*, but that it was necessary to handle the Question it self somewhat at large, and not only to prove in general, that both Protestants and Catholiques cannot be saved; but to shew also, that Salvation cannot be hoped for out of the Catholique Roman Church; and yet withal, not to omit to answer all the particulars of D. *Potter's* Book which may any way import. 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. *Potter's Answer*, though yet so, as even that in this first *Part*, I omit not to answer 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 answer D. *Potter*'s Treatise, *Section* by *Section*, as they lie in order. I here therefore intreat the Reader, that if heartily he desire satisfaction in this so important Question, he do not content himself with that which I say to D. *Potter* in my second *Part*, but that he take the *First* before him, either all, or at least so much as may serve most to his purpose of being satisfied in those doubts which press 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 chief 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 several 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 perpetual 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 business is dispatched when they have proved ours to have been always visible: for then they will conceive that theirs hath been so: And the like may be truly said of very many other particulars. Besides it is D. *Potter*'s 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 trivial old Objections, which, if they be not all answered, it will and must serve the turn, to make the ignorant sort of men believe and brag, as if some main unanswerable matter had been subtilly and purposely omitted; and every body knows that some Objection may be very plausibly made in few words, the clear and solid answer whereof will require more leaves of paper than one. And in particular D. *Potter* doth couch his corruption of Authors within the compass of so few lines, and with so great confusedness and fraud, that it requires much time, pains, and paper to open them so distinctly, as that they may appear to every man's 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 ommitted, all which could not but add 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 than 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*, meerly upon necessity; though I did very well perceive by most apparent circumstances, that I must probably have been sure enough to find them plainly misalledged, and much wronged: and for the few which are examined, there hath not wanted some difficulties to do 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 justifie it self in the midst of all difficulties which may occur. And as for me, when I alledge Protestant Writers as well Domestical as Forraign, I willingly and thankfully acknowledg my self obliged for divers of them to the Author of the Book entituled, *The Protestant's Apology for the Roman Church*, who calls himself *John Breerly*, whose care, exactness, and fidelity is so extraordinary great, as that he doth not only cite the Books, 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 find what he cites, yet suspend your judgement, till you have read the corrections placed at the end of his Book; though it be also true, that after all diligence and faithfulness on his behalf, 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 forasmuch as concerns the manner of my *Reply*, I have procured to do it without all bitterness or gall of invective words, both for as much as may import either Protestants in general, or D. *Potter*'s person in particular; unless, for example, he will call it bitterness for me to term a gross impertinency, a *sleight*, or a *corruption*, by those very names, without which I do not know how to express the things; and yet therein I can truly affirm 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 profess, that D. *Potter* gives so many and so just occasions of being round with him, as that perhaps some will jude me to have been rather remiss, than moderate. But since in the very title of my *Reply* I profess to *maintain Charity*, I conceive that the excess will be more excusable amongst all kinds of men, if it fall to be in mildness, than if it had appeared in too much zeal. 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 self as many and more personal defects than he can heap upon me. Truth only, and sincerity, I so much value and profess, 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* interd a Rejoynder.

9. In the third and last place, I have thought fit to express my self thus. If D. *Potter*, or any other resolve to answer my *Reply*, I desire that he will observe some things which may tend to his own reputation, the saving of my unnecessary pains, and especially to the greater advantage of truth. I wish then that he would be careful 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 concerns the question between D. *Potter* and *Charity Mistaken*,) doth he so often and seriously labour to prove, that Faith is not resolved into the Authority of the Church, as into the formal *Object* and *Motive* 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 Diocess, is not all one with the Universal Church? Or that the Pope as a private Doctor may err? With many other such points as will easily appear in their proper places. It will also be necessary for him not to put certain Doctrines upon us, from which he knows we disclaim as much as himself.

10. I must in like manner intreat him not to recite my reasons and discourses by halfs, but to set them down faithfully and entirely, for as much as in very deed concerns 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 find how ill he hath complied with the promise which he made in his Preface to the Reader, not to omit *without answer any one thing of moment in all the discourse of Charity Mistaken*. Neither will this course be a cause that his *Rejoynder* grow too large, but it will be occasion of brevity to him, and free me also from the pains of setting down all the words which he omits, and himself of demonstrating, that what he omitted was not material. Nay, I will assure him, that if he keep himself to the point of every difficulty, and not weary the Reader, and overcharge his margent with unnecessary quotations of Authors in Greek and Latine, and sometime also in Italian and French, together with Proverbs, Sentences of Poets, and such Grammatical stuff, nor affect to cite a multitude of our Catholique School-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. Again, before he come to set down his answer, or propose his Arguments, let him consider very well what may be replyed, and whether his own objections may not be retorted against himself, as the Reader will perceive to have hapned often to his disadvantage in my *Reply* against him. But especially I expect, and Truth it self exacts at his hand, that he speak clearly and distinctly, and not seek to walk in darkness, so to delude and deceive his Reader, now saying, and then denying, and always speaking with such ambiguity, as that his greatest care may seem to consist in a certain Art to find a shift, as his occasions might chance, either now, or hereafter to require, and as he might fall out to be urged by diversity of several Arguments. And to the end it may appear that I deal plainly, as I would have him also do, I desire that he declare himself concerning these points.

11. First, whether our Saviour Christ have not always had, and be not ever to have, a visible true Church on earth: and whether the contrary Doctrine be not a damnable heresie:

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 can 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 doth not follow, that she hath not erred Fundamentally; because every such error destroys the nature and being of the Church, and so our Saviour Christ should have had no visible Church on earth.

14. Fourthly, if the *Roman* Church did not fall into any Fundamental error, let him tell us how it can be *damnable* to live in her Communion, or to maintain errors, which are known and confessed, not to be Fundamental, or *damnable*.

15. Fifthly, if her Errors were not damnable, nor did exclude salvation, how can they be excused from *Schism*, who forsook her Communion upon pretence of errors, which were not damnable.

16. Sixthly, if D. *Potter* have a mind to say, That her Errors are Damnable, or Fundamental, let him do us so much charity, as to tell us, in particular, what those Fundamental errors be. But he must still remember (and my self 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 have, any Church which was universal, and extended her self 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. Seventhly, whether any one Error maintained against any one Truth, though never so small in it self, yet sufficiently propounded as testified or revealed by Almighty God, do not destroy the Nature and Unity of Faith, or at least is not a grievous offence excluding Salvation.

18. Eightly, if this be so, how can *Lutherans*, *Calvinists*, *Zwinglians*, and all the rest of disagreeing Protestants,

Protestants, hope for Salvation, since it is manifest, that some of them must needs err against some such truth as is testified by Almighty God, either Fundamental, or at least not Fundamental.

19. Ninthly, we constantly urge, and require to have a particular Catalogue of such Points as he calls Fundamental: A Catalogue, I say, in *particular*, and not only some *general* definition, or description, wherein Protestants may perhaps agree, though we see that they differ when they come to assign what Points in particular be Fundamental; and yet upon such a particular Catalogue much depends: as for example, in particular, Whether or no a man do not err in some Point Fundamental or necessary to Salvation; and whether or no *Lutherans*, *Calvinists*, and the rest, do disagree in Fundamentals; which if they do, the same heaven cannot receive them all.

20. Tenthly and lastly, I desire that in answering to these Points, he would let us know distinctly, what is the Doctrine of the Protestant *English* Church concerning them, and what he utters only as his own private opinion.

21. These are the Questions, which, for the present, I find it fit and necessary for me to ask of D. *Potter*, or any other who will defend his cause, or impugne ours, And it will be in vain to speak vainly, and to tell me, that a Fool may ask more questions in an hour, than a Wise man can answer in a year; with such idle Proverbs as that. For I ask but such questions as for which he gives occasion in his Book, and where he declares not himself, but after so ambiguous and confused a manner, as that Truth it self can scarce tell how to convince him so, but that with ignorant and ill-judging men, he will seem to have somewhat left to say for himself, though Papists (as he calls them) and Puritans should press him contrary ways at the same time: and these questions concern things also of high importance, as whereupon the knowledge of God's Church, and true Religion, and consequently, Salvation of the soul, depends. And now because he shall not taxe me with being like those men in the Gospel, 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 self to answer upon any demand of his, both to all these Questions, if he find that I have not done it already, and to any other, concerning matter of Faith, that he shall ask. And I will tell him very plainly, what is Catholique Doctrin, 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 perform these things, as a man who professeth learning should do, not flying from questions which concern things as they are considered in their own nature, to accidental or rare circumstances, of ignorance, incapacity, want of means to be instructed, erroneous conscience, and the like, which being very various and different, cannot be well comprehended under any general Rule. But in delivering general Doctrins, 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 concur proportionable thereunto. As for example, some may for a time have invincible ignorance, even of some Fundamental Article of Faith, through want of capacity, instruction, or the like, and so not offend either in such ignorance or error, and yet we must absolutely say, that error in any one Fundamental point is damnable; because so it is, if we consider things in themselves, abstracting from accidental circumstances in particular persons: as contrarily, If some man judge some act of virtue, or some indifferent action to be a sin, in him it is a sin indeed, by reason of his erroneous conscience, and yet we ought not to say absolutely, that virtuous or indifferent actions are sins: and in all sciences we must distinguish the general 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 errors be Fundamental and Damnable, he is not to change the state of the question, and have recourse to Ignorance, and the like; but to answer concerning the errors being considered what they are apt to be in themselves, 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 again desire an answer without any of these or the like ambiguous terms, *in some sort*, *in some sense*, *in some degree*, which may be explicated afterward, as strictly or largely as may best serve his turn, but let him tell us roundly, and particularly, in what sort, in what sense, in what degree he understands those, and the like obscure mincing phrases. If he proceed solidly after this manner, and not by way of meer words, more like a Preacher to a vulgar Auditor, than like a learned man with a pen in his hand, thy patience shall be the less abused, and truth will also receive more right. And since we have already laid the grounds of the question, much may be said hereafter in few words, if (as I said) he keep close to the real point of every difficulty without wandring into impertinent disputes, or multiplying vulgar and thred-bare objections and arguments, or labouring to prove what no man denies, or making a vain ostentation by citing a number of Schoolmen, which every Puny brought up in Schools is able to do; and if he cite his Authors with such sincerity, as no time need be spent in opening his corruptions; and finally, if he set himself awork with this consideration, that we are to give a most strict account to a most just and impartial Judge, 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 Books concerning true Faith and Religion, without which no Soul can be saved, makes a man's Errors more material, than they would be, if the question were but of toys.

The



# The Answer to the PREFACE.

AND 1. & 2. §. If beginnings 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 several Professions?* But, *Whether you may without uncharitableness affirm that Protestancy unrepented destroys 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 far; and, not medling at all with *Papists*, but leaving them to *stand or fall to their own Master*, had proved *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 Answer 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 uncharitableness 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 proved 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, and therefore uncharitably concluded, that Protestants were the part that was to be excluded. As, though Jews and Christians cannot both be saved, yet a Jew cannot justly, and therefore not charitably, pronounce a Christian damned.

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 Work and *Charity M.* together, will presently appear. *Charity M.* proves, you say, in general, *That there is but one Church.* D. *Potter* tells him, *His labour is lost in proving the unity of the Catholique Church, whereof there is no doubt or controversie*: and herein, I hope, you will grant he answers right and to the purpose. *C. M.* proves (you say) secondly, *That all Christians are obliged to hearken to the Church.* D. *Potter answers*, *It is true*: *yet not absolutely in all things, but onely 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* denies it not; and as for her *Infallibility*, he grants it in *Fundamentals*, but *not in Superstructures*. *C. M.* proves, you say, fourthly, *That to separate one's self from the Churche's Communion, is Schism.* D. *Potter* grants it, with this exception, *unless there be necessary cause to do so*; unless the conditions of her Communion be apparently unlawful. *C. M.* proves, you say, lastly, *That to dissent from her Doctrine is Heresie, though it be in points never so few, and never so small, and therefore that the distinction of points fundamental and unfundamental, as it is applyed by Protestants, is wholly vain.* This D. *P.* denies; shews the Reasons brought for it, weak and unconcluding; proves the contrary, by Reasons unanswerable: and therefore that *The distinction of points into fundamental and not fundamental, as it is applyed by Protestants, is very good.* Upon these grounds you say,

say, C. M. clearly 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 explicite and particular repentance, and dereliction of their errors; for so C. M. hath declared himself p. 14. where he hath these words, *We may safely say that a man who lives in Protestancy, and who is so far from Repenting it, as that he will not so much as acknowledge it to be a sin, though he be sufficiently enformed 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 sin. 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 die in error, and yet die with Repentance, as for all his sins of ignorance, so, in that number, for the errors in which he dies; with a repentance though not explicite and particular which is not simply required, yet implicit and general which is sufficient: so that he cannot but hope, considering the goodness of God, that the truth is retained on both Sides: especially those, of the necessity of Repentance from dead Works and Faith in Jesus Christ, if they be put in Practice, may be an Antidote against the errors held on either Side; to such he means, and says, as being diligent in seeking truth, and desirous to find it, yet miss of it through humane frailty, and die in error.* If you will but attentively consider and compare the undertaking of C. M. and D. *Potter*'s performance in all these points, I hope, you will be so ingenuous as to acknowledge, that you have injured 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 do) *An enemy to souls by deceiving them with ungrounded false hopes of Salvation*; seeing the hope of salvation cannot be ungrounded, which requires and supposes belief and practice of all things absolutely necessary unto salvation, and repentance of those sins and errours which we fall into by humane frailty: Nor *a friend to indifferency in Religion*, seeing he gives them only hope of pardon of Errours 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 impartial search of truth, and very far from teaching them that it is indifferent what Religion they are of; and, without all controversie, very honourable to the Goodness of God, with which how it can consist, not to be satisfied with his servants true endeavours to know his will, and do it, without full and exact performance, I leave it to you and all good men to judge.

4. As little justice me-thinks 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 immediately and directly pertinent to the business 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 than 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 hearkening to her in all things: It will be very possible to separate from her communion in some things, without Schism; and from her Doctrine, so far as it is erroneous, without Heresie: Then all that she proposes will not be*, eo ipso, *fundamental, because she proposes it*: and so presently all *Charity Mistaken* will vanish into smoak, and clouds, and nothing.

5. You say *he was loth to affirm plainly, that generally both Catholiques and Protestants may be saved*: which yet is manifest he doth affirm plainly, of Protestants throughout his Book; and of erring Papists that have *sincerely sought the truth, and*



*and failed of it, and die with a general repentance*, p. 77, 78. And yet you deceive your self if you conceive he had any other necessity to do so, but only that he thought it true. For we may and do 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 your Church Salvation may be had, but only that before *Luthers* time it might be: Then when your means 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 love of truth, that we are thus charitable to you.

6. Neither is it material that these particulars he speaks against, are not *fundamental errors*; for though they be not *destructive of salvation*, yet the convincing of them may be, and is, *destructive enough of his Adversarie's 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 than this; The Church of *Rome* doth err in this or that, therefore it is not infallible. And this perhaps you perceived your self, and therefore demanded not *Since they be not fundamental, what imports it whether we hold them or no?* simply: But, *for as much as concerns our possibility to be saved.* As if we were not bound by the love of God and the love 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 resolved! Our Saviour himself having assured us, * That *he that shall break one of his least Commandments* (some whereof you pretend are concerning venial sins, and consequently the keeping of them not necessary to salvation) *and shall so teach men, shall be called the least in the Kingdom of Heaven.* * Mat. 5. 19.

7. But then it imports very much, though not for the *possibility that you may be saved*, yet for the *probability that you will be so*: because the holding of these errors, though it did not *merit*, might yet *occasion* damnation. As the doctrine of Indulgences may take away the fear of Purgatory, and the doctrine of Purgatory the fear of Hell; as you well know it does too frequently. So that though a godly man might be saved *with these* errors, yet *by means of them*, many are made vicious, and so damned. *By them* I say, though *not for them.* No godly Layman who is verily perswaded that there is neither impiety nor superstition in the use of your Latine-service, shall be damned, 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 have been saved. Besides, though the matter of an Error may be only something profitable, not necessary, yet the neglect of it may be a damnable sin; As, not to regard venial sins is in the Doctrine of your Schools, mortal. Lastly, as venial sins, you say, dispose men to mortal; so the erring from some profitable, though lesser truth, may dispose a man to error in greater matters. As for example: The belief of the Pope's infallibility is, I hope, not unpardonably damnable to every one that holds it; yet if it be a falshood (as most certainly it is) it puts a man into a very congruous disposition to believe *Antichrist*, if he should chance to get into that See.

8. *Ad* §. 3. *In his Distinction of, points fundamental and not fundamental, he may seem*, you say, *to have touched the point, but does not so indeed. Because though he says, There are some points so fundamental, as that all are obliged to believe them explicitely, yet he tels you not, whether a man may disbelieve any other points of faith, which are sufficiently presented to his understanding, as Truths revealed by Almighty God.* Touching which matter of *Sufficient Proposal*, I beseech you to come out of the clouds, and tell us roundly and plainly, what you mean by *Points of faith*

 *suffici-*

*sufficiently propounded to a man's understanding, as Truths revealed by God.* Perhaps you mean such, as the person to whom they are proposed, understands sufficiently to be Truths revealed by God. But how then can he possibly choose but believe them? Or how is it not an apparent contradiction, that a man should disbelieve what himself understands to be a Truth; or any Christian what he understands or but believes to be testified by God? Doctor *Potter* might well think 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 do hereafter, *That the impiety of heresie consists in calling God's truth in question*, that this should be your meaning. Or do you esteem 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 believe 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 have told you this neither. Or do you mean by *sufficiently propounded as Divine Truths*, all that your Church propounds for such? That you may not, neither; For the Question between us, is this; *Whether your Churches Proposition be a sufficient Proposition?* And therefore to suppose this, is to suppose the Question; which you know in Reasoning is always a fault. Or lastly, do you mean (for I know not else what possibly you can mean,) by *sufficiently presented to his understanding as revealed by God*; that which, all things considered, is so proposed to him, that he might and should and would believe it to be true and revealed by God, were it not for some voluntary and avoidable fault of his own that interposeth it self between his understanding and the truth presented to it; This is the best construction that I can make of your words; and if you speak of truths thus proposed and rejected, let it be as damnable, as you please, to deny or disbelieve them. But then I cannot but be amaz'd to hear you say, That D. *Potter never tells you whether there be any other Points of faith, besides those which we are bound to believe explicitely, which a man may deny or disbelieve, though they be sufficiently presented to his understanding as truths revealed or testified by Almighty God*; seeing the light it self is no more clear than D. *Potter's* Declaration of himself for the Negative in this Question. p. 245, 246, 247, 249, 250. of his Book. Where he treats at large of this very Argument, beginning his discourse thus. "*It seems fundamental to the faith, and for the salvation of every member of the Church, that he acknowledge and believe all such points of faith, as whereof he may be convinced that they belong to the Doctrine of Jesus Christ.* To this conviction he requires three things; *Clear Revelation, Sufficient Proposition, and Capacity and Understading in the Hearer. For want of clear Revelation, he frees the Church before Christ and the Disciples of Christ, from any damnable error, though they believed not those things, which he that should now deny, were no Christian. To Sufficient Proposition, he requires two things: 1. That the points be perspicuously laid open in themselves. 2. So forcibly, as may serve to remove reasonable doubts to the contrary, and to satisfie a teachable mind concerning it, against the principles in which he hath been bred to the Contrary. This Proposition, he says, is not limited to the Pope or Church, but extended to all means whatsoever, by which a man may be convinced in conscience, that the matter proposed is divine Revelation; which he professes to be done sufficiently, not only when his conscience doth expressly bear witness to the truth; but when it would do 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, and him that knowingly gainsayeth the Truth. The third thing he requires, is Capacity and Ability to apprehend the Proposal, and the Reasons of it: the want whereof excuseth fools and madmen, &c. But where there is no such impediment, and the will of God is sufficiently propounded, there* (saith he) *he that opposeth is convinced of error; and he who is thus convinced, is an Heretique; and heresie is a work of "the*



"*the Flesh which excludeth from salvation,* (he means without Repentance.) *And "hence it followeth, that it is fundamental to a Christian's faith, and necessary for "his salvation, that he believe all revealed truths of God, whereof he may be con-"vinced that they are from God.* This is the conclusion of Doctor *Potter's* discourse; many passages whereof you take notice of in your subsequent disputations, and make your advantage of them. And therefore I cannot but say again, that it amazeth me to hear you say, that he declines this Question, and never tells you *whether or no there be any other points of faith, which being sufficiently propounded as divine Revelations may be denied and disbelieved.* He tells you plainly, there are none such: and therefore you cannot say, that he tells you not whether there be any such. Again, it is almost as strange to me, why you should say, this was the only thing in question, *Whether a man may deny or disbelieve 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 affirmed, and denied by others. Now you affirm, I grant; but, What Protestant ever denied, that it was a sin, to give God the lye? Which is the first and most obvious sense of these words. Or, which of them ever doubted, that to disbelieve is then a fault, when the matter is so proposed to a man, that he might and should, and, were it not for his own fault, would believe it? Certainly, he that questions either of these, justly deserves to have his wits called in question, Produce any one Protestant that ever did so, and I will give you leave to say, It is the only thing in question. But then I must tell you, that your ensuing 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 clean different from this postulate. For though it be always a fault to deny what either I do know, or should know, to be testified by *God*; yet that which by a cleanly conveyence you put in the place hereof, *To deny a truth witnessed by God* simply, without the circumstance of *being known or sufficiently proposed*, is so far from being certainly 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 believe it. For in such cases the Rule of the Law hath place, *Idem est non esse & non apparere*: not to be at all and not to appear to me, is to me all one. *If I had not come and spoken unto you* (saith our Saviour) *you had had no sin.*

10. As little necessity is there for that which follows: *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 himself, or not so fully and clearly, as to oblige all men to hold one way; and yet be so overvalued by the parties in variance, as to be esteemed a matter *of faith*, and one of those things of which our Saviour says, *He that believeth not shall be damn'd.* Who sees not that it is possible, two Churches may excommunicate and damn each other for keeping Christmass ten days sooner or later; as well as *Victor* excommunicated the Churches of *Asia*, for differing from him about *Easter* day? And yet I believe you will confess, that God had not then declared himself about *Easter*, nor hath now about *Christmass.* Anciently some good Catholique Bishops excommunicated and damned others for *holding there were Antipodes*: and in this question I would fain know on which side was the sufficient proposal. *The contra-Remonstrants* differ from the *Remonstrants* about the point of Predetermination as a matter of faith: I would know in this thing also, which way God hath declared himself; whether for Predetermination or against it. *Stephen* Bishop of *Rome* held it as a matter of faith and Apostolique Tradition;

*That Heretiques gave true Baptism*: Others there were, and they as good Catholiques as he, that held that this was neither matter of *Faith*, nor matter of *Truth*. *Justin Martyr*, and *Irenæus*, held the doctrine of the *Millenaries* as a matter of *faith*: and though *Justin Martyr* deny it, yet you, I hope, will affirm, that some good Christians held the contrary. S. *Augustine*, I am sure, held *the communicating of Infants* as much Apostolique tradition, as the *Baptizing* 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 Judges of Appeals* 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 contrary, do you resolve me; but now I am resolv'd, they do so. In all these differences, the point in question is esteemed and proposed 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 means to shew that we do 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 me briefly to this *Dilemma*. Either, in these oppositions, one of the opposite Parts erred damnably, and denied God's truth sufficiently propounded; or they did not. If they did, then they which do deny God's truth sufficiently propounded, may go 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 God's truth sufficiently propounded. And so the Major and Minor of your Argument, are proved false. Yet though they were as true as Gospel, and as evident as Mathematical 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 infer either as the immediate production of the former premises, or as a Corollary from this Conclusion, *Therefore one only can be saved*, I do not understand; unless 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 sins* upon repentance; and consequently, to ruine the Gospel of Christ, I leave it to the Pope and the Cardinals to determine. For if against this it be alleaged, that no man can repent of the sin wherein he dies: This muce I have already stopped, by shewing, that if it be a sin of Ignorance, this is no way incongruous.

* I mean the Divines of *Doway*: whose profession we have in your *Belgick Expurgatorius* p. 12, in *censura Perrami*, in these words: *Seeing in other ancient Catholiques, we tolerate, extenuate, and excuse very many errors, and devising some shift often deny them, 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.*

11. *Ad §. 4.* 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 needless. 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 resolved 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 been truly and really satisfied; and that the best Answer you give them, is to call them, *Mean and vulgar objections*.

12. *Ad §. 5. But this pains might have been spared: For the substance of his Discourse is in a Sermon of* D. Ushers, *and confuted four years ago by Paulus Veridicus*. It seems then, the substance of your Reply is in *Paulus Veridicus*, and so your pains 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 do) you would have considered, that to them who compare D. *Potters* Book, and the Arch-Bishops Sermon, this aspersion will presently appear a poor Detraction, not to be answered, but scorned. To say nothing, that



that in D. *Potter*, being to answer a Book by expres's Command from Royal Authority to leave any thing material unsaid, because it had been said before, especially being spoken at large, and without any relation to the Discourse which he was to Answer, had been a ridiculous vanity and foul prevarication.

13. *Ad §. 6.* In your sixth *Parag.* I let all pass 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 Heresie, and even a ground of Atheism*. What strange extractions Chymistry can make I know not; but sure I am, he that by reason would infer 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, than 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 fountain, let the Learned judge. Perhaps you will say, You intended not to deliver here a positive and measured truth, and which you expected to be called to account for; but only a high and tragical expression of your just detestation of the wicked Doctrine against which you write. If you mean so, I shall let it pass: only I am to advertize the less-wary Reader, that, passionate Expressions, and vehement Asseverations are no Arguments; unless it be, of the weakness of the cause that is defended by them, or the man that defends it. And to remember you of what *Boethius* says 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 justifie to the full: and I say, and will maintain, 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 Errors wherein they die ignorantly, by a general Repentance; is so far from being a ground of Atheism, that to say the contrary, is to cross in Diameter a main Article of our Creed, and to overthrow the Gospel of Christ*.

14. *Ad §. 7, & 8.* To the two next *Parag.* 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 Perpetual Visible Church distinct from Yours*. Some perhaps undertake to do so, as a matter of curtesie; but I believe you will be much to seek for any one that holds it necessary. For though you say, that Christ hath promised there shall be a perpetual Visible Church; yet you your selves do not pretend that he hath promised, there shall be Histories and Records always 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.

15. The other is, That *Bruerelie's* great exactness, which you magnifie so, and amplifie, is no very certain demonstration of his fidelity. A Romance may be told with as much variety of circumstances, as a true Story.

16. *Ad §. 9, & 10.* Your desires that I would, in this rejoynder, *Avoid impertinencies: Not impose doctrines upon you which you disclaim: Set down the substance of your Reasons faithfully and entirely: Not weary the Reader with unnecessary Quotations: Object nothing to you which I can answer my self, or which may be returned upon my self: 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 ingenuous Answers as possibly I can.

18. *Ad*

*That Heretiques gave true Baptism*: Others there were, and they as good Catholiques as he, that held that this was neither matter of *Faith*, nor matter of *Truth*. *Justin Martyr*, and *Irenæus*, held the doctrine of the *Millenaries* as a matter of *faith*: and though *Justin Martyr* deny it, yet you, I hope, will affirm, that some good Christians held the contrary. S. *Augustine*, I am sure, held *the communicating of Infants* as much Apostolique tradition, as the *Baptizing* 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 Judges of Appeals* 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 contrary, do you resolve me; but now I am resolv'd, they do so. In all these differences, the point in question is esteemed and proposed 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 means to shew that we do 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 me briefly to this *Dilemma*. Either, in these oppositions, one of the opposite Parts erred damnably, and denied God's truth sufficiently propounded; or they did not. If they did, then they which do deny God's truth sufficiently propounded, may go 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 God's truth sufficiently propounded. And so the Major and Minor of your Argument, are proved false. Yet though they were as true as Gospel, and as evident as Mathematical 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 infer either as the immediate production of the former premises, or as a Corollary from this Conclusion, *Therefore one only can be saved*, I do not understand; unless 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 sins* upon repentance; and consequently, to ruine the Gospel of Christ, I leave it to the Pope and the Cardinals to determine. For if against this it be alleaged, that no man can repent of the sin wherein he dies: This muce I have already stopped, by shewing, that if it be a sin of Ignorance, this is no way incongruous.

* 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, and excuse very many errors, and devising some shift often deny them, 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.*

11. *Ad §. 4.* 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 needless. 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 resolved 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 been truly and really satisfied; and that the best Answer you give them, is to call them, *Mean and vulgar objections*.

12. *Ad §. 5. But this pains might have been spared: For the substance of his Discourse is in a Sermon of* D. Ushers, *and confuted four years ago by Paulus Veridicus*. It seems then, the substance of your Reply is in *Paulus Veridicus*, and so your pains 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 do) you would have considered, that to them who compare D. *Potters* Book, and the Arch-Bishops Sermon, this aspersion will presently appear a poor Detraction, not to be answered, but scorned. To say nothing, that



that in D. *Potter*, being to answer a Book by expres Command from Royal Authority to leave any thing material unsaid, because it had been said before, especially being spoken at large, and without any relation to the Discourse which he was to Answer, had been a ridiculous vanity and foul prevarication.

13. *Ad §. 6.* In your sixth *Parag.* I let all pass 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 Heresie, and even a ground of Atheism*. What strange extractions Chymistry can make I know not; but sure I am, he that by reason would infer 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, than 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 fountain, let the Learned judge. Perhaps you will say, You intended not to deliver here a positive and measured truth, and which you expected to be called to account for; but only a high and tragical expression of your just detestation of the wicked Doctrine against which you write. If you mean so, I shall let it pass: only I am to advertize the less-wary Reader, that, passionate Expressions, and vehement Asseverations are no Arguments; unless it be, of the weakness of the cause that is defended by them, or the man that defends it. And to remember you of what *Boethius* says 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 justifie to the full: and I say, and will maintain, 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 Errors wherein they die ignorantly, by a general Repentance; is so far from being a ground of Atheism, that to say the contrary, is to cross in Diameter a main Article of our Creed, and to overthrow the Gospel of Christ*.

14. *Ad §. 7, & 8.* To the two next *Parag.* 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 Perpetual Visible Church distinct from Yours*. Some perhaps undertake to do so, as a matter of curtesie; but I believe you will be much to seek for any one that holds it necessary. For though you say, that Christ hath promised there shall be a perpetual Visible Church; yet you your selves do not pretend that he hath promised, there shall be Histories and Records always 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.

15. The other is, That *Brerelie's* great exactness, which you magnifie so, and amplifie, is no very certain demonstration of his fidelity. A Romance may be told with as much variety of circumstances, as a true Story.

16. *Ad §. 9, & 10.* Your desires that I would, in this rejoynder, *Avoid impertinencies: Not impose doctrines upon you which you disclaim: Set down the substance of your Reasons faithfully and entirely: Not weary the Reader with unnecessary Quotations: Object nothing to you which I can answer my self, or which may be returned upon my self: 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 ingenuous Answers as possibly I can.

18. *Ad*

18. *Ad* 11. §. 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 do at no hand believe to be a damnable Heresie.

19. *Ad* §. 12. To the second, What *Visible Church there was before* Luther, *disagreeing from the* Roman? I answer, 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 self 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 do not, nor need not pretend. And *for men agreeing with Protestants in all points*, we 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 perpetual 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, and 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. *Ad* §. 13. To the third, *Whether, seeing there cannot be assigned any visible true Church distinct from the* Roman, *it follows not that she erred not fundamentally?* I say, in our sense of the word *Fundamental*, 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 errors 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 sense therefore of the word *Fundamental*, I hope she erred not fundamentally: but in your sense 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. *Ad* §. 14. To the fourth. *How it could be damnable to maintain her Errors, if they were not fundamental?* I answer. 1. Though it were not damnable, yet if it were a fault, it was not to be done. For a Venial sin 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 maintain an error against conscience, though the error in it self, and to him that believes it, be not damnable. Nay the profession not only of an error, but even of a truth, if not believed when you think on it again, I believe you will confess to be a mortal sin; unless 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 died in them, upon a general 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 self, and yet not kill him, that together with the Poyson takes an Antidote: or as Felony may



may deserve death, and yet not bring it on him that obtains the Kings Pardon.

22. *Ad* §. 15. To the fifth. *How they can be excused from Schism, who forsook her Communion upon pretence of Errors which were not damnable*! I answer. All that we forsake in you, is only the belief, and practice, and profession of your Errors. Hereupon you cast us out of your Communion. And then with a strange, and contradictious, and ridiculous hypocrisie, complain that we forsake it. As if a man should thrust his friend out of doors, and then be offended at his departure. But for us not to forsake the belief of your Errors, having discovered them to be Errors, was impossible; and therefore to do 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 run away with, and take for granted) those Errors in themselves were not damnable. Now to do so, and, as matters now stand, not to forsake your Communion, is apparently contradictious: seeing the condition of your Communion is, that we must profess 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 forsook 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 do that which both in your account, and, as you think, in Gods account, puts him that does so, out of your Communion. So that either you must free your Church, from requiring the beliefe of any Error whatsoever, damnable and not damnable; or, whether you will or no, you must free us from Schism. For Schism there cannot be, in leaving your Communion, unless we were obliged to continue in it. Man cannot be obliged by Man, but to what either formally or vertually he is obliged by God; for, all just power is from God. God the Eternal Truth neither can nor will oblige us to believe any the least and the most innocent falshood to be a Divine truth, that is, to err; nor, to profess a known Error, which is to lie. So that if you require the beliefe of any Error among the conditions of your Communion, our Obligation to communicate with you ceaseth, and so the imputation of Schism to us vanisheth into nothing; but lies heavy upon you for making our separation from you just and necessary, by requiring unnecessary and unlawful conditions of your Communion. Hereafter therefore, I intreat you, let not your demand be, How could we forsake your Communion without Schism, seeing you erred not damnably? But, How we could do so without Schism, seeing you erred not at all? which if either you do prove, or we cannot disprove it, we will (I at least will for my part) return to your Communion, or subscribe my self Schismatique. In the mean time, ἀβούλῳ σπάρῳ ἔσπερω.

23. Yet notwithstanding all your Errors, we do not renounce your Communion *totally* and absolutely, but only leave Communicating with you in the practice and profession of your Errors. The tryal whereof will be to propose some form 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. *Ad* §. 16. Your sixth demand I have already satisfied in my Answers 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. *Ad* §. 17. To the seventh, *Whether error against any one truth sufficiently propounded as testified by God, destroy not the Nature and Unity of faith, or, at least, is not a grievous offence excluding salvation?* I answer; If you suppose, as you seem to do, the proposition so sufficient, that the party to whom it is made is convinced that it is from God, so that the denial of it involves also with it the denial of Gods veracity; any such Error destroies both faith and salvation. But if the

Proposal

Propoſal be only ſo ſufficient, not, that the party to whom it is made is convinced, but only that he ſhould, and but for his own fault, would have been convinced 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 Error. Yet a fault I confeſs it is, and (without Repentance) damnable, if, all circumſtances conſidered, the Propoſal be ſufficient. But then I muſt tell you, that the Propoſal of the preſent *Roman* Church is only pretended to be ſufficient for this purpoſe, but is not ſo: eſpecially all the Rays of the Divinity, which they pretend to ſhine ſo conſpicuouſly in her Propoſals, being ſo darkned and even extinguiſhed with a cloud of contradiction, from Scripture, Reaſon, and the Ancient Church.

26. *Ad Q.* 18. To the Eighth, *How of diſagreeing proteſtants, both parts may hope for ſalvation, ſeeing ſome of them muſt needs err againſt ſome Truth teſtified by God?* I anſwer, The moſt diſagreeing Proteſtants that are, yet thus far agree; 1. That thoſe 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 err; and, Why an implicite faith in Chriſt and his Word, ſhould not ſuffice as well as an implicite 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 believe the Scripture in the true ſenſe, and to live according to it. This if they perform (as I hope many on all Sides do) truly and ſincerely, 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 ſincere obedience, Why ſhould they not expect that God will perform his promiſe and give them ſalvation? For, as for other things which lie without the Covenant, and are therefore leſs 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, and unavoidable prejudices, whereby mens underſtandings are variouſly formed and faſhioned, they do embrace ſeveral Opinions, whereof ſome muſt be erroneous; to ſay that God will damn them for ſuch Errors, who are lovers of Him, and lovers of Truth, is to rob man of his comfort, and God of his goodneſs; it is to make Man deſperate, and God a Tyrant. *But they deny Truths teſtified by God, and therefore ſhall be damned.* Yes, if they knew them to be thus teſtified by him and yet would deny them, that were to give God the lie, and queſtionleſs 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 believe that God had ſo teſtified, Would not you think it a hard caſe to be damned for ſuch a denial? 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 ſays true or no? or, Whether he ſays this or no? But, ſuppoſing he ſays this, and ſays true, Whether he means 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 is 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, unleſs 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 himſelf plainly, ſure he hath no reaſon to be much offended if he be miſtaken. When there-



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 do ſee it, and will not; or, were it not for their own voluntary and avoidable fault, might and ſhould ſee it and do 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 betrai'd into their Errors, nor kept in them by any ſin of their will; if they do their beſt endevour to free themſelves from all Errors, and yet fail of it through humane frailty; ſo well am I perſwaded of the goodneſs 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 Veracity in Queſtion, is but a Panick fear, 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 ſtrewed not; to reap where he ſowed not*: of being offended with us for not doing what he knows we cannot do. This I ſay upon a ſuppoſition, that they do their beſt endevours to know Gods will and do it; which he that denies to be poſſible, knows not what he ſays; for he ſays in effect, That men cannot do, what they can do; for to do what a man can do, is to do 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 ſins, who uſe ſuch a meaſure of induſtry, in finding truth, as humane *prudence* and ordinary *diſcretion* (their abilities and opportunities, their diſtractions and hinderances, and all other things conſidered) ſhall adviſe them unto, in a matter of ſuch conſequence. But if herein alſo we fail, 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 far the greater part; they ſin 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 ſins with you are not damnable; and therefore Proteſtants errors might be ſins, and yet not damnable. But yet out of courteſie to you, we will remove this rub out of your way; and for the preſent ſuppoſe them *mortal ſins*; and is there then no hope of Salvation for him that commits them? Not, you will ſay, if he die in them without repentance; and ſuch Proteſtants you ſpeak of, *who without repentance die in their Errors*. Yea but what if they die in their errors with repentance? then I hope you will have Charity enough to think they may be ſaved. *Charity Miſtaken* takes it indeed for granted, that this ſuppoſition is deſtructive of it ſelf; and that it is impoſſible, and incongruous, that a man ſhould repent of thoſe errors wherein he dies; or die 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, God's infinite and moſt admirable perfections in himſelf, more than moſt worthy of all poſſible love: ſeeing they believe, as well as you, his infinite goodneſs 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 eternal happineſs; in redeeming them, noth with corruptible things, but the precious blood of his beloved Son: ſeeing they believe, as well as you, his infinite goodneſs and patience towards them, in expecting their Converſion; in wooing, alluring, leading, and by all means which his wiſdom can ſuggeſt unto him, and man's nature is capable of, drawing them to Repentance and Salvation: Seeing they believe theſe things as well

In the place above quoted.

well as you, and, for ought you know, conſider them as much as you, (and if they do not, it is not their Religion, but They that are too blame) what can hinder, but that the conſideration of God's moſt infinite goodnes to them, and their own almoſt infinite wickedneſs againſt him, God's Spirit co-operating with them, may raiſe them to a true and ſincere and a cordial love of God? And ſeeing ſorrow for having injured or offended the perſon beloved, or when we fear we may have offended him, is the moſt natural effect of true love; what can hinder, but that love which hath oft-times 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 univerſal ſorrow for all their ſins, both which they know they have committed, and which they fear they may have? 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 ſins, cannot but be comprized. In a word, what ſhould hinder, but that that Prayer —*Delicta ſua quis intelligit? Who can underſtand his faults? Lord, cleanſe thou me from my ſecret ſins,* may be heard and accepted by God, as well from a *Proteſtant* that dies in ſome errors, as from a *Papiſt* that dies in ſome other ſins of Ignorance, which perhaps he might more eaſily have diſcovered to be ſins, than a Proteſtant could his errors to be errors? As well from a Proteſtant, that held ſome error, which (as he conceived) God's word, and his reaſon, (which is alſo in ſome ſort God's word) lead him unto; as from a *Dominican*, who perhaps took up his opinion upon truſt, not becauſe he had reaſon to believe it true, but becauſe it was the Opinion of his *Order*; for the ſame man, if he had light upon another Order, would in all probability, have been of the other opinion: For what elſe is the cauſe, that generally *all the Dominicans are of one opinion, and all the Jeſuites of the other?* I ſay, from a *Dominican* who took up his opinion upon truſt; and that ſuch an opinion (if we believe 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, and the worſt as good as the beſt. And yet ſuch is the partiality 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 God's Teſtimony, and be incapable of ſalvation. That a *Dominican* through culpable negligence, living and dying in his error, may repent of it, though he knows it not; or be ſaved, though he do not: But if a Proteſtant do the very ſame thing, in the very ſame point, and die in his error, his caſe is deſperate. The ſum of all that hath been ſaid to this Demand, is this. 1. That no erring Proteſtant denies any truth teſtified by God, under this formality, *as teſtified by him*; nor which they know or believe to be teſtified by him. And therefore it is an horrible calumny in you to ſay, *They call God's Veracity in queſtion.* For God's undoubted and unqueſtioned Veracity, is to them the ground why they hold all they do hold: neither do they hold any opinion ſo ſtiffly, but they will forgo it rather than this one, *That all which God ſays is true.* 2. God hath not ſo clearly and plainly declared himſelf 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 lover 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 error for truth, and reject truth for error. 3. If any Proteſtant or Papiſt be betrayed into, or kept in any Error, by any ſin of his will (as it is to be feared many millions are) ſuch Error is, as the cauſe of it, ſinful and damnable: yet not excluſive of all hope of Salvation, but pardonable, if diſcovered, upon a particular explicite repentance; if not diſcovered, upon a general and implicite Repentance for all Sins known and unknown: in which number all ſinful Errors muſt of neceſſity be contained.

17. *Ad* §. 19. *To the* 9. wherein you are ſo urgent for a *particular Catalogue of Fundamentals:* I anſwer almoſt in your own words, that we alſo conſtantly urge and require to have a particular Catalogue of your Fundamentals, whether they be written Verities, or unwritten Traditions, or Church-Definitions, all which, you ſay, integrate the material Object of your Faith: In a word, of all ſuch Points as are defined 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 general definition, or deſcription, under which you lurk deceitfully, of what and what only is ſufficiently propoſed: wherein yet you do not very well agree. For many of you hold the Pope's propoſal *Ex Cathedra*, to be ſufficient and obliging: 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, and tell 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 propoſal infallible, without the acceptation of the Church univerſal: 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 Fundamental 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 known a thing, that in many Points you do ſo, that I aſſure my ſelf you will not deny it. Therefore we conſtantly urge and require a particular and perfect Inventory of all thoſe Divine Revelations, which, you ſay, *are ſufficiently propounded; and that, ſuch an one to which all of your Church will ſubſcribe, as neither redundant, nor deficient:* which when you give in with one hand, you ſhall receive a particular Catalogue of ſuch Points as I call *Fundamental*, with the other. Neither may you think me unreaſonable in this Demand, ſeeing upon ſuch a particular Catalogue of your ſufficient Propoſals as much depends, as upon a particular Catalogue of our Fundamentals. As for example; Whether or no a man do not err in ſome Point defined and ſufficiently propoſed: and, whether or no, thoſe that differ among you, differ in Fundamentals; which if they do, *One Heaven* (by your own Rule) *cannot receive them All.* Perhaps you will here complain, 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 again an hundred years hence. To deal truly, I did ſo intend it ſhould be. Neither 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 have 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 believed;* (of which rank are thoſe only, which conſtitute and make up the Covenant between God and Man in Chriſt:) and then *ſuch as are neceſſary to be believed not in themſelves, but only by accident, becauſe they were written;* Of which rank are many matters of Hiſtory, of Prophecy, of Myſtery, of Policy, of Oeconomy, and ſuch like, which are evidently not *intrinſecal* to the Covenant: Now, to ſever exactly and punctually theſe Verities one from the other, what is *neceſſary in it ſelf* and antecedently to the writing, from what is but only profitable in it ſelf, and *neceſſary only becauſe written*, is a buſineſs of extreme great difficulty, and extreme little neceſſity. For firſt, he that will go 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 piece of buſineſs of it, and almoſt impoſſible that he ſhould be certain he hath done it, when he hath done it. And then it is apparently unneceſſary to go about it, ſeeing he that believes all, certainly believes all that is neceſſary; And

This great diverſity of opinions among you, touching this matter, if any man doubt of it, let him read *Franciſcus Picus Mirandula in l. Theorem. in Expoſ Theor. quarti*; & *Th. Waldenſis Tom.* 3. *De Sacramentali. m. doct.* 3. *fol.* 5. and he ſhall be fully ſatisfied that I have done you no injury.

And he that doth not believe all (I mean all the undoubted parts of the undoubted Books of Scripture) can hardly believe any, neither have we reason to believe he doth so. So that, that Protestants give you not a Catalogue of Fundamentals, it is not from Tergiversation (as you suspect, who for want of Charity to them always suspect the worst,) but from Wisdom and Necessity. For they may very easily err in doing it; because though all which is necessary be plain in Scripture, yet all which is plain, 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*, than 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 necessity of believing those Truths of Scripture which are not Fundamental, as those that are. You see then what reason we have to decline this hard labour, which you a rigid Task-master have here put upon us. Yet instead of giving you a Catalogue of Fundamentals, with which I dare say you are resolved, before it come, never to be satisfied, I will say that to you, which, if you please, may do you as much service; and this it is: That it is sufficient for any man's Salvation that he believe the Scripture: that he endeavour to believe it in the true sense of it, as far as concerns his duty: And that he conform his life unto it either by Obedience or Repentance. He that does so (and all Protestants according to the *Dictamen* of their Religion should do so) may be secure that he cannot err Fundamentally. And they that do so, cannot differ in Fundamentals. So that, notwithstanding their differences, and your presumption, *the same Heaven may receive them All.*

28. *Ad* Q. 20. Your tenth and 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 self in them; or when you have told us what is the Doctrine of your Church, in the Question of *Predetermination*, or the *Immaculate Conception.*

29. *Ad* 21, *&* 22. Q. These answers, I hope, in the judgment of indifferent men are satisfactory to your Questions, though not to you, For I have either answered them, or given you a reason why I have not. Neither, for ought I can see, *have I slitted from things considered in their own nature, to accidental or rare Circumstances*, but told you my opinion plainly what I thought of your Errors in themselves: 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 damnableness of Error, *why you should esteem ignorance, incapacity, want of means to be instructed, accidental* and rare *Circumstances:* As if knowledge, capacity, having means of Instruction, concerning the truth of your Religion or ours, were not as rare and unusual in the adverse part of either, as Ignorance, Incapacity, and want of means of instruction. Especially how, erroneous Conscience can be a rare thing in those that err, 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 own nature and *without circumstances*, must be to consider them, neither as ignorant, nor as knowing: neither as having, nor as wanting means 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 goodness and badness of an Action depending on the Circumstances? Ought not a Judge being to give sentence of an Action, to consider all the Circumstances of it? or is it possible he should judge rightly that doth not so? Neither is it to purpose, *That Circumstances being various, cannot be well comprehended under any general rule*: For though under any general rule they cannot, yet under many general 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 term, and may be determined and invested with diverse and contrary



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 chief thing that makes defining dangerous?) Who can find fault with him for saying, *If, through want of means of instruction, incapacity, invincible or probable ignorance a man die in error, 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, and without repentance desperate.* This is all that D. *Potter* says, neither rashly damning all that are of a different opinion from him, nor securing any that are in matter of Religion sinfully, that is, willingly erroneous. The Author of this Reply (I will abide by it) says the very same thing, neither can I see what adversary he hath in the main Question but his own shadow; and yet, I know not out of what frowardness, finds fault with D. *Potter* for affirming that which himself affirms: And to cloud the matter, whereas the Question is, *whether men by ignorance, dying in error, may be saved*, he would have them considered *neither as erring, nor ignorant.* And when the question is, whether *The Errors of Papists be damnable*, to which we answer, That to them that do or might know them to be errors, they are damnable; to them that do not, they are not: He tells 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 have recourse to Accidental Circumstances*; as if Ignorance were accidental to error, or as if a man could be considered as in error, and not be considered as in ignorance of the Truth from which he errs! Certainly, Error against a Truth, must needs presuppose a nescience of it: unless you will say that a man may at once resolve for a Truth and resolve against it; assent to it, and dissent from it; know it to be true, and believe it not to be true. Whether Knowledge and Opinion touching the same thing may stand together, is made a Question in the Schools: But he that would question, Whether knowing a thing and doubting of it, much more, whether knowing it to be true, and believing it to be false, may stand together, deserves without question no other Answer but laughter. Now if Error and Knowledge cannot consist, then Error and Ignorance must be inseparable. He then that professeth your errors may well be considered either as knowing or as Ignorant. But him that does err indeed, you can no more conceive without ignorance, than Long without Quantity, Vertuous without Quality, a Man and not a living Creature, to have gone ten miles and not to have gone five, to speak sense and not to speak. For as the latter in all these is implyed in the former, so is Ignorance of a Truth, supposed in Error against it. Yet such a man, though not conceivable without ignorance simply, may be very well considered either as with, or without voluntary and sinful Ignornace. And he that will give a wise answer to this Question, Whether a Papist dying a Papist may be saved, according to God's ordinary proceeding; must distinguish him according to these several considerations, and say, He 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 have 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 super-annuated, nor Reason ever worn out. Let your Answers be solid and pertinent, and we will never find fault with them for being old or common.

The

# The First Part.

## Chap. I.

### *The State of the Question; with a summary of the Reasons for which, amongst men of different Religions, one Side only can be saved.*

NEver is malice more indiscreet, than when it chargeth others with imputation of that, to which it self becomes more liable, even by that very act of accusing others. For, though guiltiness be the effect of some error, yet usually it begets a kind of Moderation, so far forth, as not to let men cast such aspersions upon others, as must apparently 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 Orator rebukes Philosophers; who, to wax glorious, superscribed their Names upon those very Books, which they entituled, *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 affirm, that Protestancy destroyeth Salvation*; while he himself is in act of pronouncing the like heavy doom against Roman Catholiques? For, not satisfied with much uncivil language, in affirming the Roman Church *many* (a) *ways 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 revel in the House of God*; in talking of an *Idol* (c) to be worshipped at *Rome*; he comes at length to thunder out this fearful sentence against her: *For that* (d) Mass *of Errors* (saith he) *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.* And in another place he saith: *For us who* (e) *are convinced in conscience, that she errs in many things, a necessity lies upon us, even under pain of damnation, to forsake her in those Errors.* By the acerbity of which Censure, he doth not only make himself guilty of that which he judgeth to be a heinous offence in others, but freeth us also from all colour of crime by this his unadvised recrimination. For, if Roman Catholiques 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 self into this poor wonder, *Roman Catholiques believe in their conscience, that the Religion which they profess, is true, and the contrary false.*

*Quis tulerit Gracchum, &c.*

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

2. Nevertheless, 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 than 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 do we understand, why our most dear Countrymen should be offended if the Universality be particularized under the name of *Protestants*, first given (f) to certain *Lutherans*, who *protesting* that they would stand out against the Imperial 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 disclaimed by *Calvinists* and *Zwinglians*, our naming or exemplifying a general doctrine under the particular name of Protestantism, ought not in any particular manner to be odious in *England*.

(f) *Sleidan. l.* 6. *fol.* 84.

3. Moreover our meaning is not, as mis-informed 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 desperate. God forbid! Whe 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 Tribunal of particular Judgement is God's alone. When any man, esteemed a Protestant, leaveth to live in this world, we do not instantly with precipitation avouch, that he is lodged in Hell. For we are not always acqnainted with what sufficiency of means he was furnished for instruction; we do not penetrate his capacity to understand his Catechists; we have no revelation what light might have cleared his errors, or Contrition retracted his sins, in the last moment before his death. In such particular cases, we wish more apparent signs of salvation, but do not give any dogmatical sentence of perdition. How grievous sins, *Disobedience*, *Schism*, and *Heresie* are, is well known. But to discern how far the natural malignity of those great offences might be checked by Ignorance, or by some such lessening circumstance, is the office rather of *Prudence* than of *Faith*.

4. Thus we allow Protestants as much Charity, as D. *Potter* spares us, for whom in the words above mentioned, and elsewhere, he (g) makes *Ignorance* the best hope of salvation. Much less comfort can we expect from the fierce doctrine of those chief 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 belief 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 plain words of (h) Scripture; our *Masses* to be blasphemous (i) *Fables*, with much more to be seen in the *Articles* themselves. In a certain Confession of the Christian Faith, at the end of their books of Psalms collected into Meeter, and printed *Cum privilegio Regæ Regali*, they call us *Idolaters*, and *limbs of Antichrist*; and having set down a Catalogue of our doctrines, they conclude, that for them we shall after the General Resurrection be *damned to unquestionable fire.*

(g) See P. 39.
(h) *Art.* 28.
(i) *Art.* 31.

5. But yet lest any man should flatter himself with our charitable Mitigations, and thereby wax carless 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 *Judgement* may be esteemed *rash*, or *prudent*, except by weighing the reasons upon which it was grounded, we will here, under one aspect, present a Summary of those



those Principles, from which we infer, that Protestancy in it self unrepented destroys 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 supernatural *End* of eternal felicity, hath in his holy Providence settled competent and convenient *Means*, whereby that end may be attained. The universal grand Origen of all such means, is the Incarnation and Death of our Blessed Saviour, whereby he merited internal grace for us; and founded an *external* visible Church, provided and stored with all those helps which might be necessary to Salvation. From hence it followeth, that in this Church, among other advantages, there must be some effectual means to beget and conserve Faith, to maintain Unity, to discover and condemn Heresies, to appease and reduce Schisms, and to determine all Controversies in Religion. For without such means the Church should not be furnished with helps sufficient to salvation, nor God afford sufficient means to attain that End, to which himself ordained Mankind. This means to decide Controversies in Faith and Religion (whether it should be the holy Scripture, or whatsoever else) must be indued with an Universal Infallibility in whatsoever it propoundeth for a divine Truth, that is, as revealed, spoken, or testified by Almighty God, whether the matter of its nature be great or small. For if it were subject to Error 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 err in that particular.

8. Thus far all must agree to what we have said, unless they have a mind, to reduce *Faith* to *Opinion*. And even out of these grounds alone, without further proceeding, it undeniably follows, that of two men dissenting in matters of faith, great or small, few or many, the one cannot be saved without repentance, unless Ignorance accidentally may in some particular person plead excuse. For in that case of contrary belief, 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 self great or small. And thus we 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. Nevertheless, to the end that men may know in particular what is the said infallible means upon which we are to relie in all things concerning Faith, and accordingly may be able to judge in what safety or danger, more or less they live; and because D. *Potter* descendeth to divers particulars about Scriptures and the Church, *&c.* we will go forward, and prove, that although Scripture be in it self most sacred, infallible, and divine, yet it alone cannot be *to us a Rule*, or Judge, fit and able to end all doubts and debates emergent in matters of Religion; but that there must be some external, visible, publique, living Judge, to whom all sorts of persons, both learned and unlearned, may without danger of error have recourse; and in whose judgement they may rest for the interpreting and propounding of Gods Word or Revelation. And this living Judge 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 blood.

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 she 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 means which God hath left to determine Controversies were not infallibe in all things propoſed by it, as truths revealed by Almighty God, it could not settle in our minds a firm and infallible belief of any one.

11. From this Universal Infallibility of God's Church, it followeth, that whosoever wittingly denyeth any one Point propoſed by her, as revealed by God, is injurious to his divine Majesty, at if he could either deceive, or be deceived in what he testifieth. The averring whereof, were not a *Fundamental* error, but would overthrow the very foundation of all Fundamental 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 *Fundamental*, and not *Fundamental* be good and useful, as it is delivered and applyed by Catholique Divines, to teach what principal Articles of faith, Christians are obliged *explicitely* to believe: yet that it is impertinet to the present purpose of excusing any man from grievous sin, who knowingly *disbelieves*, that *is*, believes the contrary of that which God's Church propoſeth as Divine Truth. For it is one thing not to know explicitely something testified by God, and 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 sin, the voluntary denial of any other Point known to be defined by God's Church. And this were sufficiet 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 main Principle, that God hath always had, and always 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 *Schism* and *Heresie*, 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 *belief*, as practice.

15. To these reasons drawn from the vertue of *Faith*, we will add one other taken from *Charitas propria*, the Vertue of *Charity*, as it obligeth us, not to expose our soul 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 means to determine controversies in matters of Faith, is the visible Church of Christ. Secondly, that the distinction of Points *Fundamental*, and *not-Fundamental*, maketh nothing to our present Question. Thirdly, that, to say the *Creed* contains all Fundamental 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 *Schism*. Fifthly, nor from Heresie. Sixthly and lastly, that in regard of the precept of

*Charity*

*Charity* towards one's self, Protestants be in a state of sin, as long as they remain divided from the *Roman* Church. And these six Points, shall be several 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 affirm 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 pass for Good. For, is it not a grievous sin, to deny any one truth contained in Holy Writ? Is there in such denial, any distinction between Points Fundamental, and not-Fundamental, sufficient to excuse from Heresie? Is it not impertinent, to alledge the Creed containing all Fundamental 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 Error 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 Fundamental Points) must be damnable. What is this, but to say with us, *Of Persons contrary in whatsoever Point of belief, 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 (scandal where none is *given*) we must comfort our selves with that grave and true saying of S. *Gregory*: *If scandal* (k) *be taken from declaring a truth, it is better to permit scandal, than forsake the truth.* But the solid grounds of our Assertion, and the sincerity of our intention in uttering what we think yields us confidence, that all will hold for most reasonable the saying of Pope *Gelasius* to *Anastasius* the Emperor: *Far 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 concerns the present Question, and is contained in the Argument of the next ensuing Chap.

(k) *S. Greg. Hom. 7. in Ezek.*

## The ANSWER to the FIRST CHAPTER.

*Shewing, that the Adversary grants the Former Question and proposeth a New one: And that there is no reason, why among men of different opinions and Communions, one Side only can be saved.*

AD 1. *Q.* Your first onset is very violent, D. *Potter* is charged with malice and indiscretion, for *being uncharitable to you, while he is accusing you of uncharitableness.* Verily, a great fault, and folly, if the accusation be just; if unjust, a great Calumny. 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 Errors; judgeth reconciliation between 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 reconciled unto her, is damnable: Therefore, if Roman Catholiques be convicted in Conscience of the Errors of Protestants, they may and must judge a reconciliation with them damnable; and consequently to judge so, is no more uncharitable in them, than it is in the Doctor to judge as he doth.* All this I grant; nor would any Protestant accuse you of *want of Charity*, if you went no further: if you judged the Religion of Protestants damnable to them only who profess it, being convicted in conscience that it is erroneous. For, *if a man judge some act of vertue to be a sin, in him it is a sin indeed:* So you have taught us, p. 19. So if you be convinced, or rather, to speak properly, perswaded in conscience, that our Religion is erroneous, the profession of it, though it self most true, to you would be damnable. This therefore I subscribe very willingly, and withal, that if you said no more, D. *Potter* and my self should be not to Papists only, but even to Protestants, as uncharitable as you are. For I shall always profess and glory in this uncharitableness of judging *hypocrisie a damnable sin.* Let Hypocrites then and Dissemblers on both sides pass. It is not towards them, but good Christians; not to Protestant Professors, but Believers, that we require your Charity. What think you of those that believe so verily the truth of our Religion, that they are resolved to die in it, and, if occasion were, to die for it? What Charity have you for them? What think ye of those that, in the days of our Fathers, laid down their lives for it? Are you content that they shall be saved, or do you hope they may be so? Will you grant, that, notwithstanding their Errors,



Errors, there is good hope they might die with repentance? and if they did so, certainly they are saved? If you will do so, this Controversie is ended. No man will hereafter charge you with *want of Charity.* This is as much as either we give you, or expect of you, while you remain in your Religion. But then you must leave abusing silly people, with telling them (as your fashion is) that *Protestants confess, Papists may be saved, but Papists confess not so much of Protestants; therefore yours is the safer way, and in Wisdom and Charity to our own souls we are bound to follow it.* For granting this, you grant as much hope of salvation to Protestants, as Protestants do to you. If you will not, but will still affirm, as *Charity Mistaken* doth, that *Protestants*, not dissemblers, but believers, *without a particular repentance of their Religion cannot be saved*: This, I say, is a *want of Charity*, into the society whereof D. *Potter* cannot be drawn but with palpable and transparent *Sophistry.* For, I pray Sir, what dependance is there between these Propositions: We that hold Protestant Religion false should be damned if we should profess it, Therefore they also shall be damned, that hold it true? Just as if you should conclude, *Because he that doubts is damned if he eat*, Therefore he that doth not doubt, is damned also if he eat. And therefore though your Religion to us, and 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 profess either this or that according to Conscience. This recrimination therefore upon D. *Potter* wherewith you begin, is a plain Fallacy: And, I fear, your proceedings will be answerable to these beginnings!

2. *Ad Q.* 2. In this Paragraph, Protestants are thus far comforted, that they are not sent to Hell without Company; which, the Poet tels us, 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 *Imperial Edicts*, but against the *Corruptions of the Church of* Rome.

3. *Ad Q.* 3, 4, 5, 6. *That you give us not over to reprobation, That you pray and hope for our salvation*, if it be a Charity, it's such an one as is common to *Turks*, and *Jews*, and *Pagans* with us. But that which follows, is extraordinary; neither do I know any man that requires more of you than there you pretend to. For there you tell us, *That when any man, esteemed a Protestant, dies, you do not instantly avouch that he is lodged in Hell.* Where the word, *esteemed*, is ambiguous: For it may signifie, *esteemed truly*, or *esteemed falsly.* He may be esteemed a Protestant that *is so*: And he may be esteemed a Protestant that is not *so.* And therefore I should have had just occasion to have laid to your charge the transgression of your own chief Prescription, which you say, *Truth exacts at ours hands*, that is, *to speak clearly or distinctly, and not to walk in darkness*; 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 damn not any man that dies with the esteem of a Protestant, are, 1. *Because you are not always acquainted with what sufficiency of means 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 do *not penetrate his capacity to understand his Catechist*; which is also peculiar to those, who for want of capacity (as you conceive) remain Protestants indeed, and are not only so accounted. 3. Because you have *no Revelation what light might clear his errors*; which belongs to those which were esteemed Protestants, but indeed were not so. 4. Because you have *no Revelation what Contrition might have retracted his sins*: 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 sins: which appropriates this reason also to Protestants truly so esteemed. I wish with all my heart that in

obedience to your own Prescription, you had expressed your self 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 means 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 die with Contrition for all his sins.

3 That if he do die with Contrition, he may and shall be saved.

4. All these acknowledgements we have from you, while you are, as you say, stating, but, as I conceive, granting the very Point in question; which was, as I have already proved out of *C. M. whether, without uncharitableness, 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.* affirms universally, and without any of your limitations. But this presumption of his, you thus qualifie, by saying, that *This sentance cannot be pronounced truly, and therefore sure not charitably; Neither of those Protestants that want means 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 means they might have had, dyed with Contrition, that is, with a sorrow for all their sins, proceeding from the love of God.* So that, according to your Doctrin, 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 die in it without Contrition.* Which Doctrin if you would stand to; and not pull down, and pull back with one hand, what you give and build with the other, this Controversie were ended; and I should willingly acknowledge that which follows in your fourth Paragraph, *That you allow Protestants as much charity as D.* Potter *allows you.* But then I must intreat you to alter the *argument of this Chapter*, and not to go 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 crudeness of your Assertion, by saying, *One side only can be saved, unless want of Conviction, or else Repentance, excuse the other.* Besides, you must not only abstain from damning any Protestant in particular, but, from affirming in general, that *Protestants dying in their Religion cannot be saved*; for you must always remember to add this Caution, unless *they were excusably Ignorant of the falshood of it, or died with Contrition.* And then, considering that you cannot know, whether or no, all things considered, they were convinced sufficiently of the truth of your Religion, and the falshood of their own, you are obliged by Charity to judge the best, and hope they are not. Considering again, that, notwithstanding their Errors, they may die with Contrition, and that it is no way improbable that they do so, and the contrary you cannot be certain of, You are bound in Charity to judge and hope they do so. Considering thirdly and lastly, that if they die not with *Contrition*, yet it is very probable they may die with *Attrition*, and that this pretence of yours, that *Contrition will serve without actual Confession, but Attrition will not*, is but a nicety or fancy, or rather, to give it the true name, a Device of your own, to serve ends and purposes; God having no where declared himself, but that whersoever 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 quencheth not, the smoaking flax of that Repentance (if it be true and effectual) which proceeds from hope and fear: These things, I say, considered (unless you will have the Charity of your Doctrin rise up in judgement against your uncharitable Practice) you must not only not be



be peremptory, in damning Protestants, but you must hope well of their Salvation: and, out of this hope, you must do for them as well as others, those, as you conceive, Charitable Offices, of Praying, giving Alms, and offering Sacrifice, which usually you do, 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 go directly to heaven.) These things when you do, I shall believe you think as charitably as you speak. But until 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 do, 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 do; I mean, You must not affright poor 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 die 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 do the heavy censures, which Protestants (you say) pass upon your errors, any way hinder, but they may hope as well of you, upon Repentance, as I do. For the *fierce Doctrin*, which, God knows who, teacheth, that *Christ for many Ages before* Luther *had no visible Church upon earth*; will be mild enough, if you conceive them to mean (as perhaps they do) 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 confess they may) hold some particular Errors, and yet be a Member of the Church Universal; why may not the Church hold some Universal Error, and yet be still the Church? especially seeing, you say, it is nothing but *opposing the Doctrin 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 self. 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 self confess, *That Ignorance may excuse Errors, even in Fundamental 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, *Pref. §.* 22. And again, with their heaviest censures it may well consist, that your Errors, though in themselves damnable, yet may prove *not-damning to you*, if you die with true repentance, for all your sins 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 effectual, 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 easie a rate as Papists; yet (even Papists being Judges) they may obtain it: and, though there is no entrance for them but at the only door of *Contrition*, yet they may enter; Heaven is not inaccessible to them. Their errors are no such impenetrable Isthmus's between them and Salvation, but that *Contrition* may make a way through them. All their Schism and Heresie is no such fatal poison, but that, if a man joyn with it the Antidote

of a general Repentance, he may die 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 Controversie remaining now, is not simply *whether Protestancy unrepented destroys Salvation?* as it was at first proposed, but, *whether Protestancy in it self* (that is, *abstracted from Ignorance and Contrition*) *destroys Salvation?* So that, as a foolish fellow, who gave a Knight the Lye, desiring withal 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 amiss, that, conceiving as you do, Ignorance and Repentance such necessary things for us, you are not more willing to consider us with them, than 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 always stand open, I can very hardly perswade my self so much as in my most secret consideration to devest you of these so needful qualifications: But whensoever your Errors, Superstitions, and Impieties come into my mind, (and, besides the general 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 Self,) my only comfort is, amidst these Agonies, that the Doctrin and Practice 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 Doctrin, yet you will be glad to stand in the eye of Mercy as well as your fellows, and not be so stout, as to refuse either God's pardon or the King's.

6. But for the present, Protestancy is called to the bar, and though not sentenced by you to death without Mercy, yet arraigned of so much natural malignity, (if not corrected by *Ignorance* or *Contrition*) as to be *in it self destructive of Salvation.* Which Controversie I am content to dispute with you, tying my self to follow the Rules prescribed by you in your *Preface.* Only I am to remember you, that the adding of this limitation (*in it self*) 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 die in their supposed errors, either with excusable Ignorance, or with Contrition, and if they do so, may be saved,* you still are peremtory in pronouncing them damned. Which Position, supposing your Doctrin true, and ours false, as it is far from *Charity,* (whose essential Character it is, *to judge and hope the best,*) so I believe that I shall clearly evince this new, but more moderate, Assertion of yours to be far from Verity, and that it is *Popery, and not Protestancy, which in it self destroys Salvation.*

7. *Ad §. 7. & 8.* In your gradation I shall rise so far with you as to grant, *That Christ founded a visible Church, stored with all helps necessary to Salvation, particularly with sufficient means to beget and conserve Faith, to maintain Unity, and compose Schisms, to discover and condemn Heresies, and to determine all Controversies in Religion,* which were necessary to be determined. For all these purposes, he gave at the beginning (as we may see in the Epistle to the *Ephesians*) *Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, Pastors, and Doctors:* who by word of mouth taught their Contemporaries, and by writings (wrot indeed by some, but approved by all of them) taught their Christian posterity to the world's end, how all these ends, and that which is the End of all these ends, Salvation, is to be atchieved. And these means 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 of men, not always *effectual*; for, that the same means may be Sufficient for the compassing an end, and not Effectual, you must not



not deny, who hold, that *God gives to all men sufficient means of Salvation, and yet that all are not saved.* I said also, Sufficient to determine all Controversies, which were *necessary to be determined.* For, if some Controversies may for many Ages be undetermined, and yet in the mean-while men be saved; why should, or how can the Church's being furnisht with effectual means to determine *all Controversies in Religion,* be necessary to Salvation; the end it self, to which these means are ordained, being, as experience shews, not necessary? Plain sense will teach every man, that the necessity of the means must always 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 determined? or, is it not? If it be, Why is the Question of *Predetermination,* of the *immaculate Conception,* of the *Pope's indirect power in Temporalties,* so long undetermined? If not, What is it but hypocrisie to pretend such great necessity of such effectual means, for the atchieving that end, which is it self not necessary? Christians therefore have and shall have *means sufficient* (though not always effectual) *to determine,* not all *Controversies,* but all *necessary to be determined.* I proceed on farther with you, and grant that this means to decide Controversies in Faith and Religion, must be endued with an Universal 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 yield unto it but a wavering and fearful 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 do not perceive how from the denial 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, *Historical Faith,* than generally both Protestants and Papists do; 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 confess, that it agrees with it. As first, that as Opinion is an Assent, so is Faith also. Secondly, that as Opinion, so Faith, is always built upon less evidence than that of Sense or Science, which Assertion you not only grant, but mainly contend for in your *sixth Chapter.* Thirdly and lastly, that, as Opinion, so Faith admit 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 will 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 Intellectual 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 weakness 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 pleased without a down-weight, but God is contented if the scale be turned: 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 darkness, 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 Premisses deserve; that the strength of our Faith be equal or proportionable to the credibility of the Motives

tives to it. Now though I have and ought to have, an absolute certainty of this Thesis, *All which God reveals 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 revealed by God*, we cannot ordinarily have any rational and acquired certainty, more than moral, founded upon these Considerations: First, that the goodness of the precepts of Christianity, and the greatness of the promises of it, shews it, of all other Religions, most likely to come from the Fountain of goodness. And then that a constant, famous, and very general 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 himself hath set his Hand and Seal to the truth of this Doctrin, 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 deduced from the former *Thesis*, which is Metaphysically certain, and from the former *Hypothesis*, whereof we can have but a Moral certainty, we cannot possibly by natural means be more certain of it than of the weaker of the Premisses; as a River will not rise higher than the fountain from which it flows. For the Conclusion always follows 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 derived, be so: Neither can we be certain of it in the highest degree, unless we be thus certain of all the Principles whereon it is grounded. As a man cannot go or stand strongly, if either of his legs be weak. Or as a building cannot be stable, if any one of the necessary pillars thereof be infirm 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 Relator.

9. Yet all this I say not, as if I doubted, that the Spirit of God, being implored by devout and humble prayer, and sincere 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 and confirmation*, which makes them know (though how they know not) what they did but believe: And to be as fully and resolutely assured of the Gospel of Christ, as those which heard it from Christ himself with their ears, 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 or Reasons enforcing to it; he will accept of the weakest and lowest degree of Faith, if it be living and effectual unto true Obedience. For he it is that *will not quench the smoaking flax, nor breack the bruised Reed*. He did not reject the prayer of that distressed man that cryed unto him, *Lord, I believe*; *Lord, help mine unbelief*. He commands us to *receive them that are weak in faith*, and thereby declares that he receives them. And as nothing avails 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 crackt with too much straining: And that being possessed with this false principle, that it is in vain to believe the Gospel of Christ, with such a kind or degree of assent, as they yield 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;



purpose; or else, though indeed they do believe it, yet to think they do 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 eternal happiness. Consideration of this advantage, which the Devil probably may make of this Fancy, made me willing to insist somewhat largely upon the Refutation of it.

10. I return now thither from whence I have digressed, and assure you, concerning the grounds afore-said, 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 do believe them, as firmly as you pretend to do. And therefore you may build on, in God's name; for by God's help, I shall always embrace, 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 undeniably follows, *That, of two disagreeing in matter of Faith, the one cannot be saved, but by repentance or ignorance.* I answer, by distinction of those terms, *two dissenting in a matter of faith*. For it may be either in a thing which is indeed a *matter of Faith*, in the strictest sense; that is, something, the Belief whereof God requires under pain 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 discern 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 have already declared in my examination of your Preface. The inconsequence of it, is of it self evident; for, Who ever heard of a wilder Collection than this?

God hath provided means sufficient to decide all Controversies in Religion, necessary to be decided;

This means is universally infallible;

Therefore of two, that differ in any thing which they esteem a matter of Faith, one cannot be saved.

He that can find any connection between these Propositions, I believe will be able to find good coherence between the deaf Plaintiff's Accusation, in the Greek Epigram, and the deaf Defendant's Answer, and the deaf Judge's Sentence: And to contrive them all into a formal Categorical Syllogism.

11. Indeed, if the matter in agitation were plainly decided, by this infallible means 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 Testimony of God, and undoubtedly a damnable sin. 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 always such a convicted Recusant as you pretend? Certainly, if you say so, having no better warrant than you have, or can have for it, this is more proper and formal uncharitableness, than ever was charged 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 profess themselves lovers of Christ, and truly desirous to know his will and do it) are either *not decidable* by that means 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 party, by reason of some veil before his eyes, *some excusable ignorance or unavoidable prejudice*, doth not see the Question to be decided against him, and so opposeth not that which He doth know to be the

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 confess, 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 give him the Lye to his face.

12. *Ad* §. 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16. In all this loug Discourse you only tell us what you will do, but do nothing. Many Positions there are, but proofs of them you offer none, but reserve them to the Chapters following; and there, in their proper places, they shall be examined. The sum of all your Assumpts collected by your self, §. 16. is this; That *the infallible means of determining Controversies, is the Visible Church.*

That *the distinction of Points Fundamental, and not-Fundamental, 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 Schism and Heresie.*

That, *in regard of the Precept of Charity towards one's self, Protestants are in state of sin, while they remain divided from the Roman Church.*

To all these Assertions I will content my self 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 himself desires it should be, yet the Corollary, which you deduce from it, would be utterly inconsequent, That, *Whosoever denies any Point proposed by the Church, is injurious to God's Divine Majesty; as if He could deceive, or be deceived.* For though your Church were indeed as *Infallible a Propounder of Divine Truths* as it pretends to be, yet, if it appeared not to me to be so, I might very well believe God most true, and your Church most false. As, though the Gospel of S. *Matthew* be the Word of God; yet, if I neither knew it to be so, nor believed it, I might believe in God, and yet think that Gospel 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 Divine Verities, therefore he that opposeth Her, calls God's 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 deceives them, or is deceived himself.* For as I may deny something which you upon your knowledge have affirmed, and yet never disparage your honesty, if I never knew that you affirmed it: So I may be undoubtedly certain of God's Omniscience, and Veracity, and yet doubt of something which he hath revealed; provided, I do not know, nor believe that he hath revealed it. So, that though your Church be the appointed witness of God's Revelations, yet until you know, that we know she is so, you cannot without foul calumny impute to us, That *we charge God blasphemously with deceiving, or being deceived.* You will say perhaps, That this is directly consequent from our Doctrin, *That the Church may err,* which is directed by God in all her Proposals. True, if we knew it to be directed by him, otherwise not; much less if we believe, and know the contrary. But then, if it were consequent from our Opinion, have you so little Charity, as to say, that men are *justly chargeable with all the consequences of their Opinions*; Such Consequences, I mean, as they do not own, but disclaim; and, if there were a necessity of doing either, would much rather forsake their Opinion, than imbrace those 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 chargeable with all those Blasphemies? If not, seeing our case (take it at the worst) is but the same, why should

not



not your judgement of us be the same? I appeal to all those Protestants that have gone over to your Side; whether when they were most averse from it, they did ever deny or doubt of *God's Omniscience or Veracity*; whether they did ever believe, or were taught, that *God did deceive them, or was deceived himself.* Nay, I provoke you your self, and desire you to deal truly, and to tell Us, Whether you do in your heart believe, that we do indeed not believe the eternal Veracity of the eternal Verity? And, if you judge so strangely of us, having no better ground for it, than you have or can have, we shall not need any farther proof of your uncharitableness towards us, this being the extremity of true uncharitableness. 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 do so; and hereafter (as, if your ground be true, you may do with more Truth and Charity) collect thus, *They only err damnably, who oppose what they know God hath testified*; But *Protestants sure do not oppose what they know God hath testified, at least we cannot with Charity say they do*; *Therefore they either do not err damnably, or with Charity we cannot say they do so.*

13. *Ad* §. 17. *Protestants* (you say) *according to their own grounds must hold, that of persons contrary in whatsoever Point of Belief 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 lays upon Protestants any necessity to do so! You tell us, it is their holding *Scripture the sole Rule of Faith:* For this, you say, obligeth them to pronounce them damned, 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 contained in Scripture*, or have no just probable Reason, and which may move an honest man to doubt, Whether or no it be there contained. For to oppose in the first case, is a man that believes the Scripture to be the Word of God, is, to give God the lie. To oppose in the second, is, to be obstinate against Reason; and therefore a sin, 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 belief; and that for these Reasons. First, because the contrary belief 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 esteemed to be so. So that, though it were damnable to oppose any Point contained in Scripture, yet Persons of a contrary belief (as *Victor*, and *Polycrates*, S. *Cyprian*, and *Stephen*) might both be saved, because their contrary belief was not touching any Point contained in Scripture. Secondly, because the contrary belief may be about the sense of some place of Scripture which is ambiguous, and with probability capable of divers senses; and in such cases it is no marvel, and sure no sin, if several men go several ways. Thirdly, because the contrary belief may be concerning Points wherein Scripture may, with so great probability, be alledged 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 God's will and to do it, may, without any fault at all, some go one way, and some another, and some (and those as good men as either of the former) suspend their judgments, and expect some *Elias to solve doubts*, and reconcile repugnancies. Now in all such Questions, one side or other (whichsoever 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 believe that they indeed maintain it, and have great shew of reason to induce them to believe so; and therefore are not to be damned, as men opposing that which they either know to be a Truth delivered in Scripture, or have no probable Reason to believe the contrary; but rather, in Charity to be acquitted and absolved, as men who endeavour to find the Truth, but fail of it through humane frailty.

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

14. *To the firſt, whether it be not in any man a grievous ſin to deny any one Truth contained in holy Writ?* I anſwer, Yes, if he knew it to be ſo, or have no probable Reaſon to doubt of it: otherwiſe, not.

15. *To the ſecond: whether there be in ſuch denial any diſtinction between Fundamental and not-Fundamental ſufficient to excuſe from Hereſie?* I anſwer, Yes, There is ſuch a Diſtinction. But the Reaſon is, becauſe thoſe Points, either in themſelves, or by accident, are *Fundamental*, which are *evidently contained in Scripture, to him that knows them to be ſo:* Thoſe not-Fundamental, which are there-hence deducible, but probably only, not evidently.

16. *To the third: Whether it be not impertinent to alledge the Creed as containing all Fundamental Points of Faith, as if believing it alone we were at Liberty to deny all other Points of Scripture?* I anſwer, It was never alledged to any ſuch purpoſe; but only as a ſufficient, or rather more than a ſufficient Summary of thoſe Points of Faith, which were of neceſſity to be believed actually and explicitly; and that only of ſuch which were meerly 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 belief, one part only can be ſaved?* I anſwer, By no means. For they may differ about Points *not contained in Scripture*: They may differ about the *ſenſe of ſome ambiguous Text* of Scripture: They may differ about ſome Doctrines, for, and againſt which Scriptures may be alledged with *ſo great probability*, as may juſtly excuſe either Part from Hereſie, and a ſelf-condemning Obſtinacy. And therefore, though D. *Potter* do not take it ill, that you believe your ſelves may be ſaved in your Religion; yet, notwithſtanding all that hath yet been pretended to the contrarie, he may juſtly condemn you, and that out of your own principles, of *uncharitable preſumption*, for affirming as you do, that *no man can be ſaved out of it*.

---

## CHAP. II.

### *What is that means, whereby the revealed Truths of God are conveyed to our Underſtanding, and which muſt determine Controverſies in Faith and Religion.*

OF our eſtimation, reſpect, and reverence to holy Scripture, even Proteſtants themſelves do in fact give teſtimony, while they poſſeſs 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 Judge to holy Writ, if both the thing were not impoſſible in it ſelf, 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 external Judge to keep, to propoſe, to interpret in a true, Orthodox, 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 infer, that all other Books of Scripture are to be excluded, leſt, by addition of them, we may ſeem to derogate from the perfection of the former? When the firſt Books 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 mutual diſparagement? What greater wrong is it for the written Word, to be compartner now with the unwritten, than 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 extol the integrety and knowledge, and to avouch the neceſſity of a Judge in ſuits of Law, were to deny perfection in the Law? Are there not in Commonwealths, beſides the Laws, written and unwritten cuſtoms, Judges appointed to declare both the one, and the other, as ſeveral occaſions may require?

2. That the Scripture alone cannot be Judge in Controverſies of Faith, we gather it very clearly, From the quality of a writing in general: 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 Error: From the inconveniences that muſt follow upon the aſcribing of ſole Judicature 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 Judge 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 Judge cannot in common reaſon agree to any meer



meer 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 Judge, 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 applyable, and able to do all this, as the diverſity of Controverſies, Perſons, Occaſions, and Circumſtances may require. There is a great and plain diſtinction betwixt a *Judge* and a *Rule*. For, as in a Kingdom, the Judge hath his Rule to follow, which are the received Laws and Cuſtoms; ſo are not they fit or able to declare, or be Judges to themſelves, but that office muſt belong to a living Judge. The holy Scripture may be, and is, a Rule, but cannot be a Judge, becauſe, it being always the ſame, cannot declare it ſelf 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 Controverſies in Faith, than the Law would be to end ſuits, if it were given over to the fancy, and gloſs of every ſingle man.

4. This difference betwixt a Judge and a Rule, D. *Potter* perceived, when, more than once having ſtiled the Scripture a *Judge*, by way of correcting that term, he adds, *or rather a Rule*, becauſe he knew that an inanimate writing could not be a *Judge*. From hence alſo it was, that, though Proteſtants in their beginning affirmed Scripture alone to be the Judge 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 Judge in Controverſies. A difference without a diſparity. The Holy Ghoſt ſpeaking only in Scripture, is no more intelligible to us, than the Scripture in which he ſpeaks: as a man ſpeaking only Latin, can be no better underſtood, than the tongue wherein he ſpeaketh. And therefore to ſay, A Judge 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 ſpeaks in Scripture. And, it were a conceit, equally fooliſh and pernitious, if one ſhould ſeek to take away all Judges in the Kingdom, upon this nicety, that albeit Laws cannot be Judges, yet the Law-maker ſpeaking in the Law, may perform that Office; as if the Law-maker ſpeaking in the Law, were with more perſpicuity underſtood, than the Law whereby he ſpeaketh.

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

6. And, ſuppoſe it could defend it ſelf from corruption, how could it aſſure us that it ſelf were Canonical, and of infallible verity? By ſaying ſo? Of this very *Affirmation*, there will remain the ſame Queſtion ſtill; how it can prove it ſelf to be infallibly true? Neither can there ever be an end of the like multiplyed demands, till we reſt in the external Authority of ſome perſon or perſons bearing witneſs 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 ſelf is Canonical Scripture, is acknowledged by ſome Proteſtants; in expreſs words; and by all of them, in deeds. M. *Hooker*, whom D. *Potter* ranketh (a) among men of great *Learning and Judgment*, 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 ſelf 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 do 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, unleſs, beſides Scripture, there were ſomething which might aſſure us, &c.* And this he acknowledges 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 great learning and judgment 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 *Covel* doth punctually agree. *Whitaker* likewiſe confeſſeth, that the queſtion about Canonical 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 refel others*; but (as he acknowledgeth) *by the* (f) *Eccleſiaſtical Tradition*, *An argument* (ſaith he) *whereby may be argued, and convinced, what Books be Canonical, and what be not.* *Luther* ſaith, *This* (g) *indeed the Church hath, that ſhe can diſcern the Word of God, from the word of men*: as Auguſtine *confeſſeth, that he believed the Goſpel, being moved by the Authority of the Church, which did preach this to be the Goſpel.* *Fulk* teacheth, that *the Church* (h) *hath judgement to diſcern true writings from counterfeit, and the Word of God from the writing of men; and that this judgement ſhe hath not of her ſelf, 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 *Anabaptiſm*, 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 Canonical, while they cannot agree in aſſigning the Canon of holy Scripture. Of the Epiſtle of *S. James*, *Luther* hath theſe words: *The* (k) *Epiſtle of* James *is contentious, ſwelling, dry, ſtrawy, and unworthy of an Apoſtolical Spirit.* Which cenſure of *Luther*, *Illiricus* acknowledgeth and maintaineth. *Kemnitius* teacheth, *that the ſecond Epiſtle* (l) *of* Peter, *the ſecond and third of* John, *the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, the Epiſtle of* James, *the Epiſtle of* Jude, *and the Apocalyps of* John *are Apocryphal, as not having ſufficient Teſtimony* (m) *of their authority*, and therefore that *nothing in Controverſie can be proved out of theſe* (n) *Books*. The ſame is taught by divers other Lutherans: and, if ſome other amongſt them, be of a contrary opinion ſince *Luther*'s time, I wonder what new infallible ground they can alledge, why they leave their Maſter, and ſo many of his prime Schollars? I know no better ground, than becauſe they may with as much freedom abandon him, as he was bold to alter that Canon of Scripture, which he found received in God's Church.

(a) *Pag.* 131.
(b) *In his firſt book of Eccleſ. Polity Sect.* 14. *p.* 68
(c) *Ibid. l.* 2. *Sect.* 4. *p.* 102.
(d) *L.* 3 *Sect.* 8. *pag.* 1. 146 *& alibi.*
(e) *Adv. Stap. l.* 2. *c.* 6. *p.* 270. *to p.* 357.
(f) *Adv. Stap. l.* 2. *c.* 4. *p.* 300.
(g) *L. de cap. Bab. to* 2. *Witt. f.* 88.
(h) *In his Anſwer to a counterfeit Catholique, p.* 5.
(i) *Ep. con. Anab. ad duos Parochos to* 2. *Ger. Witt.*
(k) *Praf. in epiſt. Jac. in ed. Jenen.*
(l) *In Enchirid. p.* 63.
(m) *In exami. Conc. Trid part* 1. *p.* 55.
(n) *ibid.*

9. What Books of Scripture the Protestants of *England*, hold for Canonical, is not easie to affirm. In their *sixth Article* they say, *In the name of the holy Scripture, we do understand those Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament, of whose Authority was never any doubt in the Church.* What mean they by these words? That by the Churches consent they are assured what Scriptures be Canonical? This were to make the Church Judge, and not Scriptures alone. Do 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 book of *Esther* must quit the Canon, because some in the Church have 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 Jews* (r) *place the book of* Esther *in the Canon; which yet, if I might be Judge, doth rather deserve to be put out of the Canon.* And of *Ecclesiastes* he saith, *This*, (s) *book is not full; there are in it many abrupt things: he wants boots and spurs, that is, he hath no perfect sentence, he rides upon a large 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 *Soloman*, but by *Syrach* in the time of the *Macchabees*, and that it is like to the *Talmud* (the Jews Bible) *out of many books heaped into one work, perhaps out of the Library of King* Ptolomeus. And further he saith, that (u) he doth not believe all to have been done as there is set down. And he teacheth the (w) book of *Job* to be *as it were, an argument for a fable* (or Commedy) *to set before us an example of Patience.* And he (x) delivers this general 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 means the Bible was conserved.* If this were so, the books of the Prophets, being not written by themselves, but promiscuously and casually, by their Disciples, will soon be called in question. Are not these errors of *Luther* fundamental? and yet, if Protestants deny the Infallibility of the Church, upon what certain ground can they disprove these *Lutherian*, and *Luciferian* blasphemies? O Godly Reformer of the Roman Church! But to return to our English Canon of Scripture. In the New Testament by the above-mentioned rule (*of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church*) divers Books of the New Testament must be dis-canonized, to wit, all those of which some Ancients have doubted, and those which divers *Lutherans* have of late denied. It is worth the observation, how the before-mentioned *sixth Article*, doth specifie by name all the Books of the *Old Testament* which they hold for Canonical; but those of the *New Testament, as they are commonly received, we do receive and account them Canonical.* The Mystery is easily to be unfolded. If they had descended to particulars, they must have contradicted some of their chiefest Brethren. *As they are commonly received*, &c. I ask, By whom? By the Church of *Rome*? Then, by the same reason they must receive 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 be the greater, or less number of Voices, that must cry up or down, the Canon of Scripture, our *Roman* Canon will prevail: and among Protestants the *Certainty* of their *Faith* must be reduced to an *Uncertain* Controversie of *Fact*, Whether the number of those who reject, or of those others who receive such and such Scriptures, be greater. Their Faith must alter according to years and days. When *Luther* first appeared, he, and his Disciples were the greater number of that new Church; and so this claim *(Of being commonly received)* stood for them, till *Zuinglius* or *Calvin* grew to some equal, or greater number than 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 do understand those Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament, of whose Authority was never any doubt in the Church*; And in the latter part, speaking again of the *New Testament*, they give a far different rule, saying, *All the Books of the New Testament, as they are commonly received, we do receive, and account them Canonical.* 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*, pass for a good rule to know the Canon of the *New Testament*, why not of the *Old*? Above all we desire to know, Upon what infallibile ground in some Books they agree with us against *Luther*, and divers principal *Lutherans*, and in others jump with *Luther* against us? But seeing they disagree among themselves, it is evident that they have no certain rule to know the Canon of Scripture, in assigning whereof some of them must of necessity err; because, of contradictory Propositions both cannot be true.

(o) *Apud Euseb. l. 4. Hist. c. 26.*
(p) *In Synops.*
(q) *In carm. de genuinis Script.*
(r) *Li. de serm. urb. con. Erasm. tom. 2. Wit. fol. 471.*
(s) *In lat. serm. convivialibus Fran. in 8. imp. Anno 1571.*
(t) *In Germ. colloq. Lutheri ab Aurifabro ed. Francof. tit. de lib. vet. & nov. Test. fol. 379.*
(u) *Ibid. tit. de lib. Patriar. & Proph. fol. 282.*
(w) *Tit. de li. Vet. & Nov. Test*
(x) *Fol. 350.*

10. Moreover, the letters, syllables, words, phrase, or matter contained in holy Scripture have no necessary, or natural connection with divine *Revelation* or *Inspiration*: and therefore by seeing, reading, or understanding them, we cannot infer that they proceed from God, or be confirmed by divine Authority; as because *Creatures* involve a necessary relation, connection and dependance on their *Creator*, Philosophers may by the light of natural reason, demonstrate the existence of one prime cause of all things. In Holy Writ there are innumerable truths not surpassing the sphear of humane wit, which are, or may be delivered by Pagan Writers, in the self same words and phrase as they are in Scripture. And as for some truths peculiar to Christians (for example, the mystery of the blessed Trinity, &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, Sibyls, Ovid*, &c. must be esteemed Canonical Scripture, because they fall upon some truth, proper to Christian Religion. The internal *light*, and *inspiration*, which directed and moved the Authors of Canonical Scriptures, is a hidden *Quality* infused into their understanding and will, and hath no such particular sensible influence into the external *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 self alone, but by some other extrinsecal Authority.

11. And here we appeal to any man of judgement, whether it be not a vain brag of some Protestants to tell us, that they wot full well what is Scripture, by the light of Scripure it self, or (as D. *Potter* words it) *by* (y) *that glorious beam of divine light which shines therein*; even as our eye distinguisheth light from darkness, without any other help than light it self; and as our ear knows a voice, by the voice it self alone. But this vanity is refuted, by what we said even now; that the external Scripture hath no apparent or necessary connexion with divine *inspiration* or *revelation*. Will D. *Potter* hold all his Brethren for blind men, for not seeing *that glorious beam of divine light which shines in Scripture*, about which they cannot agree? Corporal light may be discerned by it self alone, as being evident, proportionate, and connatural to our faculty of seeing. That Scripture is Divine, and inspired by God,

(y) Pag. 141.



is a truth exceeding the natural capacity and compass of man's 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 do not manifest it self by it self alone, but must require some other means for applying it to our understanding. Nevertheless their own similitudes and instances make against themselves: For, suppose a man had never read, or heard of Sun, Moon, Fire, Candle, &c. and should be 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 Sun, or Moon, &c? Or, if one heard a voice, and had never known the Speaker, could he know from whom in particular 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, unless they first know the Writer, and what hand he writes: as likewise I cannot know whose voice it is which I hear, unless I first both know the person who speaks, and with what voice he useth to speak; and yet, even all this supposed, I may perhaps be deceived. For there may be Voices so like, and Hands so counterfeited, that men may be deceived by them, as Birds were by the Grapes of that skilful Painter. Now since Protestants affirm, knowledge concerning God as our *supernatural* end, must be taken from Scripture, they cannot in Scripture alone discern that it is his voice, or writing, because they cannot know from whom a writing, or voice proceeds, unless 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 affirm any thing, but only to set down, 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 himself understands not: or when one writes what another dictates, and in other such cases, wherein it is cleare, that the Writer speaks or signifies nothing in such his writing; and therefore by *it* we cannot hear, or understand *his* voice. With what certainty then can any man affirm, that by Scripture it self they can see, that the Writers did intend to signifie any thing at all: that they were Apostles, or other Canonical 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?

(z) Heb. 11. 1.

12. But let us be liberal, and for the present suppose (not grant) that Scripture is, like to corporal light, by it self alone able to determine, and move our understanding to assent; yet the Similitude proves against themselves. For light is not visible, except to such as have 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 clear only to those who are endued with the eye of Faith; or, as D. *Potter* above cited saith, to all that *have* (a) *eyes to discern the shining beams thereof*; that is, to the *believer*, as immediately 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 means precedent to Scripture, to beget Faith, which can be no other than the Church.

(a) Pag. 141.

13. Others affirm, that they know Canonical Scriptures to be such, by the *Title* of the Books. But how shall we know such *Inscriptions*, or *Titles*, to be infallibly true? From this their Answer our Argument is strengthned, because divers Apocryphal writings have appeared, under the *Titles*, and Names of sacred Authors, as the Gospel of *Thomas* mentioned by (b) S. *Augustine*, the Gospel of *Peter*, which the *Nazaræi* 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 Gospels 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 Books, as also both we, and they hold for Apocryphal, the third and fourth Books which go under the name of *Esdras*, and yet both of us receive his first and second book. Wherefore Titles are not sufficient assurances what Books be Canonical: which (h) D. *Covel* acknowledgeth in these words, *It is not the Word of God, which doth, or possibly can assure us, that we do 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* Mark's *Gospel, who was not an Apostle and to refuse the Gospel of* Thomas *who was an Apostle: and to retain* Luke's *Gospel who saw not Christ, and to reject the Gospel of* Nicodemus *who saw him.*

(b) *Con. Adimantum c. 17.*
(c) *L. 2. hæretic. fab.*
(d) *Li. 6. c. 10.*
(e) *Lib. 6. c. 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 Practice. 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 knowledg 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 yield assent, either to them, or to other verities depending on them. It is repugnant to their own Doctrin, and practice, in as much as they are wont to affirm, that one part of Scripture may be known to be Canonical, 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, fals out to prove, what we affirm. For since all Principles cannot be proved, we must (that our labour may not be endless) 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 himself, cometh to be confirmed by all those Miracles, and other arguments, whereby they convinced their doctrin to be true. Wherefore the ancient Fathers avouch that we must receive the sacred Canon upon the credit of God's 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 Councel of (l) *Carthage* having set down the Books 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 Gospel, because the Catholique Church doth alike recommend to me both these Books.* And in the same place he hath also these words: *I would not believe the Gospel, unless the authority of the Catholique Church did move me,*

(i) Pag. 234.
(k) *In Synopsi.*
(l) *Can. 47.*
(m) *Cont. ep. fundam. c. 5.*

(n) To. 1. fol. 135. me. A saying so plain, that *Zuinglius* is forced to cry out, *Here I (n) implore your equity to speak freely, whether this saying of* Augustine *seem not over-bold, or else unadvisedly to have fallen from him.*

15. But suppose they were assured what Books were Canonical, this will little avail them, unless 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 *Jews*, who either by ignorance might mistake, or upon malice force the Text, to favour their impieties. And that the Hebrew Text still retains much ambiguity, is apparent by the disagreeing *Translation of Novelists*; which also proves the Greek, for the New Testament, not to be void of doubtfulness, as *Calvin* (p) confesseth it to be corrupted. And although both the Hebrew and Greek 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, do err often, and unavoidably.*

(o) Instit. c. 6. Sect. 11.

(p) Instit. c. 7. Sect. 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 *James* of famous memory, hath to this (r) purpose. To omit (saith he) particulars, whose recital 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, Fools, Asses, Antichrists, Deceivers, and of Asse-like understanding. In so much that when *Froschoverus* the *Zuinglian* Printer of *Zurich* sent him a Bible translated by the Divines there, *Luther* would not receive the same, but sending it back rejected it, as the Protestants Writers *Hospinianus*, and *Lavatherus*, witness. 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 Ethnical.* As concerning *Calvins* Translation, that learned Protestant Writer *Carolus Molinæus* saith therefore, *Calvin in his Harmony maketh the Text of the Gospel to leap up and down, he useth violence to the letter of the Gospel; and, besides this, addeth to the Text.* As touching *Beza*'s Translation, (to omit the dislike had thereof by *Selneccerus* the *German* Protestant of the University of *Jena*) 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 errors 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 Majesties grave and learned Censure, in your *thinking the* Geneva *translation to be worst of all*; and that in the *Marginal notes annexed to the* Geneva *translation, some are very partial, untrue, seditious,* &c. Lastly, concerning the *English* translation, the Puritans say, *Our translation of the Psalms, comprized in our Book of Common Prayer, doth in addition, substraction, and aleration, differ from the truth of the Hebrew, in two hundred places at the least.* In so much as they do therefore profess to rest doubtful, *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 do detort the Scriptures from the right sense.* And that, *they shew themselves to love darkness more than light, falshood more then truth.* And the Ministers of *Lincoln*-Diocess, give their publique 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 affirm, that you *could never see a Bible well Translated into English.* Thus far the Author of the *Protestants Apologie*, &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 account a man to be justified by faith, without the works of the Law)* in favour of Justification by faith *alone*, translateth *(justified by faith ALONE)* As likewise the falsification of *Zuinglius* is no less 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 skil and honesty of men, in whom nothing is more certain than a most certain possibility to err, and no greater evidence of truth, than that it is evident some of them embrace 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 poor souls 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, flye to the always visible Catholique Church, against which the gates of hell can never so far prevail, as that she shall be permitted to deceive the Christian world with false Scriptures. And *Luther* himself, by unfortunate experience, was at length forced to confess thus much, saying, *If the (s) world last longer, it will be again necessary to receive the Decrees of Councels, and to have recourse to them, by reason of divers interpretations of Scripture which now raign.* On the contrary side, the Translation approved by the *Roman*-Church, is commended even by our Adversaries: and D. *Covell* in particular saith, *that it was used in the Church, one thousand (t) three hundred years ago,* 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 cometh 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 goodness of their Bibles; and therefore they are obliged to maintain our Translations, if it were but for their own sake.

(r) Tract. 1. Sect. 10 subd. 4. joyned with Tract. 2 cap. 2. Sect. 10. subd. 2.

(s) Li. cont. Zuing. de verit. corp. Chris. in Euch.

(t) In his answer unto M. John Burges, pag. 91.
(u) Ibid.

17. But



17. But doth indeed the source of their manifold uncertainties stop here? No, The chiefest difficulty remains, concerning the true meaning of Scripture: for attaining whereof, if Protestants had any certainty, they could not disagree so hugely as they do. Hence Mr. *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 self unto some judicial, and definitive sentence, whereunto neither part that contendeth may, under any pretence, refuse to stand.* Doctor *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 leisure, 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 Judgemnt?*

(w) In his Preface to his Books of Eccl. Politie, 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 Books 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 proof 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 Gospel, unless the Authority of the Church did move me. Them therefore whom I obeyed, saying, Believe the Gospel, why should I not obey saying to me, Do not believe* Manicheus, (Luther, Calvin, *&c.*) *Choose what thou pleasest. If thou shalt say, Believe the Catholiques; They warn 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 do well in forcing me to the faith of* Manicheus, *because, by the Preaching of Catholiques, I believed the Gospel it self. If thou say, You did well to believe them* (Catholiques) *commending the Gospel, but you did not well to believe them, discommending* Manicheus; *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 do 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 less Prophetically, than Doctrinally, when he said, *Why should I not most (z) diligently inquire what Christ commanded 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 me? This therefore I believed by fame, strengthened with celebrity, consent, Antiquity. But every one may see that you, so few, so turbulent, so new, can produce nothing deserving authority. What madness 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 self, that I were not to believe Christ, than that I should learn any thing concerning him from any other than them by whom I believed him.* If therefore we receive the knowledge of Christ, and Scritptures from the Church, from her also must we take his Doctrin, and the interpretation thereof.

(y) Con. Ep. Fund. cap. 5.

(z) Lib. de util. cred. Cap. 14

19. But besides all this, the Scriptures cannot be Judge 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 universal Judge, 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 *internal private Spirit*, because there is really no middle way betwixt a *publique external*, and a *private internal* voice; and whosoever refuseth the one, must of necessity adhere to the other.

21. This Tenet also of Protestants, by taking the office of Judicature from the Church, comes to confer it upon every particular man, who being driven from submission to the Church, cannot be blamed if he trust himself as far as any other, his conscience dictating, that wittingly he means not to cozen himself, as others maliciously may do. Which inference is so manifest, that it hath extorted from divers Protestants the open confession of so vast an absurdity. Hear *Luther*, *The Governors of (a) Churches, and Pastors of Christs Sheep, have indeed power to teach, but the Sheep ought to give judgement, whether they propound the voice of Christ, or of Aliens.* *Lubertus* saith, *As we have (b) demonstrated that all publique Judges may be deceived in interpreting; so we affirm, that they may err in judging. All faithful men are private Judges, and they also have power to judge of Doctrins, and interpretations.* *Whitaker*, even of the unlearned, saith, *They (c) ought to have recourse unto the more learned; but in the mean time we must be careful not to attribute to them over-much, but so, that still we retain our own freedom.* *Bilson* also affirmeth, that, *The people (d) must be discerners, and Judges of that which is taught.* The same pernicious Doctrin is delivered by *Brentius*, *Zanchius*, *Cartwright*, and others exactly cited by (e) *Breerely*; and nothing is more common in every Protestants mouth, than that he admits of Fathers, Councels, Church, *&c.* as far as they agree with Scripture; which upon the matter is himself. Thus *Heresie* ever falls upon extreams. It pretends to have Scripture alone for Judge of Controversies, and in the mean time sets up as many Judges, as there are men and women in the Christian world. What good Statesmen would they be, who should ideate, or fancy, such a Common-wealth, as these men have framed to themselves a Church? They verifie what St. *Augustine* objecteth against certain Heretiques. *You see (f) that you go about to overthrow all authority of Scripture, and that every mans mind may be to himself a Rule, what he is to allow, or disallow in every Scripture.*

(a) To. 2. Wittemb. fol. 375.

(b) In lib. de principiis Christian. dogm. li. 6. c. 13.

(c) De sacra Scriptura pag. 529.

(d) In his true Difference, part 2.

(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 denial of the Authority of the Church, may bring, I leave to the consideration of any judicious, indifferent man. I will only set down some words of D. *Potter*, who speaking of the Proposition of revealed Truths, sufficient to prove him that gain-saith them, to be an Heretique, saith thus: *This Proposition (g) of revealed truths, is not by the infallible determination of Pope, or Church;* (Pope, and Church being excluded, let us hear what more secure rule he will prescribe) *but by whatsoever means a man may be convinced in conscience of divine Revelation. If a Preacher do clear any Point of Faith to his Hearers; if a private Christian do make it appear*

(g) Pag. 247.

*pear to his Neighbour, that any Conclusion, or Point of Faith is delivered by divine revelation of Gods Word; if a man himself (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 prove him that gainsayeth any such proof, to be an Heretique, and obstinate opposer of the Faith.* Behold, what goodly safe Propounders of Faith arise in place of Gods universal visible Church, which must yield to a single Preacher, a Neighbour, a man himself if he can read, or at least have ears to hear Scripture read. Verily I do not see, but that every well-governed civil Common-wealth, ought to concur towards the exterminating of this Doctrin, 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.

23. Moreover, there was no Scripture, or written Word for about two thousand years from *Adam* to *Moses*, whom all acknowledge to have been the first Author of Canonical Scripture: And again, for about two thousand years more, from *Moses* to Christ our Lord, holy Scripture was only among the people of *Israel*; and yet there were *Gentiles* endued in those days with divine Faith, as appeareth in *Job*, and his friends. Wherefore, during so many Ages, the Church alone was the Decider of Controversies, and Instructor of the faithful. Neither did the Word written by *Moses*, deprive the Church of her former Infallibility, or other qualities requisite for a Judge: yea D. *Potter* acknowledgeth, that besides the *Law*, there was a living *Judge* in the *Jewish* Church, endued with an *absolutely infallible direction in case 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 successively upon several occasions; and some after the decease of most of the Apostles: and after they were written, they were not presently known 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 Controversies in Religion? That sometime Churches had one Judge of Controversies, and others another? That with moneths, or years, as new Canonical Scripture grew to be published, the Church altered her whole Rule of Faith, or Judge of Controversies? After the Apostles time, and after the writing of Scriptures, Heresies would be sure to rise, requiring in God's Church, for their discovery and condemnation, *Infallibility*, either to write new Canonical Scripture, as was done in the Apostles time by occasion of emergent Heresies; or *Infallibility* to interpret Scriptures, already written, or without Scripture, by divine unwritten Traditions, and assistance of the holy Ghost to determine all Controversies, as *Tertulian* saith: *The soul is* (h) *before the letter; and speech before Books; and sense before style.* Certainly such *addition* of Scripture, with derogation, or *substraction* from the former power and infallibility of the Church, would have brought to the world *division* in matters of faith, and the Church had rather lost than gained by holy Scripture, (which ought to be far from our tongues and thoughts) it being manifest, that, for decision of Controversis, Infallibility setled in a living Judge, is incomparably more useful and fit, than if it were conceived, as inherent in some inanimate writing. Is there such repugnance betwixt Infallibility of 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 milk of sacred Writ? No, No. Her Infallibility was, and is, derived from an inexhausted Fountain. If *Protestants* will have the Scripture alone for their Judge, let them first produce some Scripture affirming, that by the *entring* thereof, Infallibility *went out* of the Church. D. *Potter* may remember what himself teacheth; That the Church is still endued with Infallibility in Points Fundamental; 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 coming of Scripture, was deprived of Infallibility in some Points, and not in others? He affirmeth, That the *Jewish* Synagogue retained infallibility in her self, notwithstanding the writing of the *Old* Testament; and will he so unworthily and unjustly deprive the Church of Christ of Infallibility by reason of the *New* Testament? Especially, if we consider, that in the Old Testament, Laws, Ceremonies, Rites, Punishments, Judgements, Sacraments, Sacrifices, &c. were more particularly, and minutely delivered to the *Jews*, than 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 than the *Jewish* Synagogue. D. *Potter* (i) against this argument, drawn from the power and infallibility of the Synagogue, objects, That we might as well infer, that *Christians must have one Soveraign Prince over all, because the Jews had one chief Judge.* But the disparity is very clear. The Synagogue was a type, and figure of the Church of Christ; not so their civil Government, of Christian Common-wealths or Kingdoms. The Church succeeded to the Synagogue, but not Christian Princes to *Jewish* Magistrates: And the Church is compared to a house, or (k) family; to an (l) Army, to a (m) body, to a (n) kingdom, &c. all which require one Master, one General, one head, one Magistate, one spiritual King; as our blessed Saviour with *fiet Unum ovile*, (o) joyned *Unus Pastor: One Sheepfold, One Pastour*: But all distinct Kingdoms, or Common-wealths, are not one Army, Family, &c. And finally, it is necessary to Salvation, that all have recourse to one Church; but for temporal weale, there is no need that all submit, or depend upon one temporal Prince, Kingdom, 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 Kingdoms have their several Laws, different governments, diversity of Powers, Magistracy, &c. And so this objection returneth upon D. *Potter*. For as in the *One* Community of the *Jews*, there was one Power and Judge, to end debates, and resolve difficulties; so in the Church of Christ, which is *One*, there must be some *one* Authority to decide all Controversies in Religion.

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 have followed the order of Tradition which they delivered to those to whom they committed the Churches? to which order many Nations yield assent, who believe in Christ, having Salvation written in their hearts by the Spirit of God, without letters or Inke, and diligent keeping ancient Tradition. It is easie to receive the truth from God's Church, seeing the Apostles have most fully deposited in her, as in a rich store-house, all things belonging to truth. For what? if there should arise any contention of some small question, ought we not to have recourse to the most ancient Churches, and from them to receive what is certain and clear concerning the present question?*

25. Besides all this, the doctrin of Protestants is destructive of it self. For either they have certain and

(h) *De test. anim. cap.* 5.

(i) *Pag.* 24.

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

(p) *Lib.* 5. *c.* 4.



and infallible means, not to err in interpreting Scripture; or they have not. If not, then the Scripture (to them) cannot be a sufficient ground for infallible Faith, nor a meet Judge of Controversies. If they have certain infallible means, and so cannot err in their interpretations of Scriptures; then they are able with infallibility to hear, examine, and determine all Controversies of Faith; and so they may be, and are *Judges* of Controversies, although they use the Scripture as a *Rule*. And thus, against their own doctrin, they constitute another Judge of Controversies, besides Scripture alone.

26. Lastly, I ask D. *Potter*, Whether this Assertion (*Scripture alone is Judge of all Controversies in Faith*) be a Fundamental Point of Faith, or no? He must be well advised, before he say, that it is a Fundamental Point. For he will have against him, as many Protestants as teach that by Scripture alone, it is impossible to know what Books be Scripture, which yet, to Protestants, is the most necessary and chief Point of all other. D. *Covell* expresly saith, *Doubtless* (q) *it is a tolerable opinion in the Church of* Rome, *if they go no further, as some of them do not* (he should have said, as none of them do) *to affirm, that the Scriptures are holy and divine in themselves, but so esteemed by us, for the authority of the Church.* He will likewise oppose himself to those his Brethren, who grant that Controversies cannot be ended, without some external living Authority, as we noted before. Besides, how can it be in us a fundamental Error to say, the Scripture alone is not Judge of Controversies, seeing (notwithstanding this our belief) we use for interpreting of Scripture, all the means which they prescribe; as Prayer, Conferring of places, Consulting the Originals, &c. and to these add the Instruction, and Authority of God's Church, which even by his confession *cannot* err damnably, and *may* afford us more *help*, than 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 fundamental error against Faith; and consquently, he cannot affirm that our doctrin, in this present Controversie, is damnable. If he answer, that their Tenet, about the *Scriptures* being *the only Judge of Controversies*, is not a Fundamental Point of Faith: then, as he teacheth, that the universal Church may err in Points Fundamental; so, I hope, he will not deny, but particular Churches, and private men, are much more obnoxious to error in such Points; and in particular in this, that *Scripture alone is Judge of Controversies*: And so, the very Principle upon which their whole Faith is grounded, remains to them uncertain: and on the other side, for the selfsame reason, they are not certain, but that the Church is Judge of Controversies; which if she be, then their case is lamentable, who in *general* deny her this Authority, and in *particular* Controversies oppose her definitions. Besides, among publique Conclusions defended in *Oxford* the year 1633. to the questions, *Whether the Church have Authority to determine Controversies in Faith*; And, *To interpret holy Scripture?* The answer to both is *Affirmative*.

27. Since then, the visible Church of Christ our Lord, is that infallible *Means whereby the revealed truths of Almighty God, are conveyed to our understanding*; it followeth, that to oppose her definitions is to resist God himself; which blessed St, *Augustine* plainly affirmeth, when, speaking of the Controversie about *Rebaptization* of such as were baptized by Heretiques, he saith, *This* (r) *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 perform what he should say, lest we might seem to gain-say not him so much as Christ, by whose testimony he was recommended. Now Christ beareth witness to his Church.* And a little after, *Whosoever refuseth to follow the practice of the Church, doth resist our Saviour himself, who by his testimony recommends the Church.* I conclude therefore with this argument; Whosoever resisteth that means which infallibly proposeth to us God's Word or Revelation, commits a sin, which, unrepented, excludes Salvation: But whosoever resisteth Christ's visible Church, doth resist that means, which infallibly proposeth God's Word or Revelation to us. Therefore, whosoever resisteth Christ's visible Church, commits a sin, 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 do not oppose that visible Church, which was spread over the World, before, and in *Luther*'s time, is easie to be determined, and importeth every one most seriously to ponder, as a thing whereon eternal salvation dependeth. And because our Adversaries do here most insist upon the distinction of Points Fundamental, and not-Fundamental; and in particular teach, that the Church may err in Points not-Fundamental, it will be necessary to examine the truth, and weight of this evasion, which shall be done in the next Chapter.

(q) In his Defence of M. Hookers books art. 4. p. 31.

(r) *De unit. Eccles. c.* 28.

## An ANSWER to the SECOND CHAPTER.

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

AD §. 1. He that would usurp an absolute Lordship and tyranny over any people, need not put himself to the trouble and difficulty of abrogating and disanulling the Laws, made to maintain the common liberty; for he may frustrate their intent, and compass his own design as well, if he can get the power and authority to interpret them as he pleases, and add to them what he pleases, and to have his interpretations and additions stand for Laws; if he can rule his people by his Laws, and his Laws 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 ſolicitous care and induſtry, had been an impoſſible attempt:) But the more expedite way, and therefore more likely to be ſucceſsful, was, to gain the opinion and eſteem of the *publique and authoriz'd Interpreter* of them, and the Authority of adding to them what Doctrin ſhe pleaſed under the title of *Traditions* or *Definitions*. For by this means, ſhe might both ſerve her ſelf of all thoſe clauſes of Scripture, which might be drawn to caſt a favourable countenance upon her ambitious pretences, which in caſe the Scripture had been aboliſhed, ſhe could not have done; and yet be ſecure enough of having either her power limited, or her corruptions and abuſes reformed by them; this being once ſetled in the minds of men, that *unwritten doctrins, if propoſed by her, were to be received with equal reverence to thoſe that were written*; and that *the ſenſe of Scripture was not that which ſeemed to mens reaſon and underſtanding to be ſo, but that which the Church of* Rome *ſhould declare to be ſo, ſeemed it never ſo unreaſonable and incongruous*. The matter being once thus ordered, and the holy Scriptures being made in effect not your Directors and Judges (no farther than you pleaſe) but your *ſervants and inſtruments*, alwayes preſt and in readineſs to advance your deſigns, and diſabled wholly with minds to 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, and cry, *Hail King of the Jews!* to pretend a great deal of *eſteem, and reſpect, and reverence* to them, as here you do. But to little purpoſe is verbal 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 me Lord, Lord, and do not that which I command you?* Caſt away the vain and arrogant pretence of *infallibility*, which makes your errors incurable. Leave picturing God, and worſhipping him by pictures. *Teach not for Doctrin the commandments of men*. Debar not the Laity of the Teſtament of Chriſt's Blood. Let your publique Prayers, and Pſalms, and Hymns be in ſuch language as is for the edification of the Aſſiſtents. Take not from the Clergy that liberty of Marriage which Chriſt hath left them. Do not impoſe upon men that *Humility of worſhipping Angels* which S. *Paul* condemns. Teach no more proper ſacrifices of Chriſt but one. Acknowledg them *that die in Chriſt to be bleſſed, and to reſt from their labours*. Acknowledg the Sacrament after Conſecration, to be Bread and Wine, as well as Chriſts body and bloud. Acknowledg the gift of continency without Marriage, not to be given to all. Let not the weapons of your warfare be carnal, ſuch as Maſſacres, Treaſons, Perſecutions, and, in a word, all means either violent or fraudulent: Theſe and other things, which the Scripture commands you, do, and then we ſhall willingly give you ſuch Teſtimony as you deſerve; but till you do 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 poſſeſs the Scripture from you, or take it upon the integrity of your cuſtody*; but upon *Univerſal 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 far 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 clear as the ſun, if it any way made againſt you, you might keep them entire, without any thought or care to conform your doctrin to them, or reform 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 Doctrin, at leaſt in their judgement, who were prepoſſeſſed with this perſwaſion, that *your Church was to judge of the ſenſe of Scripture, not to be judged by it*.

3. For



3. For, whereas you ſay, *No cauſe imaginable could avert your will, for giving the function of ſupreme and ſole Judge to holy writ; but that the thing is impoſſible, and that by this means controverſies are increaſed 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 vailed 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 do 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 means you would fall into, of loſing 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 with wrought upon *Demetrius* and the *Craftsmen*, may have with you alſo the more effectual, 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 tryal of your Religion by Scripture, and making them yield up and captivate their judgment 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 ſelf, but of all of your Side, whoſe hearts you cannot know; and profeſs 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 men to judge them by* (for we mean nothing elſe) you only affirm it without proof, as if the thing were evident of it ſelf, and therefore I, conceiving the contrary to be evident, might well content my ſelf to deny it without refutation. Yet I cannot but deſire you to tell me, If Scripture cannot be the Judge of any Controverſie, 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 ſelf is the ſubject of the Queſtion, which cannot be determined but by natural 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 do 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 words we have direct *Boyes-play*; a thing given with one hand, and taken away with the other; an acknowledgment 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 we deny that it excludes unwritten Tradition*. As if you ſhould have ſaid, We acknowledg 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 acknowledgment, 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 self 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 kind, 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 farr 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 Sun, 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 add 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 she 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 do 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 do or not do, no man can, without Blasphemy, deny, that *Christ Jesus*, if he had pleased, could have writ us a Rule of Faith so plain and perfect, as that it should have wanted neither any part to make up its integrity, nor any cleerness 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 answer: 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 owne saying so, for nothing is proved true by being said or written in a book, but only by Tradition which is a thing credible of it self: yet it may be so in it self, and contain all the material objects, all the particular articles of our Faith, without any dependance upon Tradition; even this also not excepted, that *this writing doth contain the rule of Faith*. Now when Protestants affirm 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 proved 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



ture to them which presuppose it Divine, and a Rule of Faith, as Papists and Protestants do, contains all the material objects of Faith, is a compleat and total, and not onely an imperfect and a partial 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 books of Scripture Therefore the perfection of the whole Scripture excludes not the Addition of unwritten Tradition.* I answer; Every Text of Scripture though it hath the perfection belonging to a Text of Scripture, yet it hath not the perfection requisite to a *perfect Rule of 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 books of Scripture were written, they did not exclude unwritten Tradition: Therefore now also, that all the books 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 Scripture's 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 fain confound them. For Scripture might very well be all true, though it contain not all necessary Divine Truth. But unlesse it do so, it cannot be a *perfect Rule of Faith*; for that which wants any thing is not perfect. For, I hope, you do not imagine, that we conceive any antipathy between God's 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 Gospel of Christ, the whole Covenant between God and man, is now written. Whereas, if he had pleased, 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 sayes, It were any injury to the written Word to be joyned with the unwritten, if there were any wherewith it might be joyned: 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 faithful keeper as you pretend. The Scripture it self 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 several parts of your Church, all of them, until the last Age, were so esteemed. The interpretations of obscure places of Scripture, which without Question the Apostles taught the Primitive Christians, are wholly lost; there remains no certainty scarce of any one. These *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 not, as that which S. *Paul* glanceth at in his *second Epistle to the Thessal.* of the *cause of the hinderence of the coming of Antichrist*, are wholly lost and extinguished. So unfaithful or negligent hath been this Keeper of Divine Verities; whose eyes, like the Keepers of *Israel* (you say) have *never slumbred nor slept*. Lastly, we deny not but a Judge and a Law might well stand together, but we deny that there is any such Judge of Gods appointment.

Had

Had he intended any ſuch Judge, he would have named him, leſt otherwiſe (as now it is) our *Judge of Controverſies* ſhould be our greateſt Controverſie.

11. *Ad §. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6.* In your ſecond Paragraph, you ſum up thoſe Arguments wherewith you intend to prove that *Scripture alone cannot be Judge in Controverſies.* Wherein I proteſt 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 *Judge of Controverſie*; and you, in ſaying here, That Scripture *alone* cannot be Judge, imply that it may be called in ſome ſenſe a Judge, though not alone: Yet, to ſpeak properly (as men ſhould ſpeak when they write of Controverſies in Religion) the Scripture is not a Judge of Controverſies, but *a Rule only, and the only Rule for Chriſtians to judge them by.* Every man is to judge for himſelf with the *Judgment 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 choice, if he be a natural 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, than evidence of Truth hath made you confeſs in plain terms in the beginning 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 *Judging*, we might let paſs as impertinent to the Concluſion which we maintain, and you have already granted; yet out of courteſie we will conſider them.

12. Your firſt is this; *A Judge muſt be a perſon fit to end Controverſies; but the Scripture is not a perſon, nor fit to end Controverſies, no more than the Law would be without the Judges; therefore though it may be a Rule, it cannot be a Judge.* 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 go a journey, and had a guide which could not err, 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 Judge it will be no fitter* (you ſay) *to end Controverſies, than the Law alone to end ſuits.* I anſwer, If the Law were plain and perfect, and men honeſt and deſirous to underſtand a right, and obey it, he that ſays 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 and perfect*; and men, we ſay, are obliged under pain of Damnation, to ſeek the true ſenſe of it, and not to wreſt it to their preconceived Fancies. 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.

13. Your next encounter is with them, who acknowledging the Scripture a Rule only and not a Judge, 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, than the Scripture in which he ſpeaks.* But by this reaſon, neither the Pope, nor a Councel can be a Judge 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 do againſt Scripture. And then what you object againſt



againſt the holy Ghoſt, ſpeaking in Scripture, to exclude him from this office, The ſame I return upon them and their Decrees, to debar them from it; that they ſpeaking unto us only in their Decrees, are no more intelligible than 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 Pope's Decrees* (you will ſay) *be obſcure, he can explain himſelf; and ſo the Scripture cannot.* But the holy Ghoſt, that ſpeaks in Scripture, can do ſo, if he pleaſe; and, when he is pleaſed, will do ſo. In the mean time, it will be fit for you to wait his leiſure, and to be content, that thoſe things of Scripture which are plain ſhould be ſo, and thoſe which are obſcure ſhould remain obſcure, until he pleaſe to declare them. Beſides, he can (which you cannot warrant me of the Pope or a Councel) ſpeak at firſt ſo plainly, that his words ſhall need no farther explanation; and ſo in things neceſſary we believe he hath done. And if you ſay, *The Decrees of Councels touching Controverſies, though they be not the Judge, yet they are the Judge's ſentence*: So, I ſay, the Scripture, though not the Judge, is the ſentence of the Judge. When therefore you conclude, *That, to ſay a Judge 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 ſpeaks in Scripture*: This, I grant, is true; but I may not grant that a Judge (ſuch an one as we diſpute of) is neceſſary either to do 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, than to have a Judge to interpret the meaning of a Councel's Decrees, and others to interpret their Interpretations, and others to interpret theirs, and ſo on for ever? And where they are not plain, there if we, uſing diligence to find the Truth, do yet miſs of it and fall into Errour, there is no danger in it. They that err, and they that do not err, may both be ſaved. So that thoſe places, which contain things neceſſary, and wherein Errour were dangerous, need no infallible interpreter, becauſe they are plain: 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 than the Law it ſelf*; 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 Judges to determine Civil and Criminal Controverſies, and to give every man that juſtice which the Law allows him.* But your Argument drawn from hence to ſhew a neceſſity of a Viſible Judge in Controverſies of Religion, I ſay, is Sophiſtical: and that for many Reaſons.

14. Firſt, Becauſe the variety of Civil caſes is infinite, and therefore there cannot be poſſibly Laws enough provided for the determination of them: and therefore there muſt be a Judge to ſupply out of the Principles of Reaſon the interpretation of the Law where it is defective. 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 rigor, would be many times unjuſt, and therefore there is need of a Judge to moderate it; whereof in Religion there is no uſe at all.

16. Thirdly, In Civil and Criminal Cauſes the parties have for the moſt part ſo much intereſt, and very often ſo little honeſty, that they will not ſubmit to a Law though never ſo plain, if it be 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 plain and extended to all caſes, there would be little need of Judges. Now in matters of Religion, when the Queſtion is, Whether every man be a fit Judge and chooſer for himſelf; we ſuppoſe men honeſt, and ſuch as underſtand the difference between a Moment and Eternity. And ſuch men we conceive, will think it highly concerns them to be of the true Religion, but nothing at all that this or that Religion ſhould be the true. And then we ſuppoſe that all

the

the neceſſary points of Religion are plain and eaſie, and conſequently every man in this cauſe to be a competent Judge for himſelf; becauſe it concerns himſelf to judge right as much as eternal happineſs is worth. And if, through his own default he judge amiſs, he alone ſhall ſuffer for it.

17. Fourthly, In Civil Controverſies we are obliged only to external paſſive obedience, and not to an internal and active. We are bound to obey the ſentence of the Judge, or not to reſiſt it, but not always to believe it juſt. But, in matters of Religion, ſuch a Judge is required whom we ſhould be obliged to believe, to have judged right. So that in Civil Controverſies every honeſt underſtanding man is fit to be a Judge; But in Religion none but he that is infallible.

18. Fifthly, In Civil Cauſes there is means and power, when the Judge hath 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 Laws and Judges both. But all the power in the world is neither fit to convince, nor able to compell a man's conſcience to conſent to any thing. Worldly terrour may prevail ſo far as to make men profeſs a Religion which they believe not, (ſuch men I mean, who know not that there is a Heaven provided for Martyrs, and a Hell for thoſe that diſſemble ſuch Truths as are neceſſary to be profeſſed): But to force, either any man to believe what he believes not, or any honeſt man to diſſemble what he does believe (if God commands him to profeſs it,) or to profeſs what he does not believe, all the Powers in the World are too weak, with all the Powers of Hell to aſſiſt them.

19. Sixthly, In Civil Controverſies the caſe cannot be ſo put, but there may be a Judge to end it, who is not a party: In Controverſies of Religion, it is in a manner impoſſible to be avoided, but the Judge muſt be a party. For this muſt be the firſt, Whether he be a Judge or no, and in that he muſt be a party. Sure I am, the Pope, in the Controverſies of our time, is a chief party; for it highly concerns him, even as much as his Popedom is worth, not to yeild any one point of his Religion to be erroneous. And he is a man ſubject to like paſſions with other men. And therefore we may juſtly decline his ſentence, for fear temporal reſpects ſhould either blind his judgement, or make him pronounce againſt it.

20. Seventhly, In Civil Controverſies, it is impoſſible *Titius* ſhould hold the land in queſtion and *Sempronius* too: and therefore either the Plaintiff muſt injure the Defandant by diſquieting his poſſeſſion, or the Defendant wrong the Plaintiff by keeping his right from him. But in Controverſies of Religion, the Caſe is otherwiſe. I may hold my opinion and do you no wrong, and you yours and do me none. Nay, we may both of us hold our opinion, and yet do our ſelves no harm; provided, the difference be not touching any thing neceſſary to ſalvation, and that we love truth ſo well, as to be diligent to inform our Conſcience, and conſtant in following it.

21. Eighthly, For the deciding of Civil Controverſies, men may appoint themſelves a Judge. But, in matters of Religion, this office may be given to none but whom God hath deſigned for it: who doth not alwayes give us thoſe things which we conceive moſt expedient for our ſelves.

22. Ninthly, and laſtly, For the ending of Civil Controverſies, Who does not ſee, it is abſolutely neceſſary, that not only Judges ſhould be appointed, but that it ſhould be known and unqueſtioned who they are? Thus all the Judges of our Land are known men, known to be Judges, and no man can doubt or queſtion, but theſe are the Men. Otherwiſe, if it were a diſputable thing, Who were theſe Judges, and they had no certain warrant for their Authority, but only ſome Topical congruities; Would not any man ſay, ſuch Judges, in all likelihood, would rather multiply Controverſies than end them? So likewiſe, if our Saviour, the King of Heaven, had intended that all Controverſies in Religion ſhould be by ſome viſible Judge finally determined, Who can doubt, but in plain terms he would have expreſſed himſelf about this matter? He would have ſaid plainly, *The*



*Biſhop of Rome I have appointed to decide all emergent Controverſies.* For that our Saviour deſigned the *Biſhop of Rome* to this Office, and 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 leave it to be drawn out of uncertain Principles, by thirteen or fourteen more uncertain Conſequences, He that can believe it, let him.

23. All theſe Reaſons, I hope, will convince you, that though we have, and have great neceſſity of, Judges in Civil and Criminal Cauſes: yet you may not conclude from thence, that there is any publique authorized Judge to determine Controverſies in Religion, nor any neceſſity there ſhould be any.

24. *But the Scripture ſtands in need of ſome watchful and unerring eye to guard it, by means of whoſe aſſured Vigilancy, we may undoubtedly receive it ſincere and pure.* Very true, but this is no other than the watchfull eye of Divine Providence: the goodneſs whereof will never ſuffer, that the Scripture ſhould be depraved, and corrupted, but that in them ſhould be always extant a conſpicuous and plain way to eternal happineſs. Neither can any thing be more palpably unconſiſtent with his goodneſs, than to ſuffer Scripture to be undiſcernably corrupted in any matter of moment, and yet to exact of men the Belief of thoſe verities, which, without their fault, or knowledge, or poſſibility of prevention, were defaced out of them. So that God requiring of men to believe Scripture in its purity, ingages himſelf to ſee it preſerved in ſufficient purity; and you need not fear but he will ſatisfie his engagement. You ſay, *We can have no aſſurance of this, but your Churches Vigilancy.* But if we had no other, we were in a hard caſe; for, Who could then aſſure us that your Church hath 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 raiſed *Office of Aſſurance* give us, that that Reading is true which you now receive, and that falſe which you reject? Certainly, they that anciently received and made uſe of thoſe divers Copies, were not all guarded by the Churches Vigilancy from having their Scripture altered from the purity of the Original in many places. For of different Readings, it is not in nature impoſſible that all ſhould be falſe, but more than 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 means have we to be aſcertained of it? Firſt, the thing is not evident of it ſelf; which is evident, becauſe many do not believe it. Neither can any thing be pretended to give evidence to it, but only ſome places of Scripture; of whoſe incorruption more than 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 Churche's Vigilancy, and the Churche's Vigilancy by the incorruption of ſome places of Scripture, and again the incorruption of thoſe places by the Churche's Vigilancy. If you name any other means; then, that means which ſecures me of the Scripture's incorruption in thoſe places, will alſo ſerve 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 be blocked up, or made inviſible, I know no other means (I mean, no other natural and rational means) to be aſſured hereof, than I have that any other Book is uncorrupted. For, though I have a greater degree of rational and humane Aſſurance of that than this, in regard of divers conſiderations which make it more credible, *That the Scripture hath been preſerved from any material alteration*; yet my Aſſurance of both is of the ſame kind and condition; both Moral Aſſurances, and neither Phyſical or Mathematical.

25. To the next Argument the Reply is obvious; *That though we do not believe the Books of Scripture to be Canonical, becauſe they ſay ſo,* (For other Books that are not Canonical 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

Credibilty of *Universal Tradition*, which is a thing *Credible of it self*, and therefore fit to be rested on; whereas the Authority of your Church is not so. And therefore your rest thereon is not Rational 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 means I only know I might err, but by relying on you I know I should err. But yet (to return you one Supposse for another) suppose I should for this and all other things submit to her direction, How could she assure me that I should not be misled 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 deceive 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 can it prove it self to be infallibly true? Neither can there be an end of the like multiplied Demands, till we rest in something evident of it self 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 sum and substance of the Ten next Paragraphs, is this, *That it appears, by the Confession 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 be 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 affirmed to be the Rule by which all Controversies of Religion are to be decided, Those are to be excepted out of this generality, which are concerning the Scripture it self. For, as that general saying of Scripture, *He hath put all things under his feet*, is most true, though yet S *Paul* tell 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 do, and must, except from this generality, those which are *touching the Scripture it self*. Just 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 self. 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 self. 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 infer from hence, that either you made him no part of the whole, or else made him head of himself. 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 self, and I grant it without more ado. 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 meer 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 himself. 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 do with this matter. For first, the Question *whether such or such a Book be Canonical Scripture*, though it may be decided negatively out of Scripture, by shewing



shewing aparent and irreconcileable contradictions between it and some other Book confessedly Canonical; yet affirmatively it cannot but only by the testimonies of the Ancient Churches: any Book being to be received as undoubtedly Canonical, or to be doubted of as Uncertain, or rejected as Apocryphal, 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 means to satisfie themselves in it, as in the Questions which happen about the translation of any other Author; that is, skill in the Language of the Original, 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 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 real 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 Guids 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 than the best we have.

28. You will say, *Dependance on your Churches infallibility is a better.* I answer, it would be so, if we could be infallibly certain, that your Church is infallible, that is, if it were either evident of it self, and seen by its own light, or could be reduced unto, and setled upon, some Principle that is so. But seeing you your selves do not so much as pretend to enforce us to the belief hereof, by any proofs infallible and convincing; but only to induce us to it, by such as are, by your confession, only probable and *prudential Motives*; certainly it will be to very little purpose, to put off your uncertainty for the first turn, 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 confess, that this very Rock stands it self at the best but upon 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 real Prescription of this Priviledge, but only pleaseth her self with a false imagination and vain 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 determined by the Authority of some present Church*, is irrational, and inconsequent; I might well forbear to tire my self with an exact and punctual examination of your premises *quoad modos*, which whether they be true or false, is to the Question disputed wholly impertinent. Yet because you shall not complain of tergiversation, I will run over them, and let nothing, that is material and considerable, pass without some stricture or animadversion.

30. You pretend that M. *Hooker* acknowledgeth, that, *That whereon we must rest our assurance that the Scripture is God's Word, is the Church*: and for this acknowledgement you refer us to *l.* 3. §. 8. Let the Reader consult the place, and he shall find 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 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 self is Divine and Sacred. The Question then being by what means we are taught this*: * Some answer, *That to learn it we have no other way than 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 esteem of the Scripture, is, the Authority of God's 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 mind 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 prevail, 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 self 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 relie upon the Scriptures, endeavoured still to maintain the Authority of the Boooks 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 kind of proofs, so to manifest and clear 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 proof of what I said in my Reply to your Preface, that M. *Breerelie's* great ostentation of exactness, 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, seems to be that particular Church wherein a man is bred and brought up; and the Authority of this he makes an Argument which prefers a man's mode by more than his reason. And in saying, It seems impudent to be of a contrary mind, without cause, he implies; 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 intrinsecal Arguments afford it. (d) Somewhat, but not much, until it be backed and inforced by farther reason: it self therefore is not the fartherest reason and the last resolution. (e) Observe, I pray; Our perswasion, and the testimony of the Church concerning Scripture, may be proved true; Therefore neither of them was in his account the fartherest proof. (f) Natural reason then built on principles common to all men, is the last resolution; unto which the Churches Authority is but the first inducement.

31. But, *seeing the belief of Scripture is a necessary thing, and cannot be proved by Scripture, How can the Church of* England *teach, as she doth,* Art. 6. *That all things necessary are contained 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 material objects of our Faith; whereof the Scripture is none, but only the means of conveying them unto us: which we believe not finally, and for it self, but for the matter contained in it. So that, 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 aims at, is the belief of the Gospel, the Covenant between God and Man; the Scripture he hath provided as a means 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 final and ultimate Objects of it, and not the Means and instrumental Objects; and then



then there will be no repugnance between what they say, and that which *Hooker*, and D. *Covel*, 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.* James: Kemnitius, *and other Lutherans, the second of* Peter, *the second and third of* John. *The Epistle to the Hebrews, the Epistle of* James, *of* Jude, *and the Apocalyps. Therefore without the Authority of the Church, no certainty can be had what Scripture is Canonical.*

34. So also the *Ancient Fathers*, and not only Fathers, but *whole Churches*, differed about the certainty of the Authority of the very same Books: 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 Canonical, or had they not? If they had not, it seems there is no great harm or danger in not having such a certainty whether some Books be Canonical, 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 do understand those Books, of whose Authority was never any doubt in the Church*; you demand, *What they mean by them? Whether that, by the Churches consent they are assured what Scriptures be Canonical?* I answer for them, Yes, they are so. And whereas you infer from hence, *This is to make the Church Judge*: I have told you already, That, *of this Controversie we make the Church the Judge*; but not the present Church, much less the present Roman Church, but the consent and testimony of the *Ancient and Primitive Church*, Which, though it be but an highly probable inducement, and no demonstrative enforcement; yet me-thinks you should not deny but 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 *Prudential Motives*.

36. But, *by this Rule the whole Book of* Esther *must quit the Canon; because it was excluded by some in the Church*: by *Melito, Athanasius*, and *Gregory Nazianzen*. Then, for ought I know, he that should think 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 confess, that Saints in Heaven before him have done; *are you not partial, and a Judge of evil thoughts?*

37. *Luther's* censures of *Ecclesiastes, Job*, 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 fundamental Heresie. He that condemns him for saying, the Book of *Ecclesiastes is not full, That it hath many abrupt things*, condemns 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 Book of *Job* may be a true History, and yet, as many true stories are, and have 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 damn all for Hereticks, that say, Some Books of Scripture were written casually.) Neither is there any reason they should the sooner be called in question for being written by their Disciples, seeing being so written, they had attestation from themselves. Was the Prophesie of *Jeremy* the less Canonical, for being written by *Baruch*? Or, Because S. *Peter* the Master, dictated the Gospel and S. *Mark* the Scholler writ it, is it the more likely to be called in Question?

38. But leaving *Luther*, you return to our English Canon of Scripture; And tell

tell us, That, *in the New Teſtament, by the above-mentioned Rule (of whoſe Authority was never doubt in the Church) divers Books muſt be diſ-canonized.* Not ſo. For I may believe even thoſe queſtioned Books to have been written by the Apoſtles, and to be Canonical: 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 damn any man that ſhall doubt of them or deny them now: having the example of Saints in Heaven, either to juſtifie, or excuſe ſuch their doubting or denial.

39. You obſerve in the next place, That *our ſixth Article, ſpecifying by name all the Books of the Old Teſtament, ſhuffles over thoſe of the New with this generality —— All the Books of the New Teſtament, as they are commonly received, we do receive, and account them Canonical*: And in this you fancy to your ſelf *a myſterie 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 maly penſe.* For all the Bibles, which ſince the compoſing of the Articles have been uſed and allowed by the *Church of England*, do teſtifie and even proclaim to the World, that by *Commonly received*, they meant, *received by the Church of* Rome, *and other Churches before the Reformation.* I pray, take the pains to look in them, and there you ſhall find the Books, which the Church of *England* counts Apocryphal, marked out, and ſevered from the reſt, with this Title in the beginning, *The Books 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 Books only ſhe eſteems *Apocryphal*, I hope you will not put her to the trouble of telling you, that the reſt are in her judgment *Canonical.*

40. *But, if by* Commonly-received, *She meant, by the Church of* Rome; *then by the ſame reaſon, muſt ſhe receive divers Books of the Old Teſtament which ſhe rejects.*

41. Certainly, a very good conſequence. The Church of *England* receives the Books of the New Teſtament, which the Church of *Rome* receives; Therefore ſhe muſt receive the Books of the Old Teſtament which ſhe receives. As if you ſhould ſay, If you will do 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 do ſo, when we have no reaſon.

42. The Diſcourſe following, is but a vain Declamation. No man thinks that this Controverſie is to be tried by moſt Voices, but by the Judgement 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 Books that were never doubted of; *and in the latter ſay*, We receive all the Books of the New Teſtament, as they are commonly received, *whereas of them many were doubted?* I anſwer, 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 univerſal, yet, at leaſt, ſufficient to make conſidering men receive them for Canonical. 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 prevail 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 do 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 trained up in Schools of ſubtilty, and cannot you ſee a great difference between theſe two, We receive the Books 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



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 Books of the New Teſtament we receive for Canonical, as they are received by the Church of *England.*

45. You demand, *Upon what infallible ground we agree with* Luther *againſt you in ſome, and with you againſt* Luther *in others?* And I alſo demand, Upon what infallible ground you hold your Canon, and agree neither with us, nor *Luther?* For ſure your differing from us both, is of it ſelfe no more apparently reaſonable, than our agreeing with you in part, and in part with *Luther.* If you ſay, Your Churches infallibility is your ground: I demand again ſome infallible ground, both for the Churches infallibility, and for this, that *Yours is the Church*; and ſhall never ceaſe multiplying demands upon demands, until you ſettle me upon a Rock; I mean, give ſuch an Anſwer, whoſe Truth is ſo evident, that it needs no further evidence. If you ſay, *This is Univerſal Tradition*: I reply, your Churches infallibility is not built upon it, and that the Canon of Scripture, as we receive it, is. For we do not profeſs our ſelves ſo abſolutely, and undoubtedly certain neither do we urge others to be ſo, of thoſe Books, which have been doubted, as of thoſe that never have.

46. The Concluſion of your Tenth ſ is, That *the Divinity of a writing cannot be known from it ſelf alone, but by ſome extrinſecal Authority*; Which you need not prove, for no wiſe man denies it. But then, this Authority is that of *Univerſal Tradition*, not of Your Church. For to me it is altogether as αὐτόπιστον, that the Goſpel of S. *Mathew* is the Word of God as that all which your Church ſayes, 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; and that among other inducements and enforcements hereunto, internal arguments have 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 goodneſs, as the Miracles by which it was confirmed, were great, I ſhould want one main Pillar of my faith: and for want of it, I fear, ſhould be much ſtagger'd in it. Now this and nothing elſe, did the *Doctor* mean in ſaying, *The Believer ſees, by that glorious Beam of Divine light which ſhines in Scripture, and by many internal Arguments, that the Scripture, is of Divine Authority. By this* (ſaith he) *he ſees it*, that is, he is moved to, and ſtrengthened 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 quarrel 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 Paragragh, I am as willing it ſhould be true, as you are to have it: and ſo let it paſſe, as a diſcourſe wherein we are wholly unconcerned. You might have met with an Anſwerer, that would not have ſuffered you to have 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 corporal light, is *by it ſelf alone* able to determine and move our underſtanding to aſſent: yet notwithſtanding this ſuppoſal, *Faith ſtill* (you ſay) *muſt go before Scripture, becauſe as the light is viſible only to thoſe that have eyes: ſo the Scripture, only to thoſe that have the Eye of Faith.* But to my underſtanding, if Scripture do move and determine our Underſtanding to aſſent, then the Scripture, and its moving, muſt be before this aſſent, as the cauſe muſt be before its own effect; now this very aſſent is nothing elſe but Faith, and Faith nothing elſe than the Underſtanding's aſſent. And therefore (upon this ſuppoſal) 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 preſuppoſed before the aſſent of Faith, unto which it moves and determines, and conſequently if this ſuppoſi-

tion

tion of yours were true, there ſhould need no other means precedent to Scripture to beget Faith, Scripture it ſelf being able (as here you ſuppoſe) to determine and move the Vnderſtanding 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 conceive 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 ſoul, that is, the Underſtanding, 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 preſuppoſeth the Eye which it determines, as every Action doth the object on which it is imployed, yet it ſelf 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, moves the Underſtanding to aſſent, the Underſtanding (that is the eye and object on which it workes) muſt be before this influence upon it; But the Aſſent, that is, the belief whereto the Scripture moves and the Underſtanding is moved, which anſwers to the act of ſeeing, muſt come after. For if it did aſſent already, To what purpoſe ſhould the Scripture do that which was done before? Nay indeed, How were it poſſible it ſhould be ſo, any more than a Father can beget a Son that he hath already? Or an Architect build a houſe that is built already? Or that this very world can be made again before it be unmade? Tranſubſtantiation indeed is fruitful of ſuch Monſters. But they that have not ſworn themſelves to the defence of Error, will eaſily perceive, that *jam factum facere*, and *factum infectum facere*, are equally impoſſible. But I digreſs.

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 means precedent to Scripture to beget faith, this can be no other than the Church.* By the Church, we know you do, and muſt underſtand the *Roman Church*: ſo that in effect you ſay, no man can have faith, but he muſt be moved 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 and believe the Goſpel, becauſe they aſſent to the truth of it, and would willingly die 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 to make us believe, that we do not believe, what we know we do? 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? Again, what more ridiculous, and againſt-ſenſe and experience, than to affirm, That there are not millions amongſt you and us that believe, upon no other reaſon than their education, and the authority of their Parents and Teachers, and the opinion they have of them? The tenderneſs of the ſubject, and aptneſs to receive impreſſions, ſupplying the defect and imperfection of the Agent. And will you proſcribe from heaven all thoſe believers of your own Creed, who do indeed lay the foundation of their Faith (for I cannot call it by any other name) no deeper than upon the authority of their Father, or Maſter, or Pariſh-Prieſt? Certainly, if theſe have no true faith, your Church is very full of Infidels. Suppoſe *Xaverius* by the holineſs of his life had converted ſome Indians to Chriſtianity, who could (for ſo I will ſuppoſe) have 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*: Do theſe remain as very Pagans after their converſion, as they were before? Are they brought to aſſent in their ſouls, and obey in their lives the Goſpel 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 motive to believe be not in reaſon ſufficient? Do



Do they therefore not believe what they do believe, becauſe they do it upon inſufficient motives? They chooſe the Faith imprudently perhaps, but yet they do chooſe it. Unleſs you will have us believe, that that which is done, is not done, becauſe it is not done upon 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 hath no ends upon me, joyn'd with the goodneſs of the Chriſtian faith, might not be a far greater and more rational motive to me to imbrace Chriſtianity, than any I can have to continue in Paganiſm. And therefore, for ſhame, if not for love of Truth, you muſt recant this fancy when you write again: and ſuffer true faith to be many times, where your Churches infallibility hath no hand in the begetting of it. And be content to tell us hereafter, that we believe not enough, and not go about to perſwade us we believe nothing, for fear 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 ſophiſms you may haply bring us, to make us believe, we believe nothing: but wiſe men know that Reaſon againſt Experience is alwaies Sophiſtical. And therefore as he that could not anſwer *Zeno's* ſubtilties againſt the exiſtence of Motion, could yet confute them by doing that, which he pretended could not be done: So, if you ſhould give me a hundred Arguments to perſwade me, becauſe I do not believe Tranſubſtantiation, I do not believe in God, and the *Knots* of them I could not unty, yet I ſhould cut them in pieces with doing that, and knowing that I do ſo, which you pretend I cannot do.

50. In the thirteenth Diviſion, we have again much ado about nothing. A great deal of ſtir you keep in confuting ſome, *that pretend to know Canonical Scripture to be ſuch, by the Titles of the Books.* But theſe men you do 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 Fools hoſpital is a large place.

51. In the fourteenth §. we have very artificial jugling. D. *Potter* had ſaid, *That the Scripture* (he deſires to be underſtood of thoſe books wherein all Chriſtians agree) *is a principle, and needs not be proved among Chriſtians.* His reaſon was, becauſe, *that needs no farther proof which is believed already.* Now by this (you ſay) he means 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, he means, That it is not the moſt known in Chriſtianity, and then it may be proved. Where we ſee plainly, That two moſt different things, *Moſt known in all Sciences*, and, *Moſt known in Chriſtianity*, are captiouſly confounded. As if the Scripture might not be the firſt and moſt known Principle in Chriſtianity, and yet not the moſt known 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 ſelves are of this a ſufficient Teſtimony; for urging againſt us many texts of Scripture, you offer no proof of the truth of them, preſuming we will not queſtion it. Yet this is not to deny, that Tradition is a Principle more known than 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 affirm, that one part of Scripture may be known to be Canonical, and may be interpreted by another.* Where the former device is again put in practice. For to be known to be *Canonical*, and to be *interpreted*, is not all one. That Scripture may be interpreted by Scripture, that Proteſtants grant, and Papiſts do not

deny; neither dos 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 prove another part Canonical, and need no proof of its own being so; for that, you have produced divers Protestants that deny it; but who they are that affirm it, *nondum constat.*

53. It is superfluous for you to prove *out of S.* Athanasius, and *S.* Austine, *that we must receive the sacred Canon, upon the credit of Gods Church.* Understanding by Church, as here you explain your self, *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, which involves 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 himself, cometh to be confirmed by all those Miracles, and other Arguments, whereby they convinced their doctrine to be true.* Thus you. Now prove the Canon of Scripture which you receive by such Tradition, and we will allow it. Prove your whole doctrin, or the infallibility of your Church by such Tradition, and we will yield to you in all things. Take the alleaged places of S. *Athanasius*, and S. *Austin*, in this sense, (which is your own,) and they will not press us any thing at all. We will say, with *Athanasius, That only four Gospels are to be received, because the Canons of the Holy and Catholique Church* (understand of *all Ages* since the perfection of the Canon) *have so determined.*

54. We will subscribe to S. *Austin*, and say, That *we also would not believe the Gospel, unless the Authority of the Catholique Church did move us*, (meaning by the Church, *the Church of all Ages*, and that succession of Christians which takes in *Christ himself* and his *Apostles.*) Neither would *Zwinglius* have needed to cry out upon this saying, had he conceived as you now do, that by the Catholique Church, the Church of all Ages, since Christ, was to be understood. As for the Councel of *Carthage*, it may speak not of such Books only, as were certainly Canonical, and for the regulating of Faith; but also of those which were only profitable, and lawful to be read in the Church. Which in *England* is a very slender Argument that the book is Canonical, where every body knows that Apocryphal books are read as well as Canonical. But howsoever, if you understand by Fathers, not only their immediate Fathers and Predecessors in the Gospel but the succession of them from the Apostles; they are right in the Thesis, that *whatsoever is received frrm these Fathers, as Canonical, is to be so esteemed*; Though in the application of it, to this or that particular book they may haply err, and think that book received as Canonical, 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.

55. *But we cannot be certain, in what language the Scriptures remain uncorrupted.* Not so certain, I grant, as of that which we can demonstrate: But certain enough, morally certain, as certain as the nature of the thing will bear: 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 Baptism, against the Donatists, c.* 3. plainly implies, *the Scripture might possibly be corrupted.* He means, sure, in matters of little moment, such as concern 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 preservative of the Scriptures integrity, was the translating into so many Languages, and the general and perpetual use and reading of it in the Church: for want whereof the works of particular Doctors were more exposed to danger in this kind*; but the Canonical Scripture being by this means guarded with universal care and diligence, was not obnoxious to such attempts. And this assurance

(a) *Neque enim sic potuit integritas atque notitia literarum quamlibet illustris Episcopi, custodiri, quemadmodum Scriptura Canonica tot linguarum literis & ordine & successione celebrationis Ecclesiasticæ custodiuntur; contra quam non defuerunt tamen, qui sub nominibus Apostolorum multa confingerent. Frustra quidem; quia illa sic commendata, sic celebrata, sic nota est. Verum quid possit adversus literas non Canonica authoritate fundatas etiam hinc demonstrabit impiæ conatus audacis, quod & adversus eos quæ tanta notitia mole firmata sunt, si se erigere non prætermisit.* Aug. ep. 48. ad Vincent. cont. Donat. & Rogat.



assurance of the Scriptures incorruption, is common to us with him, we therefore are as certain hereof as S. *Austin* was, and that, I hope, was certain enough. Yet if this dos 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 firm and certain to be relied upon, than the Faith of Ancient Books.* Now this ground we have 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, quàm antiquorum probatorum codicum Latinorum fidem, &c. sic* Sixtus in Præf.

56. This is not all I have to say in this matter. For I will add moreover, that we are as certain in what Language the Scripture is uncorrupted, as any man in your Church was, until *Clement* the eighth set forth your own approved *Edition of your Vulgar* Translation. For you do not, nor cannot, without extream impudence, deny, that until 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 than one sort of them, could not possibly be true in all things. Neither were it less impudence to pretend, that any man in your Church, could until *Clement*'s time have any certainty what that one true Copie and Reading was, (if there were one perfectly true.) Some indeed that had got *Sixtus his Bible*, might, after the Edition of that, very likely think themselves cock-sure of a perfect, true, uncorrupted Translation, without being beholding to *Clement*; but how foully they were abused and deceived that thought so, the Edition of *Clements*, differing from that of *Sixtus* in a great multitude of places, doth sufficiently demonstrate.

57. This certainty therefore, in what language the Scripture remains uncorrupted, is it necessary to have it, or is it not? If it be not, I hope we may do well enough without it. If it be necessary, What became of your Church for 1500 years together? All which time, you must confess 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 grown to a higher degree of Presumption in this Point, yet are you as far as ever, from any true, real, and rational assurance of the absolute purity of your Authentique Translation: which I suppose my self to have proved unanswerably in divers places.

58. In the *sixteenth Division*, It is objected to Protestants in a long discourse transcribed out of the *Protestant's Apology*, That *their Translations of the Scripture are very different, and by each other mutually condemned.* Luther's *Translation* by *Zwinglius*, and *others*: That *of the* Zwinglians, *by* Luther. *The Translation of* Oecolampadius, *by the Divines of* Basil: *that of* Castalio, *by* Beza: *That of* Beza, *by* Castalio. *That of* Calvin, *by* Carolus Molinæus. *That of* Geneva, *by* M. Parks, *and King* James. *And lastly, One of our Traslations by the Puritans.*

59. All which might have been as justly objected against that great variety of Translations extant in the Primitive Church, and 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 have translated the Scriptures out of the Hebrew into Greek, may be numbred; but the Latin Interpreters are innumerable. For, whensoever any one, in the first times of Christianity, met with a Greek Bible, and seemed to himself to have some ability in both Languages, he presently ventured 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 learn from the same S. *Austin in Chap.* 15. *of the same Book. Amongst all these interpretations* (saith he) *let the Italian be preferred: for it keeps closer to the Letter, and is perspicuous in the sense.* Yet so far was the Church of that time from presuming upon the absolute purity and perfection, even of this best Translation, that S. *Hierom* thought it necessary to make a new Translation, of the Old Testament, out of the Hebrew

Fountain, (which himself testifies in his Book *de Viris illustribus*); and to correct the Vulgar version of the New Testament, according to the truth of the Original 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 and performed at the request of *Damasus*, Bishop of *Rome*. *You constrain me* (saith he) *to make a new work of an old: that, after the Copies of the Scriptures have been dispersed through the whole World, I should sit, as it were, an Arbitrator amongst them, and, because they vary among themselves, should determine what are those things (in them) which consent with the Greek verity.* And after: *Therefore this present Preface promises the four Gospels only, corrected by collation with Greek Copies. But, that they might not be very dissonant from the custom of the Latin reading, I have so tempered with my stile, the Translation of the Ancients, that, those things amended which did seem to change the sense, other things I have suffered to remain as they were.* So that in this matter Protestants must either stand or fall with the Primitive Church.

60. *The Corruption that you charge* Luther *with, and the falsification that you impute to* Zwinglius, What have we to do 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*, have 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 observe the use of these phrases of speech in our ordinary talk, and perhaps you will begin to doubt whether you had sufficient ground for this invective. And then for *Zwinglius*, if it be true (as they say it is) that the language our Saviour spake in, had no such word as *To signifie*, but used always, *to be*, in stead of it, as it is certain the Scripture does in an 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 err because they are Men, and certainly do err, at least some of them, because their Translations are contrary. It seems then the Faith, and consequently the Salvation of Protestants, relies upon fallible and uncertain grounds.*

63. This Objection, though it may seem to do you great service for the present; yet I fear, 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 ways, 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 himself, much less any other can have any possible certainty: for it depends upon a great many contingent and uncertain suppofals. 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 form of words, (which he cannot know, unless he were both present and attentive.) Thirdly, he must know that he was baptized with due Intention, and that is, that the Minister of his Baptism was not a secret Jew, nor a Moor, not an Atheist, (of all which kinds, I fear, experience gives you just cause to fear, that *Italy* and *Spain* have Priests not a few) but a Christian in heart, as well as Profession; (otherwise, believeing the Sacrament to be nothing, in giving it he could intend to give 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



nity 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 again was neither Jew, nor Moor, nor Atheist, nor liable to any such exception, as is unconsistent with due Intention in giving the Sacrament of Orders.

66. Fifthly, he must undertake to know, that the Bishop, which made him Priest, was a Priest himself; for your Rule is, *Nihil dat quod non habet*: And consequently, that there was again none of the former nullities in his Baptism, which might make him incapable of Ordination; nor no invalidity in his Ordination, but a true Preist to ordain him again, the requisite matter, and form, 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 until he comes to the very fountain of priesthood. For, take any one in the whole train and succession of Ordainers, and suppose him, by reason of any defect, only a supposed and not a true Priest, then according to your Doctrine he could not give a true, but only a supposed Preisthood; and they that receive it of him, and again they that derive it from them, can give no better than they receive; 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, seeing equivocal Fathers beget only equivocal Sons; No Principle in Geometry being more certain than 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 qualifie 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 fail, not one should be wanting, this to me is extreamly improbable nay even cousin-german to Impossible. So that the assurance hereof is like a Machin 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 them together, and maturely consider all the possible ways 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 an 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 do) depend upon Priestly Absolution; and this again (as you do) 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 hortible 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 Angel 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 do you that good which he can do, whether he will pronounce the absolving words with intent to absolve you! For perhaps, he may bear you some secret malice, and project to himself 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

compacted with the Devil to give no Sacraments with Intention. Lastly, he may be (for ought you can possibly know) a secret Jew, or Moor, or Anti-Trinitarian, or perhaps such a one as is so far from intending your forgiveness of sins and salvation by this Sacrament, that in his heart he laughs at all these things, and thinks Sin nothing, and Salvation a word. All these doubts you must have clearly resolved (which can hardly be done but by another Revelation,) before you can upon good grounds assure your self, that your true Priest gives you true and effectual 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 damned: which is to make Salvation a matter of chance, and not of choice; and which a man may fail of, not only by an ill life, but by ill fortune. Verily, a most comfortable Doctrin for a considering man lying upon his death-bed, who, either feels or fears that his repentance is but attrition 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 sins is a true sorrow, and his purpose of amendment a true purpose; yet he may deceive himself, 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 knows, or, for ought himself knows, by reason of some secret undiscernable invalidity in his Baptism or Ordination, he may be none, and if he be none, he can do 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 dos not, all is in vain. Put case, a man by these considerations should be cast into some agonies; what advice, 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 ask you, Why he might not know his sorrow to be a true sorrow, as well as his desire to be sorrowful, to be a true desire; I believe you would be put to silence. Then secondly, to quiet his fears, concerning the Priest and his Intention you should tell him, by my advice, that God's goodness (which will not suffer him to damn men for not doing better than 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 himself 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 Doctrins established by your Church; and besides, to degrade your Priesthood from a great part of their honour, by lessening the strict necessity of the Laitie's 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's power to damn whom he will in his Parish, because, by this rule, God should supply the defect which his malice had caused. And besides, it were to say, that, *Infants dying without Baptism might be saved*, God supplying the want of Baptism which to them is unavoidable. But beyond all this, it were to put into my mouth a full and satisfying Answer 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 goodness of God, and as repugnant to it, to suffer an ignorant Lay-man's soul to perish, meerly 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 relie upon, either above all



all other, or as much as any other, as it is to damn 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 answer therefore, which alone would serve to comfort your penitent in his perplexities, and to assure him that he cannot fail of Salvation if he will not, for fear of inconvenience you must forbear. 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*, lest 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 presumptuous tying God and Salvation to your Sacraments; And the efficacy of them to your Priest's Qualifications and intentions.

69. Your making the Salvation of Infants depend on Baptism a Casual thing, and in the power of man to confer, or not confer, would yield me a Third of the same nature. And your suspending the same on the Baptizers Intention, a Fourth. And lastly, your making the Real presence of Christ in the Eucharist depend upon the casualties of the Consecrator's 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 Doctrin, 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 Fifth 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 Fountain; neither do I think it charity to cloy the Reader with uniformity, when the Subject affords variety.

70. Sixthly, therefore, I return it thus. The faith of Papists relies alone upon their Churche's infallibility. That there is any Church infallible, and, that Theirs is it, they pretend not to believe, but only upon *prudential Motives*. Dependance upon prudential Motives they confess to be obnoxious to a possibility of erring. What then remaineth, but Truth, Faith, Salvation, and All, must in them relie upon a fallible and uncertain ground.

71. Seventhly, The Faith of Papists relies upon the Church alone. The Doctrin 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 than a most certain possibility to err. What then remaineth, but that Truth, Faith, Salvation, and All, must in them relie upon a fallible and uncertain ground.

72. Eighthly thus. It is apparent and undeniable, that many Thousands there are, who believe your Religion upon no better grounds, than a man may have for the belief 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 perpetual succession of Professors of all their Doctrins. Some, because the service of your Church is more stately, and pompous, and magnificent. Some, because they find comfort in it. Some, because your Religion is farther spread, and hath more Professors of it, than the Religion of Protestants. Some, because *your Priests compass 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 deal ingenuously, you will not deny it. And, without question, he that builds his faith upon our *English Translation*, goes upon a more prudent ground than any of these can, with reason, be pretended to be. What then can you alledge but that with you, rather than with us, Truth, and

and Faith, and Salvation, and All, relie upon fallible and uncertain grounds?

73. Ninthly. Your *Rhemish* and *Doway* Translations are delivered to your Proselytes, (such, I mean, that are dispenced 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 National languages, in respect of those that are licenced to read them. This, I presume, you will confess. 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, meer men, subject to the same passions, and to the same possibility of erring with our Translators. And then how dos 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 ax 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 uncorupted Word of God; yet others among you, and those as good and zealous Catholiques as you, are not so confident hereof.

75. First, for all those who have made Translations of the whole 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 a apparent and even palpable, that they never dreamt of any absolute perfection and authentical 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 Councel of *Trent*, when that Decree was made, which made the *Vulgar Edition* (then not extant any where in the world) *authentical*, and not to be rejected upon any pretence whatsoever. At the forming this Decree, *Vega* I say, was present, understood the mind of the Councel, as well as any man, and professes that he was instructed in it by the *President* of it, the *Cardinal* S. *Cruce*. And yet he hath written that *the Councel in this Decree means 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 Councel reports of *Vega*, and assents to it himself. *Driedo*, in his *Book of the Translation of holy Scripture*, hath these words very pregnant and pertinent to the same purpose; *The See Apostolique, hath approved or accepted* Hierom's *Edition, not as so wholly consonant to the Original, and so entire, and pure, and restored in all things, that it may not be lawful for any man, either by comparing it with the Fountain to examine it, or, in some places to doubt, whether or no* Hierom *did understand the true sense of the Scripture; but only, as an Edition to be preferred 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 Councel of* Trent, *a multitude whereof we did collect from the variety of Copy.* And again, *We maintain that the Hebrew and Greek, were by no means 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 easie to produce innumerable examples.* And this he there professes to have *learnt of* Laines *the then General of the Society*: who was a great part of that Councel, 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 adds a reason of his opinion; which with all indifferent men will be of a far greater authority. *If the Councel* (saith he) *had purposed to approve an Edition in all respects, and to make it of equal authority and credit with the Fountains, certainly they ought with exact care first to have corrected the Errors of the Interpreter*: which certainly they did not.

78. Lastly,



78. Lastly, *Bellarmine* himself, 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 discern which is the true reading of the Vulgar Edition, but only by recourse unto the Originals 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 doubtful sometimes whether your Vulgar Translation, be true, and sometimes whether this or that be your Vulgar Translation, and sometimes undoubtedly resolved that your Vulgar Translation is no true Translation, nor consonant to the Original, as it was at first delivered. And what then can be alledged, but that out of your own grounds it may be inferred and inforced upon you, that not only in your Lay-men, but your Clergy-men and Scholars, Faith, and Truth, and Salvation, and All, depends upon fallible and uncertain grounds? And thus, by ten several retortions of this one Argument, I have endeavoured to shew you, How ill you have complyed with your own advice, which was *to take heed of urging Arguments that might be returned 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 refer 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 advice) 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 Originals of these that remain to be corrupted.* And lastly, so careless 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 Originals*, which also she pretends *to be corrupted.*

81. But Luther *himself, by unfortunate experience, was at length enforced to confess thus much, saying, If the world last longer, it will be again necessary to veteive the Decrees of Councels, by reason of divers interpretations of Scripture which now raign.*

82. And what if *Luther*, having a *Pope in his belly*, (as he was wont to say that most men had,) and desiring prehaps to have his own interpretations pass without examining, speak such words in heat of Argument? Do you think it reasonable that we should subscribe to *Luther*'s divinations and angry speeches? Will you oblige your self to answer for all the assertions of your private Doctors? If not; Why do you trouble us with what *Luther* says, and what *Calvin* says? 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 fear, that the infallibility of Councels being rejected, some men would fall into greater Errors than were imposed upon them by the Councels? Is this to confess that there is any present visible Church, upon 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 fear a greater inconvenience may follow from the avoiding of the less, is not to confess that the less is none at all.

83. For D. *Covel's commending your Translation*, What is it to the business in hand? Or how proves it the perfection of it, which is here contested, any more than S. *Augustine*'s commending the *Italian* Translation, argues the perfection of that, or that there was no necessity that S. *Hierom* should correct it? D. *Covel* commends your Translation, and so does the *Bishop of Chichester*, and so does D. *James*, and so do 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 says, that *the then approved Translation of the Church of* England, *is that which cometh neareſt the Vulgar*, yet he does not say, that it agrees exactly with it. So that whereas you infer, *that the Truth of your Translation muſt be the Rule to judge of the goodneſs of ours*: this is but a vain flouriſh. For, to say of our Translations, That is the beſt which comes neareſt the Vulgar, (and yet it is but one man that says 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 near to yours, but ſuch a one which ſhould exactly agree with it, and be a Translation of your Translation.

84. *Ad* 17. *ℓ*. 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 confeſs we are uncertain of the ſenſe of many of them. But then we ſay there is no neceſſity we ſhould be certain. For, if God's will had been, we ſhould have underſtood him more certainly, he would have 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 obſerve 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 Judicial ſentence, whereunto neither part may refuſe to ſtand*. This is very true. Neither ſhould you need to perſwade us to ſeek ſuch a means of ending all our Controverſies, if we could tell where to find it. But this we know, that none is fit to pronounce for all the world a judicial definitive obliging ſentence in Controverſies of Religion, but only ſuch a Man, or ſuch a ſociety of Men, as is authorized thereto by God. And beſides, we are able to demonſtrate, that it hath not been the pleaſure of God to give to any Man, or Society of Men, any ſuch authority. And therefore, though we wiſh heartily that all Controverſies were ended, as we do that all ſin were aboliſht, yet we have little hope of the one, or the other, till the World be ended. And in the mean while, think it beſt to content our ſelves with, and to perſwade others unto, an *Unity of Charity, and mutual Toleration*; ſeeing God hath authorized no man to force all men to *Unity of Opinion*. Neither do we think it fit to argue thus, To us it ſeems convenient there ſhould be one Judge of all Controverſies for the whole world, therefore God hath appointed one: But more modeſt and more reaſonable to collect thus, God hath appointed no ſuch Judge of Controverſies, therefore, though it ſeems to us convenient there ſhould be one, yet it is not ſo: Or though it were convenient for us to have one, yet it hath pleaſed God (for Reaſons beſt known to Himſelf) not to allow us this convenience.

86. D. *Field*'s words which follow, I confeſs, 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, and ſo acknowledged 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 receive their Decrees without examination, though they ſeem contrary to Scripture and Reaſon, which the Church of *Rome* requires. And therefore, if he have in his Preface ſtrained too high in commendation of the Subject he writes of, (as Writers very often do 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, he might mean, all that are, or have been in the



the world, and ſo include even the *Primitive Church*: and her Communion we ſhall embrace, her Direction we ſhall follow, her Judgement we ſhall reſt in; in the Scripture, endeavour to find the true ſenſe of it, and live according to it.

87. *Ad ℓ*. 18. That the true Interpretation of the Scripture ought to be received from the Church, you need not prove; for it is very eaſily granted by them, who profeſs themſelves very ready to receive all Truthes, much more the true ſenſe of Scripture, not only from the Church, but from any ſociety of men, nay from any man whatſoever.

88. That the *Churche's Interpretation of Scripture is alwayes true*, that is it which you would have ſaid: and that in ſome ſenſe may be alſo admitted, *viz.* if you ſpeak of that Church) which before you ſpake of in the 14. *ℓ*.) that is, of the Church of all Ages ſince the Apoſtles. Upon the Tradition of which Church you there told us, *we were to receive the Scripture, and to believe it to be the Word of God*. For there you teach us, that *our Faith of Scripture depends on a Principle, which requires no other proof*; 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 himſelf, cometh to be confirmed by all thoſe Miracles, and other Arguments whereby they convinced their Doctrin to be true*. Wherefore the Ancient Fathers avouch that we muſt receive the ſacred Scripture upon the Tradition of this Church. 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, and we believe it; 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 Sophiſtry, to take any but thoſe that are willing to be taken.

89. If there be any Traditive Interpretation of Scripture, produce it, and prove 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 receive both Scripture, and the ſenſe of Scripture upon the Authority of *Original Tradition*, yet we receive neither the one, nor the other, upon the Authority of your Church.

90. Firſt for the Scripture, How can we receive them upon the Authority of your Church, who hold now thoſe Books to be Canonical, 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 Canonical in S. *Gregorie's* time, or elſe he was no member of your Church; for it is apparent (a) He held otherwiſe. The ſecond you rejected from the Canon in S. *Hierom's* time, as it is evident out of (b) many places of his Works.

91. If you ſay (which is all you can ſay) that Hierom *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 chuſe whether you will, Either that the particular *Roman* Church was not then believed to be the Miſtreſs of all other Churches (notwithſtanding, *Ad hanc Eccleſiam, neceſſe eſt omnem convenire Eccleſiam, hoc eſt, omnes qui ſunt undique fideles*; which Cardinal *Perron*, and his *Tranſlatreſs* ſo often tranſlates falſe: Or, if you ſay ſhe was, you will run 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.

(a) See *Grig. Mord.* 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 Epiſt. quæ ad Hebræos ſcribitur, (licèt eam Latina Conſuetudo inter Canonicas Scripturas non recipiat.)* &c.

Church. And consequently, that the Catholique Church may err in rejecting from the Canon, Scriptures truly Canonical.

92. Secondly, How can we receive the Scripture upon the Authority of the *Roman* Church, which hath delivered at several times Scriptures in many places different and repugnant, for Authentical and Canonical? Which is most evident out of the place of *Malachy*, which is so quoted for the Sacrifice of the Mass, that either all the ancient Fathers had false Bibles, or yours is false. Most evident likewise from the comparing of the story of *Jacob* in *Genesis*, with that which is cited out of it, in the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, according to the vulgar Edition. But above 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 have to believe your Antecedent, *That your Church it is which must declare, what Books be true Scripture.* Now, for the consequence, that certainly 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 obliged himself, to teach you, not only sufficiently, but *effectually* and *irresistibly* the true sense of Scripture? God is not defective in things necessary: neither will he leave himself without witness, nor the World without means of knowing his will and doing it. And therefore it was necessary that by his Providence he should preserve the Scripture from any undiscernable corruption in those things which he would have known: otherwise it is apparent, it had not been his will, that these things should be known, the only means of continuing the knowledge of them being perished. But now neither is God lavish in superfluities, and therefore having given us means, sufficient for our direction, and power sufficient to make use of these means, he will not constrain or necessitate us to make use of these means. For that were to cross the end of our Creation, which was to be glorified by our free obedience: whereas Necessity and Freedom cannot stand together. That were to reverse the Law which he hath prescribed to himself in his dealing with Man; and that is, *to set life and death before him, and to leave him in the hands of his own Counsel.* God gave the Wisemen a Star to lead them to *Christ*, but he did not necessitate them to follow the guidance of this Star: that was left to their liberty. God gave 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 gives the Church the Scripture: which in those things which are to be believed or done, are plain and easie to be followed, like the Wisemen's Star. Now that, which he desires of us on our part, is, the Obedience of Faith, and love of the Truth, and desired to find 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, than he can of the Sun to shine, of the Sea to ebb and flow, and of all other Creatures to do those things which by meer necessity, they must do, and cannot chuse. 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 do not pretend certainly to understand, and about the Interpretation whereof, your own Doctors differ among themselves? If your Church be infallibly directed concerning the true meaning of Scripture, why do not your Doctors follow her infallible direction? And, if they do, How comes such difference among them in their Interpretations?

94. Again, Why does your Church thus put her Candel under a Bushel, 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 self



self 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 the imploy particular Doctors to interpret Scriptures fallibly? unless 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 do it when the Holy Ghost shall move her to do 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 Ghost doth always move to an action, when he shews 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 no conceivable reason, Why such a work should be put off a day, but only because you are conscious to your selves, you cannot do it, and therefore make excuses. But if the moving of the Holy Ghost be irresistible, and you are not yet so moved to go about this work; then I confess you are excused. But then I would know, Whether those Popes, which so long deferred the calling of a Councel for the Reformation of your Church, at length pretended to be effected by the Council of *Trent*, whether they may excuse themselves, for that they were not moved by the Holy Ghost to do 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 himself *in Cathedra*, and fall to writing Expositions upon the Bible for the direction of Christians to the true sense of it? If you say, He cannot, you will make your self 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 go about this noble work presently? If he should not, How shall we know that the calling of the Council 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 consequentely, How shall we know whether he were assistant to it or no, seeing He assists none but what He himself moves to? And whether He did move the Pope to call this Councel, is a secret thing, which we cannot possibly know, nor prehaps the Pope himself.

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 Books be true Scripture? For, if the Holy Ghost's 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 do this without taking away their free-will in living; I say, neither can he necessitate men to believe aright, without taking away their free-will in believeing, and in professing their belief.

97. To the place of S. *Austin*; I answer, That, not the Authority of the present Church, much less of a Part of it (as the *Roman* Church is) was that which alone moved S. *Austin* to believe the Gospel, but the perpetual Tradition of the Church of all Ages. Which you your self have taught us to be the *only Principle by which the Scripture is proved, and which it self needs no proof*; and to which you

you have referred this very Saying of Saint *Austin*, *Ego verò Evangelio non crederem, nisi, &c. Chap.* 2. §. 14. And in the next place, which you cite out of his Book *De Util. Cred. c* 14. he shews, 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 Gospel, (the Christian Tradition being as full against *Manichæus*, as it was for the Gospel) therefore he did well to conclude upon these grounds that he had as much reason to dis-believe *Manichæus*, as to believe the Gospel. Now, if you can truly say, that the same Fame, Celebrity, Consent, Antiquity, that the same Universal and Original Tradition, lies against *Luther* and *Calvin*, as did against *Manichæus*, you may do well to apply the Argument against them; otherwise it will be to little purpose to substitute their names in stead of *Manichæus*, unless you can shew the thing agrees to them as well as him.

98. If you say that S. *Austin speaks here of the authority of the present Church, abstracted 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 vain presumption of yours that the *Catholique Church is of your side*. Secondly, that, if S. *Austin* speak here of that present Church, which moved him to believe the Gospel, without consideration of the Antiquity of it, and its both Personal and Doctrinal succession from the Apostles; his Argument will be like a *Buskin* that will serve any leg. It will serve to keep an *Arrian*, or a *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 do. If then you should have come to an ancient *Goth* or *Vandal*, whom the *Arrians* converted to Christianity, and should have moved him to your Religion; might he not say the very same words to you as S. *Austin* to the *Manichæans*? *I would not believe the Gospel, unless the Authority of the Church did move me. Them therefore whom I obeyed, saying, Believe the Gospel, why should I not obey saying to me, Do not believe the* Homo-ousians? *Chuse what thou pleasest: If thou shalt say, Believe the* Arrians, *they warn me not to give any credit to you. If therefore I believe them, I cannot believe thee. If thou say, Do not believe, the* Arrians, *thou shalt not do well to force me to the faith of the* Homo-ousians *because by the preaching of the* Arrians, *I believed the Gospel it self. If you say, You did well to believe them, commending the Gospel, but you did not well to believe them, discommending the* Homo-ousians: *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?* It were easie to put these words into the mouth of a *Grecian*, *Abyssine*, *Georgian*, or any other of any Religion. And I pray bethink 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 ask, *Whether Protestants do not perfectly resemble those men to whom S. Austin spake, when they will have men to believe the Roman Church delivering Scripture, but not to believe her condemning* Luther? I demand again, 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 Books for Scripture which are not so? and do not bid men to receive any Book which the delivers, for that reason, because she delivers it? And, if you meant only, Protestants will have men to believe some Books to be Scripture which the *Roman* Church delivers for such, may not we then ask as you do, Do 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. *Austin may seem to have spoken Prophetically against Protestants, when he said, why should I not most diligently enquire what Christ commanded*



*commanded of them before all others, by whose Authority I was moved to believe, that Christ commanded any good thing*? I answer. Until 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 Baptism, Education, and Faith from the Ministery of this Church, say just so to you as S. *Austin* here to the *Manichees*, ? Why should I not most diligently enquire, what Christ commanded of them (the Church of *England*) before all others, by whose Authority I was moved to believe, that Christ commanded any good thing? Can you, P. 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 Jesus* did those Miracles, and taught that Doctrine which is contained evidently in the undoubted Books of the New Testament) I believed by Fame, strengthened with Celebrity and Consent, (even of those which in other things are at infinite variance one with another,) and lastly by Antiquity (which gives an universal 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 damn all to the fire, and to Hell, that any way differ from you; that you profess it is lawful 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 Doctrins, as in the lawfulness and expedience of debarring the Laity the Sacramental Cup; the lawfulness and expedience of your Latine Service, Transubstantiation, Indulgences, Purgatory, the Pope's Infallibility, his Authority over Kings, &c. So new, I say in comparison of the undoubted Books 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 madness is this? Believe then 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 damn all other parts of Christendom. Why, I beseech you? Surely, if they were not at all, and could not teach me any thing, I would more easily perswade my self, that I were not to believe in Christ, than that I should learn any thing concerning him, from any other, than them by whom I believed him: at least, than 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 fair 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 confess 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 by some cunning Impostors, only to make themselves rich and powerful; 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 six Ages last past; how shall we know, that the Church of that time, did not usurp the same Authority upon

upon the Authors of the six last Ages before them, and so upwards, until we come to Christ himself? Whose questioned Doctrines, none of them came from the Fountain of Apostolike Tradition, but have insinuated themselves into the Streams, 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 Pope's infallibility, the blessed Virgin's immaculate Conception, the Pope's power over the Temporalties of Kings, the Doctrine of Predetermination, &c. all which yet are, or in time may be, imposed upon Christians under the Title of *Original 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 teacheth me, and not others: and some things which she teacheth to be Ancient and Certain, I plainly see to be New and 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*, and *Spain*, and *France*, and in *England* too, I leave it to the judgement of those that have wisdom and experience. Seeing therefore the *Roman* Church is so far from being a sufficient Foundation for our Belief in Christ, that it is in sundrey 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 Intepretation of Scripture.

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

103. To this I answer: As, to be understandible is a condition requisite to a Judge, so is not that alone sufficient to make a Judge; otherwise you might make your self Judge of Controversies, by arguing, The Scripture is not intelligible by all, but I am; therefore I am Judge 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 infer in the end, (which indeed was more than you undertook in the beginning) *Therefore the Church is Judge, and the Scripture not.* I say Secondly, that you still run upon a false supposition: that God hath appointed some Judge of all Controversies that may happen among Christians, about the sense of obscure Textes of Scripture: whereas he hath left every one to his liberty herein, in those words of S. *Paul*, *Quisque abundet in sensu suo, &c.* I say Thirdly, Whereas some Protestants make the Scripture Judge of Controversies, that they have the Authority of Fathers to warrant their manner of speaking: as of * *Optatus.*

* *Cont. Parmen. l. 5. in Prin.*

104. But speaking truly and properly, the Scripture is not a Judge, 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 do,) 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 terms 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



have no certain means: which is to say, that, like *Pharoah*, he gives no straw, and requires brick; that he reaps where he sows not; that he gathers where he strews not; that he will not be pleased with our utmost endeavours to please him, without full, and exact, and never failing performance; that his will is, we should do what he knows we cannot do; 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 goodness, with his wisdom, and with his word, I leave it to honest men to judge. If I should send a servant to *Paris*, or *Rome*, or *Jerusalem*, and he using his utmost diligence not to mistake his way, yet notwithstanding, meeting often with such places where the road is devided into several wayes, whereof every one is as likely to be true, and as likely to be false as any other, should at length mistake and go 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 scorn, if it were imputed to our selves? Certainly, I, for my part, fear I should not love God, if I should think so strangely of him.

105. Again, 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 mean: 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 man's 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 Gospel? If the third, that they may understand something, but not enough for their Salvations; I ask you, first, Why then doth S. *Paul* say to *Timothy*, *The Scriptures are able to make him wise unto Salvation*? Why doth Saint *Austin* say, *Ea quæ manifestè posita sunt in sacris Scripturis, omnia continent quæ pertinent ad Fidem, Moresque vivendi*? Why dos every one of the four Evangelists intitle their Book *The Gospel*, if any necessary and essential part of the Gospel 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, maliciously concealed it? Or, out of negligence, did the work they have undertaken by halfs? 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 follows, that every one of them writ the whole Gospel of Christ; I mean, all the essential 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 hath more than 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 means of the preaching of the Gospel, which was commanded to be preached, not only to learned men but *to all men.* And therefore, unless 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 vain pretence.

108. For first, How shall an unlearned man whom you have 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, perpetual Visibility, Succession, Conformity with the*

*Ancient Church*, &c. But how shall he know, first, that these are the notes of the Church, unless 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 possibly be a competent Judge, which society of Christians hath title to these notes, and which hath not? Seeing this trial of necessity requires a great sufficiency of knowledge of the monuments of Christian Antiquity, which no unlearned man can have, 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 perpetual Succession of Visible Professors, which held always the same Doctrin which they now hold, without holding any thing to the contrary; unless he hath first examined, what was the Doctrin of the Church in the first age, what in the second, and so forth? And whether this be not a more difficult work, than to stay at the first Age, and to examine the Church by the conformity of her Doctrin with the Doctrin 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 careful 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 do? Then for the sense of the Decrees, how can he be more capable of the understanding of them, than of plain Texts of Scripture, which you will not suffer him to understand? Especially, seeing the Decrees of divers Popes and Councels 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 inform them that there is such a Decree. And if the Decrees were translated into Vulgar Languages, why the Translators should not be as infallible 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 Councel, unless 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 me? He cannot be a true Pope unless he were baptized, and baptized he was not, unless the Minister had due Intention. So likewise he cannot be a true Pope, unless he were rightly ordained Priest, and that again depends upon the Ordainer's secret Intention, and also upon his having the Episcopal 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 therfore, that not the learnedst man amongst you all, no not the Pope himself, can, according to the grounds you go upon, have any certainty, that any Decree of any Councel is good and valid, and consequently, not any assurance that it is indeed the Decree of a Councel.

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



*These and these reasons I have to shew, that this or that is true Doctrin, or that this or that is the meaning of such a Scripture*? Reason being a Publique and certain thing, and exposed to all mens tryal and examination. But now, if by *private 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 dos not also giving the office of Judicature to the Church, come to confer it upon every particular man? For, before any man beleeves 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 firm, or captious and sophistical? Or, would you have all men believe all your Doctrin 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 do not so much as pretend, that either of those pretences is evident of it self, and therefore you go about to prove them both by reasons; and those reasons, I hope, every particular man is to judge of, whether they do indeed conclude and convince that which they are alledged for: that is, that these marks 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 Doctrin of the Primitive Church, and what is the Doctrin 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 do; not one in a hundred being able to give any tolerable reason for it. So that instead of reducing them to particular reasons, you reduce them to none at all, but to chance, and passion, and prejudice, and such other ways; 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 several purposes. Is there hope of gaining a Proselyte? 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 born and brought up in it: For then a Turk should have as much reason to be a Turk, as a Christian to be a Christian. That every man hath a judgment of Discretion; which if they will make use of, they shall easily find, that the true Church hath always such and such marks, and that their Church hath them, and no other but theirs. But then if any of theirs be perswaded to a sincere and sufficient tryal 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 refer 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 believes things he knows not why; I say, it is by chance that he believes the truth, and not by choice: and that I cannot but fear, that God will not accept of this *Sacrifice of fools*.

114. But you that would not have men follow their Reason, what would you have them follow? their Passion? Or pluck out their eyes and go blindfold?

*No*, you say, *you would have them follow Authority*. On God's name let them; we also would have them follow Authority for it is upon the Authority of Universal 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 go a little about? to leave Reason for a short turn, and then to come to it again; and to do that which you condemn in others? It being indeed a plain impossibility for any man to submit his reason but to Reason: for he that doth it to Authority, must of necessity think himself to have greater reason to believe that Authority. Therefore the confession cited by *Brecrely* 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, Councels, Church, as far as they agree with Scripture, which upon the matter is himself*: I say, you admit neither of them, nor the Scripture it self, but only so far as it agrees with your Church: and your Church you admit, because you think you have reason to do so: so that by you as well as by Protestants all is finally resolved into your own reason.

116. Nor do Heretiques only, but *Romish* Catholiques also, set up as many Judges, as there are men and women in the Christian world. For do 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 do so. So that the difference between a Papist and a Protestant is this, not that the one judges and the other dos not judge, but that the one judges his guide to be infallible, the other his way to be manifest. *This same pernitious Doctrin 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 says, *Try all things, hold fast that which is good.* It is taught by S. *John*, 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, *Be ye ready to render a reason of the hope that is in you.* Lastly, this very pernitious Doctrin is taught by our *Saviour*, in these words, *If the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch.* And, *Why of your selves judge you not what is right?* All which speeches, if they do not advise men to make use of their Reason for the choice of their Religion, I must confess my self to understand nothing. Lastly, not to be infinite, it is taught by M. *Knot* himself, not in one page only, or chapter of his *Book*, but all his Book over; the very writing and publishing whereof, supposeth this for certain, that the Readers are to be Judges, whether his Reasons which he brings, be strong and convincing, of which sort we have hitherto met with none: or else captious, or impertinences as indifferent men shall (as I suppose) have cause to judge them.

117. But you demand, *What good Statesmen would they be, who should ideate, or fancy such a Common, wealth, as these men have framed to themselves a Church?* Truly if this be all the fault they have, that they say, *Every man is to use his own judgement 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 conceives he hath 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 hath this to do with Common-wealths, where men are bound only to external obedience unto the Laws and Judgement of Courts, but not to an internal approbation of them, no nor to conceal their Judgement of them, if they disapprove them? As if I conceived I had reason to mislike the law of punishing simple theft with death, as Sr. *Thomas Moore* did, I might profess lawfully my judgement; and represent my Reasons to the King or Common-wealth in a Parliament, as Sr. *Thomas Moore* did, without committing any fault, or fearing any punishment.

118. To



118. To the place of S. *Austin*, wherewith this Paragraph is concluded, I shall need give no other Reply, but only 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 cross 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, than to allow that sense of Scripture which he conceives to be true and genuine, and deduced out of the words, and to disallow the contrary? For Gods sake, Sir, tell me plainly; In those Texts of Scripture, which you alledge for the Infallibility of your Church, do you not allow what sense you think true, and disallow the contrary? And do not you this, by the direction of your private reason? If you do, why do you condemn it in others? If you do 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; and 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 Son, and the Son 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 sayes so; as thus to put in Scripture for a meer stale, and to say the Church is infallible because the Scripture sayes so, and the Scripture means so, because the Church sayes so, which is infallible? Is it not most evident therefore to every intelligent man, that you are enforced of necessity to do that your self, which so tragically you declaim against in others? The Church, you say, is infallible; I am very doubtful of it: How shall I know it? The Scripture you say, affirms it, as in the 59. of *Esay*, *My Spirit that is in thee, &c.* Well, I confess I find there these words: but I am still doubtful, whether they be spoken of the Church of Christ: and 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 proof: otherwise, why brought you this Text to prove it? Nor is it of such a strange quality, above all other Propositions, as to be able to prove it self. What then remains 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 me, unless I judge of them by my Reason; and, for every man or woman to rely on that, in the choice of their Religion, and in the interpreting of Scripture, you say, is a horrible absurdity; and therefore must neither make use of your own in this matter, nor desire me to make use of it.

119. But, *Universal Tradition* (you say, and so do I too) *is of it self credible: and that hath, in all ages, taught the Church's Infallibility with full consent.* If it have, I am ready to believe it: But that it hath, I hope you would not have me take upon your word; for that were to build my self upon the Church, and the Church upon You. Let then the Tradition appear; 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 Doctrin; (as *Gualterius* in his Chronologie undertakes to do, but with so ill success, that I heard an able Man of your Religion profess, 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 shall I be assured that the places have indeed this sense in them? Seeing there is not one Father for 500. years

years after Christ, that dos say in plain terms, *The Church of* Rome *is infallible.* What, shall we believe your Church that this is their meaning? But this will be again to go into the Circle, which made us giddy before; To prove the Church Infallible, becaufe Tradition faies fo; Tradition to fay fo, becaufe the Fathers fay fo; The Fathers to fay fo, becaufe the Church faies fo, which is infallible. Yea, *but reafon will fhew this to be the meaning of them.* Yes, if we may ufe our Reafon, and rely upon it. Otherwife, as light fhews nothing to the blind, or to him that ufes not his eyes; fo reafon cannot prove any thing to him that either hath not, or ufeth not his reafon to Judge of them.

120. Thus you have excluded your felf from all proof of your Churches Infallibility from Scripture or Tradition. And if you flie, laftly, to Reafon it felf for fuccour, may not it juftly fay to you as *Jephte* faid to his Bretheren, *Ye have caft me out and baniſhed me, and do you now come to me for fuccour?* But if there be no certainty in Reafon, how fhall I be aſſured of the certainty of thofe which you alledge for this purpofe? Either I may judge of them, or not: If not, why do you propofe them? If I may, why do you fay I may not, and make it fuch a monſtrous abſurdity, That men in the choice of their Religion fhould make ufe of their Reafon? which yet, without all queſtion, none but unreafonable men can deny, to have been the chiefeſt end why Reafon was given them.

121. *Ad §* 22, *An Heretique he is* (faith D. Potter) *who oppoſeth any truth, which to be a divine revelation he is convinced in conſcience by any means 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 illogical deduction! For, may not a private man by evident reaſon convince another man, that ſuch or ſuch a Doctrin is divine Revelation, and yet though he be a true Propounder in this point, yet propound another thing falſely, and without proof, and conſequently not be a ſafe Propounder in every point? Your Preachers in their Sermons, do they not propoſe to men divine Revelations, and do they not ſometimes convince men in conſcience, by evident proof from Scripture, that the things they ſpeak are divine Revelations? And whoſoever, being thus convinced, ſhould oppoſe this divine Revelation, ſhould he not be an Heretique, according to your own grounds, for calling Gods own Truth into queſtion? And would you think your ſelf 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 means of Propoſal 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 Devil himſelf, yet if I be, I will not ſay convinced but perſwaded, though falſly, that it is a divine Revelation, and ſhall deny to believe it I ſhall be a formal though not a material Heretique. For he that believes, though falſly, any thing to be a divine Revelation, and yet will not believe it to be true, muſt of neceſſity believe God to be falſe, which, according to your own Doctrin, is the formality of an Heretique.

122. And how it can be any way advantagious to Civil government, that men without warrant from God ſhould uſurp a Tyranny over other mens conſciences, and preſcribe unto them, without reaſon, and ſometime againſt reaſon, what they ſhall believe, you muſt ſhew us plainer if you deſire we ſhould believe. For to ſay, *Verily I do not ſee but that it muſt be ſo,* is no good demonſtration. For whereas you ſay, *That a man may be a paſſionate and ſeditious creature,* from whence you would have us infer, 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 do) make 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 harm they can do by their paſſionate or ſeditious Interpretations, but



but only endanger both their temporal and eternal happineſs, I cannot imagine. For though we deny the Pope or Church of *Rome* to be an infallible Judge, yet we do not deny, but that there are Judges 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 Rebels, and Traitors, and Theeves, and Murderers.

123. *Ad §.* 23. The next §. in the beginning 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 Judge.* Juſt as if I ſhould ſay, *York* is not my way from *Oxford* to *London*, therefore *Briſtol* is: Or, a Dog is not a horſe, therefore he is a man. As if God had no other waies of revealing himſelf to men, but only by Scripture and an infallible Church. * S. *Chryſoſtom* and *Iſidorus Peluſiota* conceived, He might uſe other means. And Saint *Paul* telleth us that the γνωστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ *might be known by his works*; And that *they had the Law written in their hearts.* Either of theſe waies might make ſome faithful men, without either neceſſity of Scripture or Church.

* See *Chryſoſt. Hom.* 1 *in Mat. Iſidor. Peluſ. l.* 2. *ep.* 106. and alſo *Baſil.* in *Pſ.* 28. and then you ſhall confeſs, that by other means beſides theſe, God did communicate himſelf unto men, and made them receive and underſtand his laws: See alſo to the ſame purpoſe, *Heb.* 1. 1.

124. *But D.* Potter *ſays*, you ſay, *In the Jewiſh Church there was a living Judge, 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 Jewiſh 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 Jewiſh 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, which the Doctor attributes to the Jews. As a man may truely ſay, the Wiſemen had an infallible direction to Chriſt, without ſaying or thinking that they were conſtrained to follow it, and could not do otherwiſe.

125. *But either the Church retains ſtill her Infallibility, or it was deveſted of it upon the receiving of Holy Scripture; which is abſurd.* An Argument me thinks like this, Either you have horns, or you have loſt them: but you never loſt them, therefore you have them ſtill. If you ſay, you never had horns; ſo, ſay I, for ought appears 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 Judge of Controverſies, ſome Churches had one Judge and ſome another.* And what great inconvenience is there in that, that one part of *England* ſhould have one Judge, and another another? eſpecially ſeeing the Books of Scripture which were received by thoſe that received feweſt, had as much of the Doctrin of Chriſtianity in them, as they all had which were received by any; all the neceſſary parts of the Goſpel being contained in every one of the four Goſpels, as I have proved: So that they which had all the Books 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 Goſpels wanted nothing neceſſary: and therefore it is vainly inferred by you, that *with months and years, as new Canoical 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, and avoided, unleſs the Church be infallible; Therefore there muſt be a Church infallible.* But I pray tell me, Why cannot Hereſies be ſufficiently diſcovered, and condemned and avoided, by them which believe Scripture to be the rule of Faith? If Scripture be

ſufficient

sufficient to inform us what is the Faith, it must of necessity be also sufficient to teach us what is Heresie: seeing Heresie 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, merciful, a rewarder of them that seek him, a punisher of them that obstinately offend him; That Jesus Christ is the Son 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 Ascension, 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 saved: That they which do not believe or repent shall be damned: If a man should hold that either the keeping of the *Mosaical* Law is necessary to Salvation: or that good works are not necessary to Salvation: In a word, if any man should obstinately contradict the truth of any thing plainly delivered in Scripture, who dos not see, that every one which believes the Scripture, hath a sufficient means to discover, and condemn, and avoid that Heresie without any need of an infallible guide? If you say, that *the obscure places of Scripture contain matters of Faith*: I answer, 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 doth not do 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 wisdom, 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 himself hath not revealed? Suppose there were an absolute Monarch, that in his own absence from one of his Kingdoms, had written Laws 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 exactness, 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 wisdom be offended with these Subjects, if, by reason of the obscurity of them, they mistook the sense of them; and faild of performance, by reason of their error?

128. But, *It is more useful and fit*, you say, *for the deciding of Controversies, to have, besides an infallible rule to go by, a living infallible Judge to determin them: and from hence* you *conclude, that certainly there is such a Judge*. But why then may not another say, that it is yet more useful for many excellent purposes, that all the Patriarchs should be infallible, than that the Pope only should? Another, that it would be yet more useful, that all the Archbishops, of every Province should be so, than that the Patriarchs only should be so. Another, That it would be yet more useful, if all the Bishops of every Diocese 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 consequence, That not only a general Councel, 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 gross, and absurd, against sense and experience, then must also the ground be false, from which it evidently and undeniably follows, *viz.* that



that that course of dealing with men seems always more fit to Divine providence, which seems most fit to human reason.

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

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

131. Who sees not that for mens direction it were much more beneficial for the Church, that Infallibility should be setled in the Popes Person, than in a General Councel: That so the means of deciding Controversies might be speedy, easie, and perpetual, whereas that of general Councels is not so. And will you hence infer, that not the Church Representative, but the Pope is indeed the infallible Judge 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 business, and by his Spirit assisted them in it, that so we might have Translations as Authentical as the Original: yet you see God did not think fit to do 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 Apostolicke Interpretation of all the difficult places of Scripture, would have been strangely beneficial 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 Judge 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 Judge of Controversies, that it would have been infinitely beneficial 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 Terms, *The Bishops of* Rome *shall be alwayes Monarches of the Church, and they either alone, or with their adherents, the Guides of Faith, and the Judges 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 himself, neither needed you and your Fellows have troubled your self to invent so many Sophisms for the proof of it. There would have been no more doubt of it

among Christians, than there is of the Nativity, Passion, Resurrection, or Ascension of Christ. You were best now rubb your forehead hard, and conclude upon us, that because this would have been so useful 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 thankful for those sufficient, nay abundant means, of Salvation, which God hath of his own goodness granted us: and not conclude he hath done that which he hath not done, because, forsooth, in our vain judgments, it seems 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 than this; *There is no Repugnance between the Scripture's existence, and the Church's 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 me to be infallible, as well as either your Church, or Pope: in as much as there is no more repugnance between the Scripture's existence and our infallibility, than there is between theirs.

138. *But, if Protestants will have the Scripture alone for their Judge, let them first produce some Scripture, affirming, that by the entring thereof, infallibility went out of the Church.* This Argument put in form, runs thus. No Scripture affirms, that by the entring thereof, infallibility went out of the Church: Therefore there is an infallible Church, and therefore the Scripture alone is not Judge, that is, the Rule to judge by. But as no Scripture affirms, that by the entring of it, infallibility went out of the Church, so neither do we, neither have we any need to do so. But we say, that it continued in the Church even together with the Scriptures, so long as Christ and his Apostles were living, and then departed: God in his providence having provided a plain and infallible Rule, to supply the defect of living and infallible Guides. Certainly, 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 have gone out of the Church, therefore it is Infallible. Somewhat like his discourse that said, It could not be proved out of Scripture, that the King of *Sweden* was dead, therefore he is still living. Me-thinks in all reason, you that challenge priviledges, and exemption from the condition of Men, which is to be subject to errour; You that by vertue of this priviledge usurp authority over mens consciences, should produce your Letters Patents from the King of Heaven, and shew some expres warrant for this Authority you take upon you, otherwise you know the rule is, *Ubi contrarium non manifestè probatur, præsumitur pro libertate.*

139. *But* D. Potter *may remember what himself teacheth, That the Church is still endued with Infallibility in points Fundamental, 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.* Still your discourse is so far from hitting the White, that it roves quite besides the Butt. 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 proof 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? *Jam 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* says, that the Church is the former: that is, There shall be some men in the world, while the world lasts, which err not in Fundamentals; for otherwise there should be no Church: For to say, the Church,



Church, while it is the Church, may err in Fundamentals, implies a contradiction, 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 Fundamentals, signifies no more but this, There shall be a Church in the world for ever. But we 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 do, nor can, err in Fundamentals, nor in declaring what is Fundamental, what is not Fundamental: 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 denomination. 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 doctrin, but by the true doctrin to the Church. Hereafter therefore, when you hear Protestants say, The Church is Infallible in Fundamentals, you must not conceive them as if they meant, as you do, 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 far driven out of the world, but that it shall have always, some where or other, some that believe and profess 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 coming of Scripture, was deprived of infallibility in some points, and not in others?* And I also would gladly know, Why you do thus frame to your self vain imaginations, and then father them upon others? We yeild unto you, That there shall be a Church which never erreth in some points, because (as we conceive) God hath promised so much; but not, where shall be such a Church which doth or can err in no points, because we find not, that God hath promised such a Church; and therefore we 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 have nothing to do with.

141. But he affirmeth, That *The Jewish Church retained Infallibility in her self; and therefore it is unjustly, and unworthily done of him to deprive the Church of Christ of it.* That the Jews had sometimes an infallible miraculous direction from God in some cases of moment, he doth affirm, and had good warrant: but that the Synagogue was absolutely infallible, he no where affirms; and therefore it is unjustly and 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 condemned and excommunicated them that so professed, and caused him to be crucified for saying so, I leave it to Christians to judge. But then suppose God had been so pleased to do as he did not, to appoint the Synagogue an Infallible Guide: Could you by your rules of Logick constrain him to appoint such an one to Christians also; or say unto him, that in wisdom he could not do otherwise; Vain man, that will he thus always tying God to your imaginations. It is well for us that he leaves us not without directions to him; but if he will do this sometime by living Guides, sometime by written Rules, What is that to you? May not he do what he will with his own?

142. *And whereas you say, for the further enforcing of this Argument, that there is greater reason to think the Church should be infallible, than the Synagogue: because to the Synagogue all Laws and Ceremonies, &c. were more particularly, and*

*minutely delivered, than 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 and Ceremonies, and orders for government, we grant it, and you know we do ſo. Our Saviour only hath left a general injunction by S. *Paul, Let all things be 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 Governours of the Church. But, if you mean, that he hath only concerning matters of Faith, the ſubject in Queſtion, preſcribed in general that we are to hear the Church, and left it to the Church to determine what particulars we are to believe, The Church being nothing elſe but an agregation 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 ſelf, or think we ſhould be contented with a bare ſaying, without any ſhew or pretence of proof.

143. As for D. *Potter's* Objection againſt this Argument, *That as well you might infer, that Chriſtians muſt have all one King, becauſe the Jews 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 urged by him not againſt the Infallibility but the Monarchy of the Church. For whereas you ſay, The diſparity is very clear: He 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 ordered, but that there ſhould not be ſo. For that there was no more reaſon to believe that the Eccleſiaſtical Government of the Jews was a Pattern for the Eccleſiaſtical Government of Chriſtians, than the Civil of the Jews, for the Civil of the Chriſtians. He would tell you, that the Church of Chriſt, and all Chriſtian Commonwealths, and Kingdoms, 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 Jewiſh Synagogue, ſo Chriſtian Princes ſhould ſucceed to Jewiſh Magiſtrates: That is, the Temporal Governours of the Church ſhould be Chriſtians. He would tell you, that as the Church is compared to a Houſe, a Kingdom, an Army, a Body, ſo all diſtinct Kingdoms might and ſhould be one Army, one Family, *&c.* and that it is not ſo, is the thing he complains 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 Jews had one King, therefore all Chriſtians ought to have, as well as this. The Jews had one High-Prieſt over them all, therefore all Chriſtians alſo ought to have. He might tell you moreover, that the Church may have one Maſter, one General, 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 unleſs you mean ſo, you ſay nothing to the purpoſe. And beſides, he might tell you, and that very truly, that it may ſeem altogether as available for the Temporal good of Chriſtians to be under one Temporal Prince, or Commonwealth; as for their ſalvation, 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, and for the defence of Chriſtendom, from the hoſtile invaſions of Turks, and Pagans. And from all this he might infer, that though now, by the fault of men, there were in ſeveral Kingdoms, ſeveral Laws, Governments, 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 general Rule, that what kind of government the Jews had, that the Chriſtians muſt have. And, if you



you limit the generality of this Propoſition, and frame the Argument thus: What kind of Eccleſiaſtical government the Jews had, that the Chriſtians muſt have: But, They were governed by one High-Prieſt, Therefore, Theſe muſt be ſo: He will ſay, that the firſt Propoſition of this Syllogiſm, is altogether as doubtful as the Concluſion; and therefore neither fit nor ſufficient to prove it, until it ſelf be proved. And then beſides, that there is as great reaſon to believe this, That what kind of Civil government the Jews had, that the Chriſtians muſt have. And ſo D. *Potter's* Objection remains ſtill unanſwered: That there is as much reaſon to conclude a neceſſity of one King over all Chriſtian Kingdoms, from the Jews having one King; as one Biſhop over all Churches, from their being under one High-Prieſt.

144. *Ad §.* 24. Neither is this diſcourſe confirmed by *Irenæus* at all: Whether by this diſcourſe you mean that immediatly foregoing, of the Analogy between the Church and the Synagogue, to which this ſpeech of *Irenæus*, alledged here by you, is utterly and plainly impertinent; Or whether by this diſcourſe, you mean (as I think you do) not your Diſcourſe, but your Concluſion which you diſcourſe on, that is, that *Your Church is the infallible Judge in Controverſies.* For neither hath *Irenæus* one ſyllable to this purpoſe; neither can it be deduced out of what he ſays, 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 yield aſſent, who believe in Chriſt, having Salvation written in their hearts by the Spirit of GOD, without Letters or Ink, 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 words juſt as if a man ſhould ſay, If God had not given us the light of the Sun, we muſt have made uſe of Candles and Torches: If we had no eyes, we muſt have felt out our way: If we had no legs, we muſt have uſed crutches. And doth not this in effect import, that while we have the Sun we need no Candles? While we have our eyes, we need not feel out our way? While we enjoy our legs, we need not crutches? And, by like reaſon, *Irenæus* in ſaying, *If we had no Scripture, we muſt have followed Tradition; and they that have none, do well to do ſo*; Doth he not plainly import, 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 inform you, *Non enim per alios*, &c. *we have received the diſpoſition of our Salvation from no others, but from them by whom the Goſpel came unto us. Which Goſpel truly the Apoſtles firſt preached, and afterwards by the will of God delivered in writing to us, to be the Piller and Foundation of our Faith.* Upon 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 doctrin, ſome things are ſimply neceſſary for the Salvation of all men; as the knowledge of the Articles of the Apoſtle's Creed; and beſides, the knowledge of the ten Commandments, and ſome of the Sacraments. Other things are 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 Prelates 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 *ſays, that the Apoſtles wrote what they preached in the World, it is true* ſaith he, *and not againſt Traditions, becauſe they preached*

*preached not to the People all things, but only those things which were neceſſary or profitable for them.*

145. So that at the moſt you can infer 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 ſays) it was *then eaſie to receive the Truth from God's Church; then*, in the Age next after the Apoſtles, Then, when all the Ancient and Apoſtolique Churches were at an agreement about the Fundamentals of Faith: Will it therefore follow, that now, 1600 years after, when the ancient Churches are divided almoſt into as many Religions as they are Churches, every one being the Church to it ſelf, and Heretical to all other, that it is as eaſie, but extreamly difficult or rather impoſſible, to find the Church firſt independently of the true Doctrin, 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 far, 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 anſwer that which is moſt certain and evident, and which I am confident you your ſelf, 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* his 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 Fountain, and that no other than of Apoſtolique Preaching. And this is the very ground of *Tertullian's* ſo often miſtaken *Preſcription againſt Heretiques: Variâſſe 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 miſchief 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 clear truths, we muſt expect nothing but certain and clear contradictions.

148. Neither will the *Apoſtle's depoſiting with the Church all things belonging to truth*, be any proof that the Church ſhall certainly keep this *depoſitum*, entire and ſincere, 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 faithful men: and yet S. *Paul* thought it not ſuperfluous, earneſtly to exhort him to the careful 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* ſays, *The Apoſtles fully depoſited in the Church all truth*, yet he ſays not, neither can we infer from what he ſays, That the Church ſhould always infallibly keep this *depoſitum*, entire, without the loſs of any truth, and ſincere without the mixture of any falſhood.

149. *Ad §. 25.* But you proceed and tell us, *That, beſides all this, the Doctrine of Proteſtants is deſtructive of it ſelf. For either they have certain and infallible means not to err in interpreting; or not. If not, Scripture to them cannot be a ſufficient ground for infallible faith: If they have, and ſo cannot err in interpreting Scripture, then they are able with infallibility to hear and determine all Controverſies of*



*Faith; and ſo they may be, and are, Judges of Controverſies, althought they uſe the Scripture as a Rule. And thus againſt their own doctrine, they conſtitute another Judge 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 doctrin of Papiſts is deſtructive of it ſelf? For either they have certain and infallible means not to err, 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 meerly a phantaſtical) ground for infallible faith, nor a meet Judge of Controverſies: (For unleſs I be infallibly ſure that the Church is infallibile, How can I be upon her Authority infallibly ſure, that any thing ſhe ſays is Infallible?) If they have certain infallible means, and ſo cannot err in the choice of their Church, and in interpreting her Decrees, then they are able with Infallibility to hear, 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 Judge of Controverſies, beſides the Church alone. Nay every one makes himſelf a chuſer of his own Religion, and of his own ſenſe of the Churches Decree, which very thing in Proteſtants they ſo highly condemn: and ſo, in judging others, condemn themſelves.

150. Neither in ſaying thus have I only cried quittance with you: but that you may ſee how much you are in my debt, I will ſhew unto you that for your Sophiſm againſt our way, I have given you a Demonſtration againſt yours. Firſt, I ſay, your Argument againſt us is a tranſparent fallacy. The firſt Part of it lies thus: Proteſtants have no means to interpret, without Errour, obſcure and ambiguous Places of Scripture; therefore plain places of Scripture cannot be to them a ſufficient ground of Faith. But though we pretend not to certain means 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 means of not erring in and about the ſenſe of thoſe places, which are ſo plain and clear that they need no Interpreters; and in ſuch we ſay our Faith is contained. If you ask me, How I can be ſure that I know the true meaning of theſe places? I ask you again, Can you be ſure, that you underſtand what I, or any man elſe ſayes? They that heard our Saviour and the Apoſtles preach, could they have ſufficient aſſurance, that they underſtood at any time what they would hvae them do? If not, to what end did they hear them? If they could, Why may we not be as well aſſured that we underſtand ſufficiently what we conceive plain in their writings?

151. Again, I Pray tell us, whether you do certainly know the ſenſe of theſe Scriptures, with which you pretend you are led to the knowledge of your Church? If you do not, How know you that there is any Church Infallible, and that theſe are the notes of it, and that this is the Church that hath theſe notes? If you do, then give us leave to have the ſame means, 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 means, and ſo cannot err*, methinks you forget your ſelf very much, and ſeem to make no difference between having certain means to do a thing, and the actual doing of it. As if you ſhould conclude, becauſe all men have certain means of Salvation, therefore all men certainly muſt be ſaved, and cannot do otherwiſe; as if, Whoſoever had a horſe muſt preſently get up and ride; Whoſoever had means to find out a way, could not neglect thoſe means and ſo miſtake it. God be thanked that we have ſufficient means 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 do ſo:

and

and you have none at all. If you ask, seeing we may possibly err, How can we be assured we do not? I ask you again, seeing your eye-sight may deceive you, How can you be sure you see the Sun, when you do 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, unless he hath given us certain means 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 means of avoiding error, and to be in no danger nor possibility of error; You infer upon us an absurd Conclusion, *That we make our selves able to determine Controversies of Faith with Infallibility, and Judges of Controversies.* For the latter part of this Inference, we acknowledge and embrace it. We do make our selves Judges of Controversies, that is, we do 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 we are chusers, and you not chusers, but that, we, as we conceive, chuse wisely, but you, being willfully blind, chuse 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, *Judges*, and *Infallible Judges*; unless you will say, either that we have no Judges in our Courts of Civil Judicature, or that they are all Infallible.

154. Thus have we cast off your *Dilemma*, and broken both the horns 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 moral certainty of the things you believe, 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. God's 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 duty, to give a greater assent to the conclusion, than the premisses deserve; 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 do; and tell men, They cannot be saved, unless they believe your Propositions with an infallible Faith. To which end they must believe also your Propounder, your Church to be simply Infallible. Now how is it possible for them to give a rational assent to the Churches infallibility, unless they have some infallible means to know that she is infallible? Neither can they infallibly know the infallibility of this means, but by some other, and so on for ever: unless they can dig so deep as to come at length to the Rock, that is, *to settle all upon something evident of it self*, which is not so much as pretended. But the last resolution of all is into Motives, which indeed upon examination will scarce appear probable, but are not so much as avouched to be any more than very credible. For example, if I ask you, Why you do believe Transubstantiation? What can you answer, but because it is a Revelation of the Prime Verity. I demand again, How can you assure your self or me of that, being ready to embrace it if it may appear to be so? And what can you say, but that you know it to be so, because the Church says so, which is infallible? If I ask, What mean you by your Church? You can tell me nothing but the company of Christians which adhere to the *Pope*. I demand then further: Why should I believe 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 belief. But are these Motives lastly infallible? No say you, but very credible. Well, let them pass for such, because now we have not leisure to examine them. Yet methinks seeing the Motives



Motives to believe the Church's 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 less, that her propositals, particularly Transubstantiation, are Divine Revelations. And me-thinks you should require only a Moral, and modest assent to them, and not a Divine, as you call it, and infallible Faith. But then of these Motives to the Church's 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*: give 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 Judg 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 have not as many, and as great Motives to draw me to them? 5. Whether I have not greater reason to belive you do err, than that you cannot? And now Sir, I pray let me trouble You with a few more Questions. Am I a sufficient Judge 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 contain 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 fifteen contains in it the examination of all Controversies; and not only so, but of all uncontroverted Doctrins. For how shall I, or can I, *know the Church of* Rome's *conformity with the Ancient Church*, unless 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 seem 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 perpetual to it. So that, for ought I can see, Judges we are, and must be of all sides? every one for himself, and God for us all.

155. *Ad §. 26.* I answer; This Assertion, that *Scripture alone is Judge of all controversies in Faith*, if it be taken properly, is neither a Fundamental nor Unfundamental point of Faith, nor no point of Faith at all, but a plain falshood. It is not a *Judge of Controversies, but a rule to judge them by*; and that not an absolutely perfect Rule, but as perfect as a written Rule can be; which must always need something else, which is either evidently true, or evidently credible, to give attestation to it, and that in this case is Universal Tradition. So that Universal Tradition is the Rule to judge all Controversies by. But then because nothing, besides Scripture, comes to us with as full a stream of Tradition as Scripture, Scripture alone, and no unwritten Doctrin, nor no Infallibility of any Church, having attestation from Tradition truly Universal; for this reason we conceive, as the Apostles persons while they were living were the only Judges 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 go in upon half so fair cards, for the Title of Apostolick Tradition, as these things, which by the confession of both Sides are not so: I mean *the Doctrin of the Millenaries*, 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 conceive, that we would be understood, of all those that are possible to be judged 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 he does not, he 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 Jew, it would be vainly done of me, should I press him with the Authority of the New Testament which he believes not; until out of some principles common to us both, I had perswaded him that it is the Word of God. The New Testament therefore, while he remains a Jew, would not be a fit Rule to decide this Controversie; in as much as that which is doubted of it self, 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. *Austin*'s to contain nothing but the Truth of God, and yet not to have been inspired by God himself,) against such men therefore there were no disputing out of the Bible; because nothing in question can be a proof to it self. When therefore we say, Scripture is sufficient means to determine all Controversies, we say not this, either to Atheists, Jews, 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, and consequently not necessary to be believed one way or other; or they may may be determined by Scripture. In a word, That all things necessary to be believed are evidently contained 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 belief, but what hath descended to us from Christ by Original and Universal Tradition: Now nothing but Scripture hath thus descended to us, Therefore nothing but Scripture can challenge our belief. Now then to come up closer to you, and to answer to your Question, not as you put it, but as you should have put it: I say, That this Position, *Scripture alone is the Rule whereby they which believe it to be God's Word, are to judge all Controversies in Faith*, is no fundamental 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 have 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 have said already, that Necessary Controversies may be and 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 means for the ending of them. And, to your Third, I say, that Your pretence of *using these means*, is but hypocritical; for you use them with prejudice, and with a setled resolution not to believe any thing which these means happily may suggest into you, if it any way cross your pre-conceived perswasion of your Church's Infallibility. You give not your selves liberty of judgment in the use of them, nor suffer your selves to be 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 err, therefore it is not infallible; as you are resolute to believe this, The Church is infallible, therefore it doth not err, and therefore it doth not oppose Scripture, though it seem to do 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 confer places*, but it is that you may confirm, or colour over with plausible disguises your erroneous doctrin, not that you may judge of them, and forsake them, if there be reason for it.

*You*



*You consult the Originals*, but you regard them not when they make against your Doctrin or Translation.

158. You add not only the Authority, but the Infallibility, not of God's Church, but of the *Romans*, a very corrupt and degenerous part of it: whereof D. *Potter* never confessed, that it cannot err 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 error, tell you, that you must make use of none of all these to discover any error in the Church, but only to maintain her impossibility of erring. And lastly, D. *Potter* assures himself that your Doctrin and Practices are damnable enough in themselves; Only he hopes (and *spes est rei inexta nomen*) he hopes, I say, that the Truths which you retain, especially the necessity of repentance and faith in Christ, will be as an Antidote to you against the errors which you maintain; and that your superstruction may burn, 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, unless you suppose him infallible; and, if you do, Why do you write against him?

159. Notwithstanding, though not for these reasons, yet for others, I conceive this Doctrin not Fundamental: Because, if a man should believe Christian Religion wholely, 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 performs the entire condition of the new Covenant, which is, that we believe the matter of the Gospel, and not that it is contained in these or these Books. So that the Books 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 Doctrin, as requisite to the wel-being of it. *Irenæus* tells us (as *M. K.* acknowledgeth) of some barbarous Nations, that *believed the Doctrin 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 be a Rule, and a perfect Rule of Faith. Neither doubt I, but if the Books 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 belief and practice 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 Books wherein they are contained. Not but that it were now very strange and unreasonable, if a man should believe the matter of these Books, and not the Authority of the Books: and therefore, if a man should profess the not-believing of these, I should have reason to fear he did not believe that. But there is not always an equal necessity for the belief of those things, for the belief whereof there is an equal reason. We have, I believe, as great reason to believe there was such a man as *Henry* the eighth King of *England*, as that *Jesus 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 him, yet it were no mortal sin, nor no sin 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 perform the whole will of the dead, should fully satisfie 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 Doctrins 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 rational, and concluding or no, I submit to better judgment; but sure I am, that the Corollary, which you draw from this Position, *that this Point is not Fundamental*, 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 private men may err in points not Fundamental. A pretty sophism, depending upon this Principle, that whosoever possibly may err, he cannot be certain that he doth not err. 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 Fundamentals, that even the Fundamentals of Christianity, remain to you uncertain? A Judge may possibly err in judgment, can he therefore never have assurance that he hath judged right? A Traveller may possibly mistake his way, must I therefore be doubtful 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 egg to an egg, or milk to milk.

161. And, *for the self same reason* (you say) *we are not certain, that the Church is not Judge of Controversies*: But now this self same appears to be no reason; and therefore, for all this, we may be certain enough that the Church is no Judge of Controversies. The ground of this sophism 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 Arch-Bishop of *Toledo*, that the whole is not greater than a part of the whole, that twice two make not four: In your opinion, good Sir, are these damnable Heresies? 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 deceitful foundations.

162. Besides (you say) *among publique Conclusions defended in* Oxford, *the year 1633. to the Questions, whether the Church have Authority to determine Controversies of Faith? And to interpret holy Scripture? The Answer 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 self obliged to be of this opinion? If you will, say so: If not, do as you would be done by. Again, me-thinks, so subtile a man as you are, should easily apprehend a wide difference between Authority to do a thing, and Infallibility in doing it: and again, between a Conditional Infallibility and 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 Universal Tradition; and Infallibility while they proceed according to this Rule. As if there should arise an Heretique, that should call in question Christ's Passion and Resurrection, the Church had Authority to decide this Controversie, and infallible direction how to do it, and to excommunicate this man, if he should persist in error. I hope, you will not deny but that the Judges have Authority to determine Criminal and Civil Controversies; and yet, I hope, you will not say, that they are absolutely infallible in their determination. Infallible while they proceed according to Law, and if they do so: but not infallibly certain that they shall ever do so. But that the Church should be infallibly assisted by God's 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 fail to decree the truth, whether she used means



means 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, than you have all this while, that is, just nothing.

163. *Ad §.* 27. To the place of S. *Austin* alledged in this Paragraph, I Answer, First, that in many things you will not be tried by S. *Augustin*'s judgement, nor submit to his Authority; not concerning Appeals to *Rome*, not concerning Transubstantiation, not touching the use and worshipping of Images, not concerning the State of Saint's souls before the day of Judgement, not touching the Virgin *Marie*'s freedom from actual and original sin, not touching the necessity of the Eucharist for Infants, not touching the damning Infants to hell that die without Baptism, not touching the knowledge of Saints departed, not touching Purgatory, not touching the fallibility of Councels, even general Councels; not touching perfection and perspicuity of Scripture in matters necessary to Salvation, not touching Auricular Confession, not touching the half-Communion, not touching prayers in an unknown tongue; In these things, I say, you will not stand to S. *Austin*'s judgment, and therefore can with no reason or equity require us to do 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. *Austin* out of this heat, delivering the Doctrine of Christianity calmly and moderately; where he says, *In iis quæ aperté posita sunt in sacris Scripturis, omnia ea reperiuntur quæ continent fidem, moresque vivendi.* 3. We say, he speaks not of the *Roman* but the Catholike Church, of far greater extent, and therefore of far greater credit and authority than 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 says not that Christ hath recommended the Church to us for *an infallible definer of all emergent Controversies*, but for a *credible witness of ancient Tradition*. Whosoever therefore refuseth to follow the practice 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 practices of the Church, but such as are evidently post-nate to the time of the Apostles, and plainly contrary to the practice of former and purer times. Lastly, it is evident, and even to Impudence it self undeniable, that upon this ground, *of believing 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. *Austin*'s time, and that by S. *Austin* himself: and therefore without controversie this is no certain ground for truth, which may support falshood as well as truth.

164. To the Argument wherewith you conclude, I answer, That though the Visible Church shall always without fail propose so much of God's Revelation, as is sufficient to bring men to Heaven, for otherwise it will not be the visible Church; yet it may sometimes add to this revelation things superfluous, nay, hurtful, nay in themselves damnable, though not unpardonable; and sometimes take from it things very expedient and profitable; and therefore it is possible, without sin, to resist in some things the Visible Church of Christ. But you press 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 usual 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 inferr, 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; unless it be, that she is poor, and oppressed by the Turk, and you are in glory and splendor.

165. Neither

165. Neither is it so easie 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 a state wherein she may be justly opposed*. And lastly, for calling the distinction of *points* into *Fundamental and not Fundamental*, an Evasion, I believe, you will find it easier to call it so, than to prove it so. But that shall be the issue of the Controversie in the next Chapter.

## CHAP. III.

### *That the distinction of Points Fundamental and not Fundamental, is neither pertinent, nor true in our present Controversie. And that the Catholique Visible Church cannot Err, in either kind 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 shews) that they differ only in Points not Fundamental. 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 nevertheless be saved, because those errors were not Fundamental. If you will them to remember, that Christ must always have 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 *Schism* and *Heresie*: they have an Answer (such as it is) that the Catholique Church cannot perish, yet may err in Points not Fundamental, and therefore *Luther* and other Protestants were obliged to forsake her for such errors, under pain of *Damnation*: as if (forsooth) it were *Damnable*, to hold an error not *Fundamental*, nor *Damnable*. If you wonder how they can teach, that both Catholiques and Protestants may be saved in their several Professions: they salve this contradiction, by saying, that we both agree in all Fundamental 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 Fundamental, but only by some general description, or by referring us to the *Apostles Creed*, without determining, what Points therein be Fundamental, or not Fundamental for the matter: and in what sense they be, or be not, such: And yet concerning the meaning of divers Points contained in, 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 remain uncertain, whether or not they disagree from one another, from the ancient Fathers, and from the Catholique Church, in Points Fundamental: 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 hereafter.

2. And to the end, that what shall be said concerning this distinction may be better understood, we are to observe, that there be two precepts which concern 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 explicit belief of some chief Articles of Christian Faith. The other is termed *Negative*, which strictly binds us not to disbelieve, that is, not to believe the contrary of any one Point sufficiently represented to our understandings, as revealed or spoken by Almighty God. The said *Affirmative Precept* (according to the nature of such commands) injoyns 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 severally believed than other: either because they are in themselves more great, and weighty, or else 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 than 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 several 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 general Doctrin will be more clear 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 do him 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 affirm, that God could be deceived, or would deceive, which were to overthrow the whole certainty of our Faith, wherein the thing most principal, is not the Point which we believe, which Divines call the *Material Object*, but the chiefest is the *Motive* for which we believe, to wit, Almighty God's infallible Revelation, or Authority, which they term



term the *Formal Object* of our Faith. In two senses therefore, and with a double relation, Points of Faith may be called Fundamental, 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 express 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 applyed by Protestants. The other sense, according to which Points of Faith may be called *Fundamental*, and necessary to Salvation, with reference to the *Negative* Precept of Faith, is such, that we cannot without grievous sin, 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 be damnable, and to reject others, equally proposed as God's Word, might stand with Salvation. Yea, the obligation of the *Negative* Precept is far more strict, than 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 disbelieve, or deny what he affirmeth; and in this sense sin and damnation are more inseparable from *Error* in Points not *Fundamental*, than from *Ignorance* in Articles *Fundamental*. 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* contains divers Fundamental Points of Faith, as the Deity, Trinity of Persons, Incarnation, Passion, and Resurrection of our Saviour Christ, *&c.* It contains also some Points, for their matter, and nature in themselves not Fundamental; as under what Judge our Saviour suffered, that he was buried, the circumstance of the time of his Resurrection the third day, *&c.* But yet nevertheless, whosoever once knows that these Points are contained in the Apostles *Creed*, the denial of them is damnable, and is in that sense a *Fundamental* error: and this is the precise Point of the present question.

(a) Pag. 209.
(b) Charity Mistaken, c. 8. p. 75.

3. And all that hitherto hath been said, is so manifestly true, that no Protestant or Christian, if he do but understand the terms, and state of the question, can possibly deny it: Insomuch as I am amazed, that men who otherwise are indued with excellent wits, should so enslave themselves to their Predecessors in Protestantism, as still to harp on this distinction, and never regard how impertinently, and untruly it was implyed by them at first, to make all Protestants seem to be of one Faith, because forsooth they agree in Fundamental Points. For the difference amongst Protestants, consists not in that some believe some Points, of which others are ignorant, or not bound expresly to know (as the distinction ought to be applyed;) but that some of them disbelieve, and directly, wittingly, and willingly oppose what others do believe to be testified by the Word of God, wherein there is no difference between Points Fundamental, and not Fundamental: Because, till Points Fundamental 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-Fundamental, which as soon as they come to be sufficiently propounded as divine Truths, they can no more be denied, than Points Fundamental propounded after the same manner. Neither will it avail them to their other end, that, for preservation of the Church in being, it is sufficient that she do not err in Points Fundamental. For, if in the mean time she maintain any one Error against Gods Revelation, be the thing in it self never so small, her Error 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) and quantity of Faith without which none can be saved*, he saith, *It is enough to believe some things by a vertual Faith, or by a general, and as it were, a negative Faith, whereby they are not denied or contradicted*. Now our question is in case that divine Truths, although not Fundamental, be denied and contradicted; and therefore, even according to him, all such denial 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 Fundamental, 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, whatsoever 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 Heretick, and Heresie is a work of the flesh which excludeth from heaven,* (Gal. 5. 20, 21.) *And hence it followeth, that it is FUNDAMENTAL to a Christian's 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 *Fundamental* 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 Fundamental, and not Fundamental; and if any should chance to imagine, that it is against the Foundation of Faith, not to believe Points *Fundamental*, although they be not sufficiently propounded, D. *Potter* doth not admit of this (f) difference betwixt Points Fundamental, and not Fundamental. 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 Heresie, although they believed not our Saviour's Resurrection, (g) which is a very Fundamental Point of Faith. Thus then I argue out of D. *Potter's* own confession: No error is damnable unless 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 general effect of damnation, if the difference arise not from the manner of being propounded. And what now is become of their distinction?

(c) Pag. 211.
(d) Pag. 212.
(e) Pag. 250.
(f) Pag. 246.
(g) Pag. 242.

5. I will therefore conclude with this argument. According to all Philosophy and Divinity, the *Unity* 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 God's Word or Revelation) we must likewise affirm that the *Unity* and *Diversity* of Faith, must be measured by God's Revelation (which is alike for all objects) and not by the smalness, or greatness of the matter which we believe. Now, that the nature of Faith is not taken from the greatness or smalness of the things believed, is manifest; because otherwise one who believes only Fundamental Points, and another, who together with them, doth also believe Points not Fundamental, should have Faith of different natures, yea there should be as many differences of Faith, as there

there are different Points which men believe, according to different capacities or instructions, *&c.* all which consequences are absurd, and therefore we must say, that *Unity in Faith* doth not depend upon Points Fundamental, or not Fundamental, but upon Gods Revelation equally or unequally propos'd: and Protestants pretending an *Unity* only by reason of their agreement in Fundamental Points, do 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 *Formal motive* of Faith, which is God's revelation, and consequently lose all *Faith* and *Unity* therein.

6. The first part of the Title of this Chapter (*That the distinction of Points Fundamental, and not Fundamental 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 concern Points Fundamental, or not Fundamental*. And this I prove by these reasons.

7. It hath been shewed in the precedent Chapter, that the Church is Judge of Controversies; which she could not be, if she could err in any one Point; as D. *Potter* would not deny, if he were once perswaded that she is Judge. Because, if she could err in some Points, we could not rely upon her *Authority* and Judgment in any one thing.

8. This same is proved by the reason we alledged before, that seeing the Church was infallible in all her definitions e're Scripture was written (unless we will take away all certainty of Faith for that time) we cannot with any shew of reason affirm, that she hath been deprived thereof by the adjoyned comfort and help of Sacred Writ.

9. Moreover, to say that the Catholique Church may propose any false Doctrine, maketh her liable to *damnable* sin 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 witness, every falshood is a deadly sin in any private person whatsoever, although the thing be of it self no other material nor prejudicial to any; because the quantity or greatness of that sin 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 Oaths, no *levitas materiæ*, that is *smallness of matter*, can excuse from a moral sacriledge, against the moral vertue of Religion, which respects worship due to God: If, I say, every least falshood be deadly sin in the foresaid kind of Oath, much more pernicious a sin must it be in the *publick person* of the Catholique Church to propound untrue Articles of Faith, thereby fastening God's *prime Verity* to a falshood, and inducing, and obliging the world to do the same. Besides, according to the Doctrine of all Divines, it is not only injurious to God's Eternal Verity, to disbelieve things by him revealed, but also to propose as revealed Truths, things not revealed: as in Commonwealths it is a hainous offence to coin either by counterfeiting, the metal or the stamp, or to apply the King's Seal to a writing counterfeit, although the contents were supposed to be true. And whereas to shew the detestable sin of such pernicious fictions, the Church doth most exemplarily punish all broachers of feigned revelations, visions, miracles, prophecies, *&c.* as in particular appeareth in the Council of (h) *Lateran*; excommunicating such persons; if the Church her self could propose false revelations, she her self should have been the first, and chiefest deserver to have been censured, and, as it were, excommunicated by her self. For (as the Holy Ghost saith in (i) *Job, Doth God need your lye, that for him you may speak deceits?* And that of the *Apocalyps* is most truly verified in fictious revelations: *If any* (k) *shall add to these things, God will add unto him the plagues which are written in this Book*: and D. *Potter* saith, *to add* (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 add false revelations, is, to accuse her of high presumption, and of pernicious errors excluding Salvation.

(h) *Sub Leon.* 10. *Sess.* 11.
(i) *Cap.* 13. *v.* 8.
(k) *Cap. ult. v.* 18.
(l) Pag. 128.

10. Perhaps some will here reply, that although the Church may err, yet it is not imputed to her for sin, by reason she doth not err 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 Fundamental, she cannot but know, that she may err in Points not Fundamental, at least she cannot be certain that she cannot err, and therefore cannot be excused from headlong and pernicious temerity, in proposing Points not Fundamental, to be believed by Christians, as matters of Faith, wherein she can have no certainty, yea, which always 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 always expose her self to danger of falshood and error; and in fact doth always err in the *manner* in which she doth propound any matter not Fundamental; because she proposeth it as a Point of Faith *certainly* true, which yet is always uncertain, if she in such things may be deceived.

12. Besides, if the Church may err in Points not Fundamental, she may err in proposing some Scripture for Canonical, which is not such: or else err in not keeping and conserving from corruptions such Scriptures at are already believed to be Canonical. For I will supposse, that in such Apocryphal Scripture as she delivers, there is no Fundamental 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 Fundamental Error to apply Divine revelation to any Point not revealed, or else must yield, that the Church may err in her *Proposition*, or *Custody* of the Canon of Scripture: and so we cannot be sure whether she hath not been deceived already, in Books 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 obsered, that some Books of Scripture which were not always known to be Canonical, have been afterward received for such; but never any one Book or syllable defined by the Church to be Canonical, was afterward questioned, or rejected for Apocryphal. A sign that God's 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 general promises of our Saviour Christ made to his Church to Points only Fundamental, 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

(m) Mat. 16. 18.
(n) Joan. 16. 13.



ner of interpreting the Scripture, limit the Infallibility of the Apostles words, and preaching, only to Points Fundamental; and whatsoever general Texts of Scripture shall be alledged for their infallibility, they may by D. *Potter*'s example be explicated, and restrained to Points Fundamental. By the same reason it may be farther affirmed, that the Apostles, and other Writers of Canonical Scripture, were indued with infallibility, only in setting down Points Fundamental. 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 Fundamental Points. In this manner D. *Fotherby* hath, *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 express 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 Fundamental, 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* (p) *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 than any since, them) yet it was made to them for the behoof of the Church, and is verified in the Church Universal: But all truth is not simply all but all of some kind. To be lead 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 lie unrevealed in the infinite Treasury of God's Wisdom, wherewith the Church is not acquainted, &c. So then, the Truth is self enforceth us to understand by (all Truths) not simply all, nor 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 directly to the Apostles, and is verified in the Universal 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 Fundamental? 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 Fundamental; so may he restrain, what other Text soever, that can be brought for the universal infallibility of the Apostles or Scriptures. So he may; and so he must, lest otherwise he receive this answer of his own from himself, *How many Truths lie unrevealed in the infinite Treasury of God's Wisdom, wherewith the Church is not acquainted?* And therefore to verifie such general sayings, they must be understood of Truths absolutely necessary to Salvation. Are not these fearful 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.

(o) In his Sermons. S. cap. 2. pag. 50.
(p) Pag. 150.
(q) Joan. c. 16. 13. & c. 14. 16.
(r) Pag. 151, 152.

14. All, that with any colour may be replyed to this Argument, is; That, if once we call any one Book, or parcel of Scripture in question; although for the matter it contain no Fundamental error, yet it is of great importance and Fundamental, by reason of the consequence; because, if once we doubt of one Book received for Canonical, the whole Canon is made doubtful and uncertain, and therefore the infallibility of Scripture must be universal, and not confined within compass of Points Fundamental.

15. I answer: For the thing it self it is very true, that if I doubt of any one parcel of Scripture received for such, I may doubt of all: and thence by the same parity I infer, 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 *Canonical* Books, or any other Points Fundamental, or not Fundamental; which thing being most absurd, and withal most impious, we must take away the ground thereof, and believe that she cannot err in any Point great or small: and so this reply doth much more strengthen what we intend to prove. Yet I add, 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 Fundamental (as in his 7. *Sect.* he pretendeth) then he might be sure, that whensoever he meets with such Points in Scripture, in them, it is infallibly *true*, although it may err in others; and not only *true* but *clear*, because Protestants teach, that, in matters necessary to Salvation, the Scripture is so clear, that all such necessary Truths are either manifestly contained therein, or may be clearly deduced from it. Which Doctrines being put together, to wit: That Scriptures cannot err in Points Fundamental; that they clearly contain all such Points; and that they can tell what Points in particular be such, I mean Fundamental; it is manifest, that it is sufficient for Salvation, that Scripture be infallible only in Points Fundamental. 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 less moment. Neither will they be able to avoid this impiety against holy Scripture, till they renounce their other Doctrins, and in particular, till they believe that Christ's promises to his Church, are not limited to Points Fundamental.

16. Besides, from the fallibility of Christ's Catholique Church in some Points, it followeth, that no true Protestants, learned or unlearned, do or can with assurance believe the universal Church in any one Point of Doctrine. Not in Points of lesser moment, which they call *not-Fundamental*; because they believe that in such Points she may err. Not in *Fundamental*; because they must know what Points be Fundamental, before they go to learn of her, lest otherwise they be rather deluded, than instructed; in regard that her certain, and infallible direction extends only to Points Fundamental. Now, if before they address themselves to the Church, they must know what Points are Fundamental, 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 dreadful menaces, by Fathers, Scriptures, and our blessed Saviour himself, counselled, and commanded to seek, to hear, to obey the Church; St. *Austin* was of a very different mind from Protestants: *If* (saith he) *the* (f) *Church through the whole world practise any of*

(f) Epist. 118.

*these things, to dispute whether that ought to be so done, is a most insolent madness.* And in another place he saith, *That which* (t) *the whole Church holds, and is not ordained by Councels, but hath always been kept, is most rightly believed to be delivered by Apostolical Authority.* The same holy Father teacheth, that the custom of baptizing children cannot be proved by Scripture alone, and yet that it is to be believed, as derived from the Apostles. *The custom 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, unless it were an Apostolical Tradition.* And elsewhere. *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 do not believe. I have 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 faithful 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 at *Ratisbon* gave this round answer: *Nos ab Augustino* (x) *hac in parte liberè dissentimus In this we plainly disagree from Augustin.* Now, if this Doctrine of baptizing Infants be not Fundamental in D. *Potter's* sense, then according to S. *Augustine*, the infallibility of the Church extends to Points not Fundamental. But if on the other side it be a Fundamental Point; then, according to the same holy *Doctor*, we must relie on the authority of the Church for some Fundamental Point not contained in Scripture, but delivered by Tradition. The like argument I frame out of the same Father about the not re-baptizing of those who were baptized by Heretiques, whereof he excellently to our present purpose speaketh in this manner *We follow* (y) *indeed in this matter even the most certain authority of Canonical Scriptures.* But how? consider his words; *Although verily there be brought no example for this Point out of the Canonical Scriptures, yet even in this Point the truth of the same Scripture is held by us, while we do that, which the authority of Scriptures doth recommend, that so, because the holy Scripture cannot deceive us, whosoever is afraid to be deceived by the obscurity of this question, must have 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 observe, 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 self recommends the Church; and therefore relying on her, we relie on Scripture, without danger of being deceived 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 seems D. *Potter* is of opinion that this Doctrin about not re-baptizing 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 have 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 self. Yet if he will needs hold, that this Point is not Fundamental, 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-Fundamental. The same Father in another place, concerning this very question of the validity of Baptism conferred by Heretiques, faith: *The* (a) *Apostles indeed have prescribed nothing of this, but this Custom ought to be believed, to be originally taken from their Tradition, as there are many things that the universal Church observeth, which are therefore with good reason believed to have been commanded by the Apostles, although they be not written.* No less clear is S. *Chrysostom* for the infallibility of the Traditions of the Church. For, treating on these words (2 *Thes* 2. *Stand, and hold the Traditions which you have learned, whether by speech or by Epistle*) he 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 plain with S. *Chrysostom*, 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 approve any Error against Faith, or good manners. *The Church* (saith he) *being* (d) *placed between much chaff and cockle, doth tolerate many things; but yet she doth not approve, nor dissemble, nor do those things which are against Faith, or good life.*

17. And as I have proved that Protestants, according to their grounds, cannot yield infallible assent to the Church in any one Point: so by the same reason I prove, that they cannot relie upon Scripture it self in any one Point of Faith. Not in points of lesser moment (or not Fundamental) because in such Points the Catholique Church, (according to D. *Petter*) and much more any Protestant may err, and think it is contained in Scripture, when it is not. Not in Points Fundamental, because they must first know what Points be Fundamental, before they can be assured, that they cannot err in understanding the Scripture; and consequently, independently of Scripture, they must foreknow all Fundamental Points of Faith: and therefore they do not indeed relie upon Scripture either for Fundamental, or not Fundamental Points.

18. Besides, I mainly urge D. *Potter*, and other Protestants, that they tell us of certain Points which they call Fundamental, and we cannot wrest from them a list in particular of such Points, without which no man can tell whether or no he err in Points Fundamental, and be capable of Salvation. And which is most lamentable, instead 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, Freewill, and such like, to be Fundamental Errors overthrowing the Gospel. Others are not of his mind, as *Melancthon*, who saith, in (f) the opinion of himself, and other his Brethren, *That the Monarchy of the Bishop of* Rome, *is of use, or profit, to this end, that consent of Doctrin may be retained. An agreement therefore may easily be established in this Article of the Pope's Primacy, if other Articles could be agreed upon.* If the Pope's Primacy be a means, *that consent of Doctrine may be retained*, first submit to it, and other Articles will be *easily agreed upon. Luther* also saith of the Pope's Primacy, it may be *born* (g) *withal.* And why then, O *Luther*, did you not bear with it? And how can you and your followers be excused from damnable Schism, who chose rather to divide God's Church, than to bear with that, which you confess may be *born withal*? But let us go forward. That the Doctrine of Free-will, Prayer for the dead, worshipping of Images, Worship and Invocation of Saints, Real presence, Transubstantiation, Receiving under one kind, Satisfaction, and Merit of Works, and the Mass be not Fundamental errors, is taught (*re-*

*spective*)

(t) *Lib.* 4. *de Bapt. cap.* 24.
(u) *Lib.* 10. *de Genesi ad liter. cap* 23
(w) *Serm.* 14. *de verbis Apost. c.* 18.
(x) See *Protocol. Monach. edit.* 2. *p.* 367.
(y) *Lib.* 1. *cont. Cresson. cap.* 32. & 34.
(z) *De Unit. Eccl. cap.* 19
(a) *De Bapt. cont. Donat. l.* 5. *c.* 23.
(b) *Hom.* 4.
(c) *De Sacra Scrip. p.* 678.
(d) *Ep.* 119.
(e) *Instit. l.* 4. *c.* 2.
(f) *Cent. Ep. Theol. Ep.* 74.
(g) *In Assertionib. Art.* 36.



*spective*) by divers Protestants carefully alledged in the *Protestants* (h) *Apology*, &c. as namely by *Perkins, Cartwright, Frith, Fulke, Sparke, Goad, Luther, Reynolds, Whitaker, Tindal, Francis Johnson*, 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 Mass, Prayer to Saints, and for the Dead, Freewill, Presence at Idol-service, Mans Merit, with such like, Justification by Faith alone is by some Protestants affirmed to be the *soul of the* (k) *Church: The only principal origin of* (l) *Salvation, of all other Points of* (m) *Doctrine the chiefest and weightiest.* Which yet, as we have seen is contrary to other Protestants, who teach that Merit of good works is not a Fundamental Error; yea, divers Protestants defend merit of good works, as may be seen in (n) *Brererly.* One would think that the King's Supremacy, for which some blessed men lost their lives, was once amongst Protestants held for a Capital Point: but now D. *Andrews* late of *Winchester* in his Book against *Bellarmine* tells us, that it is sufficient to reckon it among *true Doctrines.* And *Wotten* denies that *Protestants* (o) *hold the King's Supremacy to be an essential Point of Faith.* O freedom of the new Gospel! Hold with Catholiques, the Pope; or with Protestants, the King; or with Puritans, 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 Academical Protestants hold, that Doctrines, about the Supper, Baptism, 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 partial their Assertions be) *Perkins* teacheth, that the Real presence of our Saviour's Body in the Sacrament, as it is believed by Catholiques, is a Fundamental Error; and yet affirmeth the Consubstantiation of *Lutherans*, not to be such, notwithstanding that divers chief *Lutherans*, to their Consubstantiation joyn the prodigious Heresie of Ubiquitation. D. *Usher* in his Sermon of the *Unity of the Catholique Faith*, grants Salvation to the *Æthiopians*, who yet with Christian Baptism joyn Circumcision. D. *Potter* (q) cites the Doctrine of some, whom he termeth men of great learning and judgment: that, *all who profess to love and honour* JESUS CHRIST *are in the visible Christian Church, and by Catholiques to be reputed Brethren.* One of these men of great learning and judgment, is *Thomas Morton*, by D. *Potter* cited in his Margent, whose love and honour to *Jesus Christ*, you may perceive by this saying, that the *Churches of Arians* (who denied our Saviour Christ to be God) *are to be accounted the Church of God, because they do hold the foundation of the Gospel, which is Faith in Jesus Christ the Son 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 prove *Hooker's* and *Morton's* opinion, brings this: *The people of the ten Tribes after their defection, notwithstanding their gross corruption; and Idolatry*, remained still a true Church. We may also, as it seemeth by these mens reasoning, deny the Resurrection, and yet the members of the true Church. For a learned man (saith D. *Potter* (s) in behalf of *Hooker's* and *Morton's* opinion) was anciently made a Bishop of the Catholique Church, though he did professedly doubt of the last Resurrection of our bodies. Dear Saviour! What times do 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 Baptism, if we may use Circumcision, and with the worship of God joyn Idolatry, wherein we do differ from Turks, and Jews? or rather, are we not worse than either of them? If they, who deny our Saviour's Divinity, might be accounted the Church of God, How will they deny that favour to those ancient Heretiques, who denied our Saviour's true humanity? and so the total denial of Christ will not exclude one from being a member of the true Church. S. *Hilary* (t) maketh it of equal 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 Son of God, and the Son of Man, because the one without the other, can give no hope of Salvation.* And yet D. *Potter* saith of the aforesaid Doctrine of *Hooker* and *Morton*: *The* (u) *Reader may be pleased to approve, or reject it, as he shall find cause.* And in another place (w) he sheweth so much good liking of this Doctrine, that he explicateth and proveth the Churches perpetual Visibility by it. And in the second Edition of his Book, he is careful to declare, and illustrate it more at large than he had done before: howsoever, this sufficiently sheweth, that they have no certainty what Points be Fundamental, 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 *Arianism* among Fundamental Errors: 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 prove, that even the denial of the Blessed Trinity may stand with Salvation. Divers Protestants have taught, that the Roman Church, erreth in Fundamental Points. But D. *Potter*, and others teach the contrary, which could not happen if they could agree what be Fundamental Points. You brand the *Donatists* with the note of an error, *in the matter* (y) *and the nature of it properly heretical*; because they taught that the Church remained only with them, in the part of *Donatus*. And yet many Protestants are so far from holding that Doctrine to be a Fundamental Error, that themselves go 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 have no agreement in specifying, what be Fundamental Points; neither have you any means to determine what they be; for, if you have any such means, Why do you not agree? You tell us, the *Creed* contains all Points Fundamental: which, although it were true, yet you see it serves not to bring you to a particular knowledge, and agreement in such Points. And no wonder, For (besides what I have said already in the beginning of this Chapter, and am to deliver more at large in the next) after so much labour and paper spent to prove that the *Creed* contains all Fundamental Points, you conclude: *It remains* (a) *very probable, that the Creed is the perfect Summary of those Fundamental truths, whereof consists the Unity 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, and the sole *Judge* of your Faith, must be Scripture. Scripture doth indeed deliver divine Truths, but seldom doth qualifie them, or declare whether they be, or be not, absolutely necessary to Salvation. You fall (b) heavy upon *Charity Mistaken*, because it demands a particular Catalogue of Fundamental Points, which yet you are obliged in conscience to do, if you be able. For without such a Catalogue, no man can be assured whether or no he have Faith sufficient to Salvation. And therefore take it not in ill part, if we again and again demand such a Catalogue. And that you may see we proceed fairly, I will perform, on our behalf, what



(h) *Tract.* 1. *c.* 2. *Sect.* 14. *after F.*
(i) *Cap.* 1. *v.* 4.
(k) Chark *in the Tower Disputati n, the* 4 *day s conference.*
(l) Fox *Act and Mon. p.* 402.
(m) *The Confession of Bohemia in the Harmony of Confessions, p.* 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. l.* 2. *c.* 6.
(q) *Pag.* 113, 114. *Morton* in his Treatise of the Kingdom of Israel, p 94.
(r) Pag. 121.
(s) Pag. 128.
(t) *Comment. in Mat. cap.* 16.
(u) Pag. 123.
(w) Pag. 253.
(x) *A moderate examination, &c. cap.* 1. *paulo post initium.*
(y) Pag. 126.
(a) Pag. 241.
(b) Pag. 215.

we request of you, and do here deliver a Catalogue, wherein are compriſed all Points by us taught to be neceſſary to Salvation in theſe words: *We are obliged under pain of damnation, to believe whatſoever the Catholique Viſible Church of Chriſt propoſeth, as revealed by Almighty God.* If any be of another mind, 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.

20. For even out of your own Doctrine, that the Church cannot err in Points neceſſary to Salvation, any wiſe man will infer, that it behoves all who have care of their ſouls, 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 Error cannot be Fundamental, nor deſtructive of Faith, and Salvation: neither can they be accuſed of any the leaſt imprudence, in erring (if it were poſſible) with the univerſal Church. Secondly, ſince ſhe is, under pain of eternal damnation, to be believed, and obeyed in ſome things, wherein confeſſedly ſhe is induced with infallibility; I cannot in wiſdom ſuſpect her credit in matters of leſs moment. For who would truſt another in matters of higheſt conſequence, and be afraid to rely on him in things of leſs moment? Thirdly, ſince (as I ſaid) we are undoubtedly obliged not to forſake her in the chiefeſt, or Fundamental Points, and that there is no Rule to know preciſely what, and how many thoſe Fundamental Points be; I cannot without hazard of my ſoul leave her in any one Point, leſt perhaps that Point, or Points, wherein I forſake her, prove indeed to be Fundamental, and neceſſary to Salvation. Fourthly, that Viſible Church, which cannot err in Points Fundamental, 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 err: wherein if he ſpeak true, then to deny any one point in *particular*, which ſhe defineth, or to affirm in *general*, that ſhe may err, puts a man into a 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 harm, becauſe ſhe cannot maintain any damnable error, or practice: but to be divided from her (ſhe being Chriſts Catholique Church) is moſt certainly damnable. Fifthly, the true Church, being in lawful and certain poſſeſſion of Superiority and Power, to command and require Obedience, from all Chriſtians in ſome things; I cannot without grievous ſin withdraw my obedience in any one, unleſs I evidently know, that the thing commanded comes not within the compaſs of thoſe things to which her Power extendeth. And who can better inform me, how far God's Church can proceed, than God's Church her ſelf? Or to what Doctor can the Children and Scholars, with greater reaſon, and more ſecurity fly for direction, than to the *Mother*, and appointed *Teacher* of all Chriſtians: In following her, I ſhall ſooner be excuſed, than in cleaving to any particular Sect, or Perſon, teaching or applying Scriptures againſt her Doctrine, or Interpretation. Sixthly, the fearful examples of innumerable perſons, who, forſaking the Church upon pretence of her Errors, have failed even in Fundamental Points, and ſuffered ſhipwrack of their Salvation, ought to deter all Chriſtians from oppoſing her in any one Doctrine, or practice: as (to omit other, both ancient and modern hereſies) we ſee that divers chief Proteſtants, pretending to reform the corruptions of the Church, are come to affirm, that for many ages ſhe erred to death, and wholly periſhed: which D. *Potter* cannot deny to be a Fundamental Error againſt that Article of our Creed, *I believe the Catholique Church*, as he affirmeth it of the *Donatiſts*, becauſe they confined the Univerſal Church within *Africa*, or ſome other ſmall tract of ſoil. Leſt therefore I may fall into ſome Fundamental Error, it is moſt ſafe for me to believe all the Decrees of that Church which cannot err Fundamentally; eſpecially if we add, That, according to the Doctrine of Catholique Divines, one error in Faith, whether it be for the matter it ſelf, great or ſmall, deſtroys Faith, as is ſhewed in *Charity Miſtaken*; and conſequently to accuſe the Church of any one Error, is to affirm, that ſhe loſt all Faith, and erred damnably: which very ſaying is damnable, becauſe it leaves Chriſt no viſible Church on earth.

(c) Pag. 75. 21. To all theſe arguments I add this Demonſtration: D *Potter* teacheth, that *there neither was* (c) *nor can be any juſt cauſe to depart from the Church of Chriſt, no more than from Chriſt himſelf.* But if the Church of Chriſt can err in ſome Points of Faith, men not only may, but muſt forſake her in thoſe, (unleſs D. *Potter* will have them believe one thing, and profeſs another); and if ſuch errors and corruptions ſhould fall out to be about the Churches Liturgy, publick Service, adminiſtration of Sacraments, & the like; they who perceive ſuch errors, muſt of neceſſity leave her external Communion. And therefore, if once we grant the Church may err, it followeth that men may, and ought to forſake her (which is againſt D. *Potter*'s own words) or elſe they are inexcuſable who left the Communion of the *Roman* Church, under pretence of errors, which they grant not to be Fundamental. And, if D. *Potter* think good to anſwer this argument, he muſt remember his own Doctrine to be, that even the Catholique Church may err in Points not Fundamental.

(d) Pag. 97. 22. Another argument for the univerſal Infallibility of the Church, I take out of D. *Potter*'s 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, unleſs he preſuppoſe that the *Church truly Catholique*, cannot err in Points not Fundamental. For if ſhe may err in ſuch Points, the *Roman* Church which he affirmeth to err only in Points *not Fundamental*, may agree with the *Church truly Catholique*, if ſhe likewiſe may err in Points *not Fundamental*. Therefore either he muſt acknowledge a plain contradiction in his own words, or elſe muſt grant that the *Church truly Catholique* cannot err in Points not *Fundamental*, which is what we intended to prove.

23. If *Words* cannot perſwade you, that in all Controverſies you muſt rely upon the infallibility of the Church; at leaſt yield your aſſent to *Deeds*. Hitherto I have produced Arguments drawn as it were, *ex natura rei*, from the wiſdom and goodneſs of God, who cannot fail to have left ſome infallible means to determine Controverſies, which, as we have 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 prove 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 ask my* (f) *Father, and he will give you another Paraclete, that he may abide with you for ever, The Spirit of Truth.* And, *But when he, the Spirit of* (g) *Truth cometh, he ſhall teach you all Truth.* The Apoſtle ſaith, that the Church is *the Pillar, and ground of* (h) *Truth.* And, *He gave ſome Apoſtles, and ſome Prophets, and other ſome Evangeliſts, and other ſome Paſtors and Doctors to the conſummation of the ſaints unto the work of the*

(e) Mat. 16.
(f) Joan. 14.
(g) Joan. 16.
(h) 1 Tim. c. 3.



*Miniſtry, unto the edifying of the Body of Chriſt: until we meet all into the unity of Faith, and knowledge of the Son of God, into a perfect man, into the meaſure of the age of the fulneſs of Chriſt: that now we be not children, wavering, and carried about with every wind of Doctrine in the wickedneſs of men, in craftineſs, to the circumvention* (i) *of Error.* All which words ſeem clearly enough to prove, that the Church is univerſally infallible, without which, unity of Faith could not be conſerved againſt *every wind of Doctrine*. And yet D. *Potter* (k) limits theſe promiſes and priviledges to *Fundamental* Points, in which he grants the Church cannot err. I urge the words of Scripture which are univerſal, and do not mention any ſuch reſtraint. I alledge that moſt reaſonable, and received Rule, that Scripture is to be underſtood literally, as it ſoundeth, unleſs ſome manifeſt abſurdity force us to the contrary. But all will not ſerve, to accord our different interpretation. In the mean time divers of D. *Potter*'s 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 have as much right as theſe, to interpoſe their opinion and interpretation. Behold we are three at debate about the ſelf-ſame words of Scripture: We conſer divers places and Texts: We conſult the Originals: We examine Tranſlations: We endeavour to pray heartily: We profeſs to ſpeak ſincerely: To ſeek nothing but Truth, and Salvation of our own Souls, and that of our Neighbours; and finally, we uſe all thoſe means, which by Proteſtants themſelves are preſcribed for finding out the true meaning of Scripture: Nevertheleſs we neither do, or have any poſſible means to agree, as long as we are left to our ſelves; and when we ſhould chance to be agreed, the doubt would ſtill remain whether the thing it ſelf be a *Fundamental* Point or no: And yet it were great impiety to imagine that God, the lover of Souls, hath left no certain infallible means, 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 hear Gods Viſible Church, with ſubmiſſive 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 pains, follow the way of the Catholique Diſcipline, which from Chriſt himſelf, by the Apoſtles, hath come down even to us, and from us ſhall deſcend to all poſterity.* And though I conceive that the diſtinction of Points *Fundamental*, and not *Fundamental*, hath now been ſufficiently confuted; yet that no ſhadow of difficulty may remain, I will particularly refel 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 Fundamental Points of Faith.

(i) Epheſ. 4.
(k) Pag. 152, 153.
(l) *De Vitil. cred. cap.* 8.

## The ANSWER to the THIRD CHAPTER.

*Wherein it is maintained, That the diſtinction of Points* Fundamental *and* not Fundamental, *is in this preſent Controverſie good and pertinent: And that the Catholique Church may err in the latter kind 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 firm and ſtable, or, if it be not, it cannot be for any default in this Diſtinction.

2. *If you object to them diſcords in matter of Faith without any means of agreement,* They will anſwer you, that they want not good and ſolid means of agreement in matters neceſſary to Salvation, *viz.* Their belief 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 mutual ſuffering one another *to abound in their ſeveral ſenſe*, in matters not plainly and undoubtedly there delivered. And for their agreement in all Controverſies of Religion, either they have means to agree about them, or not: If you ſay they have, why did you before deny it; If they have not means, why do you find fault with them, for not agreeing?

3. You will ſay, that their fault is, that *by remaining Proteſtants, they exclude themſelves from the means of agreement, which you have*, and which by ſubmiſſion to your Church they might have alſo. But if you have means 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 have no means to do it, or elſe know of none they have, which puts them in the ſame caſe, as if they had none: or they which profeſs to have an eaſie and expedite means to do it, and

and yet still leave it undone? *If you had been blind* (saith our *Saviour* to the *Pharisees*) *you had had no sin; but now you say you see, therefore your sin remaineth.*

4. If you say, you *do 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 do agree. And do not Protestants do so likewise? Do not they agree in those things, wherein they do agree?

5. But *you are all agreed, that only those things wherein you do agree are matters of Faith.* And Protestants, if they were wise, would do so too. Sure I am they have reason enough to do 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 plainly revealed: and with an implicite Faith, in that sense of the whole Scripture which God intended whatsoever was. Secondly, That which you pretend is false; or else, why do 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 unlawful to refuse it, and allow the refusing of it? Why do 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 Actual sin; 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 Universal Tradition, and consequently *de Fide*, that the *Virgin Mary* was conceived in original sin, Others the contrary.

6. But what shall we say now, if you be not agreed touching your pretended means of Agreement, how then can you pretend to Unity either Actual or Potential more than Protestants may? Some of you say, the Pope alone without a Council may determine all Controversies: But others deny it. Some, that a general Council without a Pope may do so: Others deny this. Some, Both in conjunction are infallible determiners: Others again deny this. Lastly, some among you, hold the Acceptation of the Decrees of Councils by the Universal 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 receive not the Decree, therefore the whole Church hath not received it?

7. Again, Means of agreeing differences are either rational and well-grounded, and of Gods appointment; or voluntary and taken up at the pleasure of men. Means of the former nature, we say, you have as little as we. For where hath God appointed, that the Pope, or a Council, or a Council confirmed by the Pope, or that Society of Christians which adhere to him, shall be the *infallible Judge of Controversies*? I desire you to shew any one of these Assertions plainly 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 terms by any one Father for four hundred years after Christ. And if you cannot do this (as I am sure you cannot) and yet will still be obtruding your selves upon us for our Judges, Who will not cry out,

——*perisse frontem de rebus?*

8. But then for means of the other kind, such as yours are, we have great abundance of them. For besides all the ways which you have devised, which we may make use of when we please, we have a great many more, which you yet have never thought of, for which we have as good colour out of Scripture, as you have for yours. For first, we 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 refer 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 judgment.* (c) *The Heart of the King is in the hand of the Lord.* We could refer the matter to any Assembly of Christians

(a) Prov. 16. 33.
(b) Prov. 16. 10.
(c) Prov. 21. 1.



Christians assembled in the Name of Christ, seeing it is written, (d) *Where two or three are gathered together in my Name, there am I in the midst of them.* We may refer it to any Priest, because it is written, (e) *The Priests lips shall preserve knowledg.* (f) *The Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses chair, &c.* To any Preacher of the Gospel, 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:* and 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 again, (k) *He hath given Pastors, and Doctors, &c lest we should be carryed about with every wind of Doctrin.* To any particular Church of Christians, seeing it is a particular Church which is called (l) *The house of God, the Pillar and 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 Publican.* We might refer 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 wisdom, let him ask of God, who giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not.* Lastly, we might refer it to the Jews, for without all doubt of them it is written, (p) *My Spirit that is in thee, &c.* All these means of agreement, whereof not any one but hath as much probability from Scripture, as that which you obtrude upon us, offer themselves upon a sudden to me: haply 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 means to determine differences, we had them in great abundance. And if you say, These would fail us and contradict themselves: So as we pretend, yours have. There have been Popes against Popes: Councels against Councels: Councels confirmed by Popes against Councels confirmed by Popes: Lastly, the Church of some Ages against the Church of other Ages.

(d) Mat. 18. 20.
(e) Mal. 2. 7.
(f) Mat. 23. 2.
(g) Mat. 28. 20.
(h) Luk. 10. 16.
(i) Heb. 13. 17.
(k) Eph. 4. 14.
(l) 1 Tim. 3. 15
(m) Mat. 18. 17.
(n) Mat. 7. 8.
(o) Jam. 1. 5.
(p) Isa. 59. 21.

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

10. But *they are convinced sometimes even by their own confessions, that the Ancient Fathers taught divers Points of Popery: and then they reply, those Fathers may nevertheless be saved, because those errors were not Fundamental all.* And may not you also be convinced 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*? Do not your *Purging Indexes* clip the tongues, and seal up the lips of a great many for such confessions? And is not the above-cited confession of your *Doway* Divines, plain and full to the same purpose? And do not you also, as freely as we, charge the Fathers with errors, and yet say they were saved. Now what else do we understand by an *unfundamental* 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 return 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 perpetual Visibility, and perpetual Purity. As for the Answer 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 Fundamental; and that Protestants were obliged 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

confound them) *to forsake the errors of the Church*, and to *forsake the Church*: or to *forsake the Church in her error*, 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 separate *per omnia*; but only in those practices which they conceived superstitious or impious. If you would at this time propose a form of Liturgy, which both Sides hold lawful, and then they would not joyn 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 unlawful practices, and for this reason, they (*not absolutely, but thus farre*) separate from your Communion. And this, I say, they were obliged to do under pain of damnation. *Not as if it were damnable to hold an error not damnable*, but because it is damnable outwardly to profess and maintain it, and to joyn with others in the practice of it, when inwardly they did not hold it. Now had they continued in your Communion, that they must have done, *viz.* have professed to believe, and externally practised 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 damnabe dissimulation and hypocrisie, I leave it to you to judge. You your self tell us within two pages after this, *That you are obliged, never to speak any one least lye against your knowledge*, p. 2. Now what is this but to live in a perpetual lye?

12. As for that which in the next place you seem so to wonder at That *both Catholiques and Protestants, according to the opinion of Protestants, may be saved in their several professions, because forsooth, we both agree in all Fundamental points.* I Answer, this Proposition so crudely set dow, as you have here set it down, I know no Protestant will justifie. For you seem to make them teach, that it is an indifferent thing, for the attainment of Salvation, whether a man believe the Truth or the Fallhood; 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 means to find the Truth, and so dye in Error; or use the best means 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 means to find the Truth, and will not use them, they conceive, though their case be dangerous, yet if they die with a general repentance for all their sins, known and unknown, 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 than is simply, and indispensably necessary to salvation.

13. *But seeing we make such various use of this Distinction, is it not prodigiously strange that we will never be induced to give in a particular Catalogue what points be Fundamental?* 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 little is given, little shall be required.* To Infants, Deaf-men, Mad-men, nothing, for ought we know, is given; and if it be so, of them *nothing* shall be required. Others perhaps may have means only given them to believe, (b) *That God is, and that he is a Rewarder of them that seek him*; and to whom thus much only is given, to them it shall not be damnable, that they believe but only thus much. Which me thinks is very manifest from the Apostle, in the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, where having first said, *That without Faith it is impossible to please God*, he subjoyns as his reason, *For whosoever cometh unto God, must believe that God is, and that he is a Rewarder of them that seek him.*

(a) Luk 12 48.

(b) Heb. 11. 6.



*him.* Where, in my opinion, this is plainly intimated, that this is the *minimum quod 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 means of rising higher are deficient. Besides, if without this belief, *That God is, and that he is a Rewarder of them that seek him*, God will not be pleased, then his will is, that we should believe it. Now his will it cannot be, that we should believe a Fallhood, It must be therefore true, that he is a Rewarder of them that seek 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 immediately to Salvation without Christ, but with bringing them according to his good pleasure, first, to Faith in Christ, and so to Salvation. To which belief the Story of *Cornelius* in the 10. *Chapter 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 believed not in Christ, but was a meer Gentile, and one that knew not but men might be worshipped, and yet we are assured, *that his prayers and alms* (even while he was in that state) *came up for a memorial before God; That his prayer was heard, and his Alms had in remembrance in the sight of God*, ver. 4. That upon his *Then fearing God, and working righteousness*, (such as it was) *he was accepted with God.* But how accepted? Not to be brought immediately to Salvation, but to be promoted to a higher degree of the knowledg of Gods will: For so it is in the 4. and 5. v. *Call for* Simon *whose firname is* Peter, *he shall tell thee what thou oughtest to do*: and at the 33. v. *We are all here present before God, to hear all things that are commanded thee of God.* So that though even in his Gentilism, he was accepted in his present state, yet if he had continued in it, and refused to believe in Christ after the sufficient revelation of the Gospel to him, and God's will to have him believe 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 darkness more than 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 and fundamental to believe In Christ, that is, to expect remission of sins and Salvation from him, upon the performance of the conditions he requires; among which conditions one is, that we believe what he hath revealed, when it is sufficiently declared. to have been revealed by him: For by doing so, *we set to our seal, that God is true, and that Christ was sent by him.* Now that may be sufficiently declared to one (all things considered,) which (all things considered) to another is not sufficiently declared: and consequently that may be fundamental and necessary to one, which to another is not so. Which variety of Circumstances, makes it impossible to set down an exact Catalogue of Fundamentals, 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 give you a garment that will fit all statures; or to make you a Dial to serve all Meridians; or to design particularly, what provision will serve an Army for a year: whereas there may be an Army of ten thousand, there may be of one hundred thousand. And therefore without setting down a Catalogue of Fundamentals 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 less of them to whom he gives less) we must content our selves by a general description to tell you what is Fundamental. and to warrant us in doing so, we have your own example p. 19. where being engaged to give us a Catalogue of Fundamentals, instead thereof you tell us only in general, *That all is Fundamental, and not to be disbelieved under pain of damnation, which the Church hath defined.* As you therefore think it enough to say in general, *That all is fundamental which the Church hath defined*, without setting down in particular a compleat Catalogue of all things, which in any Age the Church hath defined (which, I believe, you will not undertake to do; and if you do, it will be contradicted by your Fellows:) So in reason you might

think it enough for us also to say in general, *That it is sufficient for any mans salvation to believe that the Scripture is true, and contains all things necessary for salvation; and to do his best endeavour to find and believe the true sense of it*: without delivering any particular Catalogue of the Fundamentals 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, meerly 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 err from the true and intended sense of some, nay of many obscure and ambiguous Texts of Scripture, yet we may be sure enough, that we err not damnably: because, if we do indeed desire and endeavour to find the Truth, we may be sure we do so, and as sure that it cannot consist with the revealed goodness of God, to damn him for error, that desires and indeavours to find the Truth.

15. *Ad §. 2.* The effect of this Paragraph (for as much as concerns 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 affirms that to be Truth, which he either knows to be not a Truth, or which he doth not know to be a Truth: and therefore without all controversie this is a damnable sin.* To this I subscribe with hand and heart: adding withall that not only he which knows, 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 sin of derogation from Gods most perfect and pure Veracity.

16. *Ad §. 3.* I said purposely (*known by himself, and believes himself*) For as, without any disparagement of a mans honesty, I may believe something to be false, which he affirms, of his certain knowledge to be true; provided I neither know nor believe that he hath so affirmed: So without any the least dishonour to Gods eternal 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 Fundamental, and damnable Errors to disagreeing Protestants; Because forsooth, *some of them disbelieve, and directly, wittingly, and willingly oppose, what others do believe to be testified by the Word of God.* The sophistry of your Discourse will be apparent, if it be contrived into a Syllogism: Thus therefore in effect you argue;

Whosoever disbelieves any thing known by himself to be revealed by God, imputes falshood to God, and therefore errs fundamentally:

But some Protestants disbelieve those things, which Others believe to be testified by God;

Therefore they impute falshood to God, and err Fundamentally.

Neither can you with any colour pretend, that in these words *known to be testified by God*, you meant, *not by himself, but by any other*: Seeing he only in fact affirms, that God doth deceive or is deceived, who denies some things which himself knows or believes to be revealed by God, as before I have demonstrated. For otherwise, if I should deny belief to some things 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 evidently false. Besides, how can it be avoided, but the Jesuits and Dominicans and Franciscans must upon this ground differ Fundamentally, and one of them err damnably; seeing the one of them disbelieves, and willingly opposes, what the others believe to be the Word of God?

18. Whereas



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 do 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 others 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 do 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 answer, 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 do not believe.

19. But, ignorance of what we are expresly bound to know, is it self 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 yield that one side must of necessity be in a mortal crime. But for want of proof of this, you content your self only to say it; and therefore I also might be contended only to deny it, yet I will not, but give a reason for my denyal. 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 hath 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 Syllogism 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 understand. Besides, though we grant that Scripture, Reason, and Authority, were all on one side, and the appearances of the other side all easily answerable: yet if we consider the strange power that Education, and Prejudices instilled by it, have over even excellent understandings, we may well imagine, that many truths which in themselves 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 judgment with us for those things, which, all things considered, were unavoidable.

20. *But till Fundamentals* (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 unfundamental being thus sufficiently proposed as divine Truths, may not be denyed: Therefore you conclude, there is no difference between them. Ans.* A Circumstantial point may by accident become Fundamental, because it may be so proposed, that the denyal of it, will draw after it the denyal of this Fundamental truth, *That all which God says is true.* Notwithstanding in themselves there is a main difference between them: *Points fundamental being those only which are revealed by God, and commanded to be preacht to all, and believed by all. Points Circumstantial, being such, as though God hath revealed them, yet the Pastors of the Church are not bound under pain 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 fundamental, is not sufficient for the preservation of the Church; because any Error 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 do so; for *ipso Facto* in doing it, it were a Church no longer. But, if you mean against some Revelation, which the Church by error thinks to be no Revelation, it

is false. The Church may ignorantly dis-believe such a Revelation, and yet continue a Church; which thus I prove: That the Gospel was to be preached to all Nations, was a Truth revealed before our Saviour's Ascension, in these words, *Go and teach all Nations*, Mat. 28. 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*, until the conversion of *Cornelius*; and yet was still a Church. Therefore to disbelieve 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 plain Revelation of God, that (a) the Sacrament of the Eucharist *should be administred in both kinds*: and (b) that the publique Hymns and *Prayes 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 veil before their eye, their Churches supposed Infallibility; I hope, the denial of them shall not be laid to their charge, no otherwise than as building hay and stubble on the Foundation, not overthrowing the Foundation it self.

(a) 1 Cor. 11. 28.
(b) 1 Cor. 14. 15, 16, 26.

22. *Ad §.* 2. In the beginning of this Paragraph, we have this Argument against this Distinction; *It is enough (by D.* Potter's *confession) to believe some things negatively*, i. e. *not to deny them*; *Therefore all denial of any divine truth excludes Salvation.* As if you should say, One Horse is enough for a man to go a journey; Therefore without a Horse no man can go a journey. As if some Divine Truths, *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 have concluded as you do: but now, that some may not be denied, and that some may be denied without damnation, why they may not both stand together, I do not yet understand.

23. In the remainder you infer out of D. *Potter*'s words, *That all errors are alike damnable, if the manner of propounding the contrary Truths be not different*: which, for ought I know, all Protestants, and all that have sense must grant. Yet I deny your Illation from hence, That *the distinction of points into Fundamental and Unfundamental, is vain and uneffectual for the purpose of Protestants.* For though being alike proposed as divine Truths, they are by accident alike necessary, yet the real difference still remains 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 believe, have 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 have different Faiths, but from the Motive to it.* 3. *This Motive is Gods Revelation.* 4. *This Revelation is alike for all objects.* 5. *Protestants disagree in things equally revealed by God*: *Therefore they forsake the formal motive of Faith*: *and therefore have 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 disordered for the form, and the Conclusion utterly inconsequent. First, for the second Proposition; Who knows not that the Essence of all Habits (and therefore of Faith among the rest) is taken from their Act, and their Object? If the Habit be general, from the Act and Object in general; if the Habit be special, from the Act and Object in special. Then for the Motive to a thing; that it cannot be of the Essence of the thing to which it moves, who can doubt that knows that a Motive is an efficient cause, and that the efficient is always extrinsecal to the effect? For the fourth, that *Gods Revelation is alike for all objects*, It is ambiguous: and if the sense of it be, that his Revelation is an equal Motive to induce us to believe all objects revealed by him, it is true, but impertinent: If the sense of it be, that all objects revealed by God are alike (that is, alike plainly and undoubtedly) revealed by him, it is pertinent, but most untrue. Witness the great diversity of Texts of Scripture, whereof some are so plain and 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 fifth; *Protestants disagree in things equally revealed by God*! In themselves 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 believe such a sense of Scripture, others to believe another; which to say that God will not take into his consideration in judging mens opinions, is to disparage his goodness. 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 revealed to either? The sense of this Scripture, *Why are they then baptiz'd for the dead*? and this, *He shall be saved, yet so as by fire*, and a thousand others, are equally revealed to you and to another Interpreter, that is, certainly to neither. He now conceives one sense of them, and you another; And would it not be an excelent Inference, if I should conclude now as you do; That you forsake the formal motive of Faith, which is Gods Revelation, and consequently lose all Faith and Unity therein? So likewise the Jesuites and Dominicans, the Franciscans and Dominicans, disagree about things equally revealed by Almighty God: and seeing they do 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 have failed of your undertaking in your first part of your Title, and that is a very ill *omen*, especially in points of so streight mutual dependance, that we shall have but slender performance in your second Assumpt. Which is, *That the Church is infallible in all her Definitions, whether concerning Points Fundamental, or not Fundamental.*



25. *Ad §.* 7. *&* 8. The Reasons in these two Paragraphs, as they were alledged 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 sin, either deny any thing to be Truth, which she knows to be Gods Truth*: or propose *any thing as his Truth, which she knows not to be so.* But that she may not do this by ignorance or mistake, and so without damnable sin, that you should have proved, but have not. But, say you, *This excuse cannot serve*: *for if the Church be assisted only for Points Fundamental, she cannot but know that she may err in points not Fundamental.* Answ. It does not follow, unless you suppose, that the Church knows that she is assisted no farther. But if, being assisted only so far, she yet did conceive by errour her assistance absolute and unlimited, or, if knowing her assistance restrained to Fundamentals, she yet conceived by errour, that she should be guarded, from proposing any thing but what was fundamental, then the consequence is apparently false. *But at least she cannot be certain that she cannot err, and therefore cannot be excused from headlong and pernicious temerity in proposing points not fundamental, to be believed by Christians as matters of Faith.* Ans. Neither is this deduction worth any thing, unless it be understood of such unfundamental points, as she 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*? She builds without a foundation, and *says*, *Thus saith the Lord*, *when the Lord doth not say so*: which cannot be excused from rashness and high presumption; such a presumption, as an Embassadour should commit, who should say in his Masters name that for which he hath no Commission; Of the same nature, I say, but of a higher strain: as much as the King of Heaven, is greater than any earthly King. But though she may err in some points not fundamental, yet may she have 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

Fundamental,

Fundamental, *i. e.* no essential parts of Christianity; yet are evidently, and undeniably set down in Scripture, and consequently, may be without all rashness proposed by the Church as certain 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 deceive me, yet I am certain enough that I see what I see, and feel what I feel. Our Judges are not infallibile in their judgments, yet are they certain enough, that they judge a right, and that they proceed according to the Evidence that is given, when they condemn a Thief, or a murderer to the Gallows. A Traveller is not always certain of his way, but often mistaken: and doth it therefore follow that he can have no assurance that *Charing-cross* is his right way from the *Temple* to *White-Hall*? The ground of your Error here is your not distinguishing between Actual 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 straightness 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 certain of the Truth of some particular Decrees, and yet not certain that she shall never decree but what is true.

27. *Ad* §. 12. *But if the Church may err in points not fundamental, she may err in propoſing Scripture, and ſo we cannot be aſſured whether ſhe have not been deceived already.* The Church may err 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 have we sufficient certainty of Scripture, not from the bare testimony of any present Church, but from Universal 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: Unless the Church be infallible, we can have no certainty of Scripture from the Authority of the Church: Therefore unless 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 rational assurance we can have of it, than such as we have of the incorruption of other ancient Books, that is, the consent of ancient Copies: such, I mean *for the kind*, though it be far *greater for the degree of it*. And if the Spirit of God give any man any other Assurance hereof, this is not rational and discursive, but supernatural and infused. An Assurance it may be to himself, but no Argument to another. As for the infallibility of the Church; it is so far from being a proof of Scriptures Incorruption that no proof 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) than any other, and made to speake as they do, 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 says so, which is infallible: I would demand again touching this very thing, That there is an Infallible Church, seeing it is not of it self evident, how shall I be assured of it? And what can he answer, but that the Scripture says so, in these and these places? Hereunto I would ask 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



for their purpose. If to this he answer again, that the Church is infallible and therefore cannot do; 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 Books, which were not always known to be Canonical have been afterwards received for such. But never any Book or Syllable defined for Canonical, was afterwards questioned or rejected for Apocryphal:* I demand, touching the first sort, Whether they were commended to the Church by the Apostles as Canonical? 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 Canonical? 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 Canon of Scripture, which hath suffered some Books of Canonical Scripture to be lost? and others to lose for a long time their being Canonical, at least, the necessity of being so esteemed, and afterwards, as it were by the law of *Postliminium* hath restored their Authority and Canonicalness unto them? If this was delivered by the Apostles to the Church, the point was sufficiently discussed, and therefore your Churche's 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 Canonical, was afterwards questioned or rejected for Apocryphal:* Certainly it is a bold Asseveration, but extremely false. For I demand, The Book of *Ecclesiasticus* and *Wisdom*, *the Epistle of St. James*, and *to the Hebrews*, were they by the Apostles approved for Canonical: or no? If not, With what face dare you approve them, and yet pretend that all your doctrin is Apostolical? Especially, seeing it is evident that this point is not deducible by rational 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 do so, then I shall be bold to ask you, what Books you meant in saying before, *Some Books which were not always known to be Canonical, have been afterwards received*? Then for the Book of *Macchabees*, I hope, you will say it was defined for Canonical before S. *Gregorie*'s 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 do not amiſs, if we produce a teſtimony out of Books, although not Canonical, yet ſet forth for the edification of the Church. For Eleazar in the Book of Macchabees*, &c. Which, if it be not to reject it from being Canonical, is, without question, at least to question it. Moreover, because you are so punctual, 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. years 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 questioned by *Sixtus*; If different from both, then was it questioned and condemned by both, and still lies under the condemnation. But then lastly, Suppose

pose it had been true, *That both some Book not known to be Canonical had been received*, and that *never any, after receiving had been questioned*: How had this been a sign that the Church is infallibly assisted by the Holy Ghost? In what mood or figure would this Conclusion follow out of these Premisses? Certainly, your flying to such poor signs as these are, is to me a great sign, that you labour with penury of better Arguments: and that thus to catch at shadows and bulrushes, is a shrewd sign of a sinking cause.

30. *Ad* §. 13. We are told here, *That the general promises of Infallibility to the Church, must not be restrained only to points Fundamental; Because then the Apostles words and writings may also be so restrained.* The Argument put in form, 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 Fundamentals:

Therefore neither is the Church's Infallibility thus to be limited. Or thus;

The Apostles Infallibility in their Preaching and Writing may be limited to Fundamentals, 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 answer, 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 justly and rightly*, It is very pertinent, but very false. So that as D. *Potter limits the infallibility of the Present Church unto Fundamentals, so another may limit the Apostles unto them also.* He may do it *de facto*, but *de jure* 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 Controversie will be at end. Besides, there is not the same reason for the Churche's 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 wise men have the ordering of the building, they will make it much a surer thing, that the foundation shall not fail the building, than 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, than the adherence of the structure to it. Now the Apostles, and Prophets, and Canonical 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 to be greater then the Churche's, which is built upon them. Again, a dependant 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 straitness of the thing regulated, upon the straitness 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 hath free-will, and is subject to passions and error: Therefore the Churche's 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



the Apostles were, shew it as the Apostles did; *They went forth* (saith S. *Mark*) *and preached every where, the Lord working with them, and confirming their words with Signs following.* It is impossible that God should lye, and that the eternal Truth should set his hand and seal to the confirmation of a falshood, or of such Doctrin as is partly true, and partly false. The Apostles Doctrin 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 error, 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 Saviour's expres's Warrant and Injunction, *To go and preach to all Nations*, yet until 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 unlawful for them, to go or preach the Gospel to any but the Jews.

32. And for those things which they profess 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 do so, and not contradict the Apostles and God himself. Therefore when S. *Paul* says, in the 1 Epist. to the *Corinth.* 7. 12. *To the rest speak I, not the Lord*; And again, *Concerning Virgins I have no commandment of the Lord, but I deliver my judgment*: If we will pretend that the Lord did certainly speak, what S. *Paul* spake, and that his judgment was God's commandment, 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 judgment 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 these things which they spake, of certain knowledg*) 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 speaks the words you cavil at. D. *Stapleton*, saith he, *p.* 140. is full and punctual to this purpose: then sets down the effect of his discourse *l.* 8. *Princ. Doct.* 4. *c.* 15. and in that, the words you cavil at; and then *p.* 150. he shuts up this Paragraph with these words, Thus D. *Stapleton*. So that, if either the Doctrin, or the Reason, be not good, D. *Stapleton* not D. *Potter* is to answer for it.

33. Neither do D. *Potter*'s ensuing words *limit the Apostles infallibility 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 Spirit's guidance, and consequently infallibility in a more high and absolute manner than any since them.* From whence, thus I argue: He 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 than 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 Spirit's infallible guidance in a more high and absolute manner*; Therefore he limits not the Apostles infallibility to Fundamentals. I once knew a man out of courtesie help a lame dog over a stile, and he for requital bit him by the fingers: Just so you serve D. *Potter*. He out of courtesie 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 conditional, limited, moderate, secundary senses, they may be understood of the Church. But says, 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 courtesie in granting

you thus much, cavil at him, as if he had preſcribed theſe bounds to the Apoſtles alſo, as well as the preſent Church. Whereas, he hath explained himſelf to the contrary, both in the clauſe fore-mentioned, *The Apoſtles, who had the Spirit's guidance in a more high and abſolute manner than any ſince them*; and in theſe words enſuing, *whereof the Church is ſimply ignorant*; and again, *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 fear, craftily have concealed: *How many obſcure Texts of Scripture which ſhe underſtands not? How many School-Queſtions which ſhe hath not, happily cannot determine? And for matters of fact, it is apparent that the Church may err*; and then concludes, *That we muſt underſtand by All truths, not ſimply All, But* (if you conceive 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 themſelves; for that *All which they were lead 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 freedom from error in all thoſe things which they delivered conſtantly, as certain revealed Truths. For, if we once ſuppoſe they may have erred in ſome things of this nature, it will be utterly undiſcernable what they have erred in, and what they have not. Whereas though we ſuppoſe the Church hath erred in ſome things, yet we have means to know, what ſhe hath erred in, and what ſhe hath not. I mean by comparing the Doctrin of the preſent Church, with the Doctrin of the Primitive 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 be underſtood only of Truths abſolutely neceſſary to ſalvation; Is it conſequent that he makes their Preaching and Writing not infallible in points not Fundamental? Do you not bluſh for ſhame at this Sophiſtry? The Doctor ſays, no more was promiſed in this place; Therefore he ſays 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 propoſed by them as Divine Truths, the like muſt be affirmed of the Church, becauſe D.* Potter *teacheth the ſaid promiſe to be verified in the Church.* True, he doth ſo, but not in ſo abſolute a manner. Now what is oppoſed to Abſolute, but Limited, or reſtrained? To the Apoſtles then it was made, and to them only, yet the words are true of the Church. And this very promiſe might have 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 far as ſhe doth adhere to it.* In a word, the Apoſtles were lead 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 Star and the Wiſemen. The Star was directed by the finger of God, and could not but go right to the place where Chriſt was: But the Wiſemen were led by the Star 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 chuſe. So was it between the Apoſtles writing Scriptures, and 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 Star, or as a Traveller is directed by a Mercurial Statue, or as a Pilot by his Card and Compaſs: led ſufficiently, but not irreſiſtibly: led as that ſhe may follow, not ſo that ſhe muſt. For, ſeeing the Church is a Society of men, whereof every one (according to the Doctrin of the *Romiſh* Church) hath freewill in believing; it follows, that the whole Aggregate hath freewill in believing.

And



And if any man ſay that at leaſt *it is morally impoſſible, that of ſo many whereof all may believe aright, not any ſhould do ſo*: I anſwer, it is true, if they did all give themſelves any liberty of judgment. But if all (as the caſe is here) captivate their underſtandings to one of them, all are as likely to err as that one. And he more likely to err than any other, becauſe he may err and thinks he cannot, and becauſe he conceives the Spirit abſolutely promiſed to that ſucceſſion of Biſhops; of which many have been notoriouſly and confeſſedly wicked men, *Men of the World*: whereas this Spirit is the *Spirit of Truth, whom the world cannot receive, 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 and other mens ſalvation: Doth it therefore follow that they were, *de facto*, led no farther? God indeed is obliged by his Veracity to do all that he hath promiſed, but is there any thing that binds him to do no more? May not he be better than his word, but you will quarrel at him? May not his Bounty exceed his Promiſe? And may not we have certainty enough that oft-times it doth ſo? God at firſt did not promiſe to *Solomon*, in his viſion at *Gibeon*, any more than what he askt, which was *wiſdom to govern his people*, and that he gave him. But yet, I hope, you will not deny that we have certainty enough that he gave him ſomething which neither God had promiſed, nor he had asked. If you do, you contradict God himſelf: For *Behold* (ſaith God) *becauſe thou haſt asked this thing, I have done according to thy word. Lo, I have given thee a Wiſe and an Underſtanding heart, ſo that there was none like thee before thee, neither after thee ſhall any ariſe like unto thee. And I have 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 days.* God, for ought appears, never obliged himſelf by promiſe, to ſhew S. *Paul* thoſe *Unſpeakable myſteries*, which in the third Heaven he ſhewed unto him: and yet, I hope, we have certainty enough, that he did ſo. God promiſes to thoſe that *ſeek his Kingdom, and the righteouſneſs thereof, that all things neceſſary ſhall be added unto them*; and in rigour by his promiſe he is obliged to do no more, and if he give 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 meer Neceſſity? So, though God had obliged himſelf by promiſe to give his Apoſtles infallibility only in things neceſſary to ſalvation; nevertheleſs it is utterly inconſequent, that he gave them no more, than by the rigour of his promiſe he was engaged to do; or that we can have no aſſurance of any farther aſſiſtance that he gave them: eſpecially when he himſelf, both by his word, and by his works, hath aſſured us, that he did aſſiſt them farther. You ſee by this time that your chain of *fearful conſequences* (as you call them) is turned to a rope of ſand, and may eaſily be avoided without any flying to your imaginary infallibility of the Church in all her propoſals.

35. *Ad. §. 14. & 15 Doubting of a Book received for Canonical*, may ſignifie, either doubting whether it be Canonical; or ſuppoſing it to be Canonical, whether it be True. If the former ſenſe were yours. I muſt then again diſtinguiſh of the term, *Received*; For it may ſignifie, *either received by ſome particular Church*, or by the *preſent Church Univerſal*, 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 Univerſal Church of this preſent time, whether it be Canonical or no: and yet have juſt reaſon to believe, and no reaſon to doubt, but that other Books are Canonical. As *Euſebius* perhaps had reaſon to doubt of the Epiſtle of S. *James*; the Church of *Rome*, in *Hieromes* time, of the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*. And yet they did not doubt of all the Books of the Canon, nor had reaſon to do ſo. If by *Received*, you mean *Received by the Church of all Ages*, I grant, he that doubts of any one ſuch Book, hath 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 do not according to reason. If you meant your words in the latter sense; then I confess, he that believes such a Book to be Canonical, *i. e.* the word of God, and yet (to make an impossible Supposition) believes it is not to be true, if he will do according to reason, must doubt of all the rest, and believe none. For there being no greater reason to believe any thing true, than because God hath said it, nor no other reason to believe the Scripture to be true, but only because it is Gods word; he that doubts of the Truth of any thing said by God, hath as much reason to believe nothing that he says: and therefore, if he will do according to reason, neither must nor can believe any thing he says. And upon this ground you conclude rightly, that *the infallibility of true Scripture must be Universal, and not confined to Points Fundamental.*

36. And this Reason why we should not refuse to believe any part of Scripture, upon pretence that the matter of it is not Fundamental, you confess to be convincing. *But the same reason you say is as convincing for the Universal infallibility of the Church. For* (say you) *unless She be infallible in all things, we cannot believe her in any one.* But by this reason your Proselytes, knowing you are not infallible in all things, must not, nor cannot believe you in any thing. Nay you your self must not believe your self in any thing, because you know that you are not infallible in all things. Indeed if you had said *We could not rationally believe 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 error can be no firm or stable foundation of my belief in any thing: and if it were in any thing, then this authority being one and the same in all proposals, I should have the same reason to believe all, that I have to believe one: and therefore must either do 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 believe her in propounding Canonical Books.* If you mean still (as you must do unless you play the Sophister) *not upon her own Authority*, I grant it: For we believe Canonical Books not upon the *Authority of the present Church*, but upon *Universal Tradition.* If you mean, *Not at all*, and that with reason we cannot believe these Books to be Canonical, which the Church proposes, I deny it. There is no more consequence in the Argument than in this, The devil is not infallible, therefore if he says there is one God, I cannot believe him. No Geometrician is Infallible in all things, therefore not in these things which he demonstrates. 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 Doctrins of theirs: because they pretend to be able to tell what points are Fundamental and what not; and therefore though they should believe Scripture erroneous in others, yet they might be sure it erred not in these.* To this I answer. That if without dependance on Scripture, they did know what were Fundamental, and what not, they might possibly believe the Scripture true in Fundamentals, and erroneous in other things. But seeing they ground their belief, that *such and such things only are Fundamentals*, only upon *Scripture*, and go 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 Fundamental. For who would not laugh at them if they should argue thus, The Scripture is true in something, the Scripture says that these Points only are Fundamental, therefore this is true, that these only are so: For every Fresh-man in Logick knows, that from meer particulars nothing can be certainly concluded. But on the other side, this reason is firm, and demonstrative, The Scripture is true in all things; But the Scripture says, that these only Points are the Fundamentals of Christian Religion; therefore it is true, that these only are so. So that the know-



knowledge of Fundamentals being it self drawn from Scripture, is so far from warranting us to believe the Scripture is, or may be, in part True; and in part False; that it self can have no foundation, but the Universal truth of Scripture. For, to be a Fundamental Truth, presupposes to be a Truth; now I cannot know any Doctrin to be a Divine and supernatural Truth, or a true part of Christianity, but only because the Scripture sayes so which is all true: Therefore, much more can I not know it to be a Fundamental Truth.

38. *Ad §. 16.* To this Paragraph I answer. Though, the Church being not infallible, I cannot believe her in every thing she sayes; yet I can and must believe her in every thing she proves, either by Scripture, Reason, or Universal Tradition, be it Fundamental, or be it not Fundamental. This you say, we *cannot in Points not Fundamental, because in such we believe she may err.* But this I know, we can: because though she may err in some things, yet she dos not err in what she proves, though it be not Fundamental. Again you say, *we cannot do it in Fundamentals, because we must know what Points be Fundamental, before we go to learn of her.* Not so. But seeing Faith comes by Hearing, and by hearing those who give testimony to it which none doth but the Church and the Parts of it; I must learn of the Church, or of some part of it, or I cannot know any thing Fundamental or not Fundamental. For how can I come to know, that there was such a man as Christ, that he taught such doctrin, that he and his Apostles did such Miracles in Confirmation of it, that the Scripture is GOD's Word, unless 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 Fundamentals, unless I know them before I go to learn of her, I may be rather deluded than instructed by her.* The reason and connexion of this consequence, I fear neither I nor you do 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 Infallibe Director in Fundamentals.* For if she were so, then must we not only learn Fundamentals of her, but also *learn of her what is Fundamental, and take all for Fundamental 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 do us this favour, to be so acute, as to distinguish between being *infallible in Fundamentals*, and being an *infallible Guide in fundamentals.* That there shall be alwaies *a Church infallible in Fundamentals*, 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 Fundamentals, 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 Fundamentals. A man that were destitute of all means of communicating his thoughts to others, might yet, in himself, and to himself, 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 repair to it for direction, could not be an infallible Guide, and yet he might be in himself 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 Fundamental, otherwise than 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 Fundamental, others are not so; and consequently learn, even of the Church, even of your Church, that all is not Fundamental, nay all is not true, which the Church teacheth to be so. Neither do 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 Master's erroneous Conclusions.

41. But

41. But you ask, *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 self 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 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 worn-out Objections, without taking notice of their Answers.

42. Your Argument from S. *Austines* 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 madness*. And from hence you infer, *If the whole Church practise any thing, to dispute whether it ought to be done, is insolent madness*, 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 disturb 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 go about to reform some errors, which the Church hath suffered to come in, and to vitiate the very substance of Gods worship. It was a practice of the whole Church in S. *Austines* time, and esteemed an Apostolique Tradition, even by Saint *Austin* himself, *That the Eucharist should be administred to Infants*: Tell me, Sir, I beseech you; Had it been insolent madness to dispute against this practice, 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 Saint *Austines* words, not simply of all things; but (as indeed he himself restrained them) *of these things, of matter of Order, Decency, and Uniformity*.

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

44. But the Doctrins, That *Infants are to be baptized, and, those that are baptized by Heretiques, are not to be rebaptized, are neither of them to be proved by Scripture: And yet according to S. Austine they are true Doctrins, and we may be certain of them upon the Authority of the Church, which we could not be, unless the Church were Infallible; therefore the Church is infallible*. I answer, that there is no repugnance but we may be certain enough, of the Universal Traditions of the ancient Church; such, as in S. *Austins* account, these were which here are spoken of, and yet not be certain enough, of the definitions of the present Church. Unless you can shew (which I am sure you can never do) that the Infallibility of the present Church, was alwaies a Tradition of the Ancient Church. Now your main business is to prove the present Church infallible, not so much in consigning ancient Tradition, as in defining emergent Controversies. Again, it follows not, because the Churches Authority is warrant enough for us to believe some Doctrin, touching which the Scripture is silent; therefore it is Warrant enough to believe these, to which the Scripture seems repugnant. Now the Doctrins, which S. *Austin* received upon the Churches Authority, were of the first sort; the Doctrins for which we deny your Churches Infallibility, are of the second. And therefore though the Churches Authority might be strong enough to bear the



the weight which S. *Austin* laid upon it, yet haply it may not be strong enough, to bear that which you lay upon it. Though it may support some Doctrins without Scripture, yet surely not against it. And last of all, to deal ingenuously with You and the World, I am not such an Idolater of S. *Austin*, as to think a thing proved sufficiently because he says it, nor that all his sentences are Oracles; and particularly in this thing, that whatsoever was practiced or held by the Universal Church of his time, must needs have come from the Apostles. Though, considering the neerness 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 profess, I must have better satisfaction, before I can induce my self to hold it certain and infallible. And this, not because Popery would come in at this door, as some have vainly feared, but because by the Church Universal of some time, and the Church Universal 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 practice of the present Universal Church, can be no infallible proof, that the Doctrin so believed, or the Custom so practised, came from the Apostles. I instance in the Doctrin of the *Millenaries*, and the *Eucharists necessity for Infants*: both which Doctrins 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 opinions, but Apostolike Traditions. And therefore measuring the Doctrin of the Church by all the Rules which Cardinal *Perron* gives us for that purpose, both these Doctrins must be acknowledged to have been the Doctrins of the ancient Church of some Age or Ages; And that the contrary Doctrins were Catholique at some other time, I believe you will not think it needful for me to prove. So that either I must say, the Apostles were Fountains of contradictious Doctrins, or that being the Universal Doctrin of the present Church, is no sufficient proof that it came originally from the Apostles. Besides, who can warrant us, that the Universal Traditions of the Church were all Apostolical? seeing in that famous place for Traditions, in *Tertullian*, (a) *Quicunque Traditor, Any Author whatsoever* is Founder good enough for them. And who can secure us that Human inventions, and such as came *à quocunque Traditore* might not in a short time, gain the reputation of Apostolique! Seeing the Direction, then was, (b) *Praecepta majorum Apostolicas Traditiones quisque existimat*.

(a) *De corona Militis. c.* 3. & 4. Where having recounted sundry unwritten Traditions then observed by Christians, many whereof, by the way, (notwithstanding the Council of *Trents* profession, *To receive them and the written Word with like affection of Piety*) are now rejected and neglected by the Church of *Rome*: For example, *Immersion in Baptism, Tasting a mixture of milk and Honey presently after abstaining from Baths for a week after; Accounting it an impiety to pray kneeling on the Lord's Day, or between Easter and Pentecost*: I say, having reckoned up these and other Traditions in *Chap.* 3. He adds another in the 4. of *the Veiling of Women*; And then adds *Since I find no law for this, it follows, that Tradition must have given this observation to custom, which shall gain in time, Apostolique Authority by the interpretation of the reason of it. By these examples therefore it is declared, That the observing of unwritten Tradition, being confirmed by custom, may be defended. The perseverance of the observation, being a good testimony of the goodness of the Tradition Now Custom even in civil affairs where a Law is wanting, passeth for a Law. Neither is it material, on which it is grounded, 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 quocunque productum —— *Whosoever is the producer of it. Do ye think it is not lawfull*, Omni fideli, *for every faithful 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 says, Why even of your selves judge ye not what is right?* And a little after, *This reason now demands, saving the respect of the Tradition* —— A quocunque Traditore censetur, nec Authorem respiciens sed Authoritatem: *From whatsoever Tradition it comes, neither regard the Author but the Authority*. (b) *Hier.*

45. No less, you say, is S. *Chrysostom, 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 Universal as the Tradition of the undoubted Books of Scripture is, to be as infallible as the Scripture is; for neither doth being written make the Word of God, the more infallible, nor being unwritten make it the less infallible:) Not therefore in her Universal Traditions, were you to prove the Church infallible, but in all her Decrees and definitions of Controversies.

Controverſies. To this Point when you ſpeak; you ſhall have an Anſwer; but hitherto you do but wander.

46. But let us ſee what S. *Chryſoſtom* ſays, *They* (the Apoſtles) *delivered 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 *Julius Ceſar* was Emperor 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 works which *our Saviour did* (which S. *John* ſuppoſes, *would not have been contained in a world of Books*) if they had been written, or if God by ſome other means had preſerved 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 more a faithful keeper Records are then Report, thoſe few that were written are preſerved and believed; thoſe infinitely 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 ceaſeth, when it becoms 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 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. *Cardinal Perron*, in his Diſcourſe of Traditions, having alledged this place for them, *Hold the Tratidions*, &c. tell 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 Books of Scripture: becauſe it is upon occaſion of Tradition* (touching the *cauſe* of the *hinderance of the coming of Antichriſt*) *which was never writen, that he lays this injunction 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 coming of Antichriſt. But what if they did not perform 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 hath 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 do that which you cannot do your ſelves. It is therefore requiſite that you make this command poſſible to 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 do you your ſelves know that ye may inſtruct us? Can ye, or dare you ſay, this or this was this hinderance which S. *Paul* here meant, and all men under pain of damnation are to believe it? Or if you cannot, (as I am certain you cannot) go then, and vaunt your Church, for the only Watchful, Faithful, 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 goodneſs 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!



written! Saint *Chryſoſtom*'s counſel 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 withal, 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 unqueſtioned Books of Canonical Scripture, to be the written Word of God.

47. You conclude this Paragraph with a ſentence of S. *Auſtins*, who ſays, *The Church doth not approve, nor diſſemble, nor do, theſe things which are againſt Faith or good life*: and from hence you conclude, *That it never hath done ſo, nor ever can do ſo.* But though the argument hold in Logick *à non poſſe, ad non eſſe*, yet I never heard that it would hold back, *à non eſſe, ad non poſſe*. The Church cannot do this, therefore it does not, follows with good conſequence: but the Church doth not this, therefore it ſhall never do it, nor can never do it, this, I believe will hardly follow. In the Epiſtle next before to the ſame *Januarius*, writing of the ſame matter, he hath theſe words, *It remains, that the thing you enquire of, muſt be of that third kind of things, which are different in divers places. Let every one therefore do, that which he finds done in the Church to which he comes; for none of them is againſt Faith or good manners.* And why do you not infer from hence, that *no particular Church can bring up any Cuſtom that is againſt Faith or good manners*? Certainly this Conſequence hath as good reaſon for it as the former. If a man ſay of the Church of *England*, (what S. *Auſtin* of the Church) that ſhe neither approves nor diſſembles, nor doth 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. *Auſtin*, according to you, thought) *approve or diſſemble, or do 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 than, the Commandments of God himſelf. This S. *Auſtin* himſelf profeſſeth in this very Epiſtle. *This* (ſaith he) *I do 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 drunkenneſs.* Of theſe he ſays, *That they were neither contained in Scripture, decreed by Councils, nor corroborated by the Cuſtom of the Univerſal Church. And though not againſt Faith, yet unprofitable burdens of Chriſtian liberty, which made the condition of the Jews more tolerable than that of Chriſtians.* And therefore he profeſſeth of them, *Approbare non poſſum, I cannot approve them.* And, *Ubi facultas tribuitur, reſecanda exiſtimo; I think they are to be cut off, whereſoever we have power.* Yet ſo deeply were they rooted, and ſpread ſo far, through the indiſcreet devotion of the people, always more prone to ſuperſtition than true piety, and through the connivence of the Governours, who ſhould have ſtrangled them at their birth, that himſelf, though he grieved at them, and could not allow them, yet for fear of offence he durſt not ſpeak againſt them, *Multa hujuſmodi, propter nonnullarum vel ſanctarum 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 ſelf, did ſee and diſſemble, and tolerate them; for theſe are the things of which he preſently ſays after, *The Church of God* (and you will have him ſpeak of the true Catholique Church) *placed between Chaff and 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 ſelf to be brought in bondage to theſe ſervile burdens.* Our Saviour tells the Scribes and Phariſees,

sees, *That in vain they worshipped God, teaching for Doctrines mens Commandments: For that laying aside the Commandments 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. *Augustin* complains of, as the general fault of Christians of his time, was parallel to this: *Multa* (saith he) *quæ in divinis libris saluberrimè præcepta sunt, minus curantur*; This, I suppose, I may very well render in our Saviour's words, *The Commandements of God are laid aside*; And then, *Tam multis præsumptionibus sic plena sunt omnia, All things, or all places, are so full of so many presumptions, and those exacted with such severity, may with Tyranny, that he was more severely censured, who in the time of his Octaves touched the earth with his naked feet, than he which drowned and buried his soul in drink.* Certainly, if this be not *to teach for Doctrines mens Commandments*, I know not what is. And therefore these superstitious Christians might be said *to worship God in vain*, as well as the Scribes and Pharisees. 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* concerning them, *Diversorum locorum diversis moribus innumerabiliter variantur*; and apparent, because the stream of them was grown so violent, that he durst not oppose it, *Liberius 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 condemn 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 Universal superstition in the Church, can consist with the assistance and direction of Gods omnipotent Spirit to guard it from superstition, and with the accomplishment of that pretended Prophecy of the Church, *I have set Watchmen upon thy walls, O Jerusalem, which shall never hold their peace day nor night*; Besides, how these Superstitions being thus nourished, cherished, and strengthened by the practice of the most, and urged with great violence upon others as the Commandments of God, and but fearfully opposed or contradicted by any, might in time take such deep root, and spread their branches so far, as to pass for Universal Customs of the Church, he that does not see, sees nothing. Especially, considering the catching and contagious nature of this sin, 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. *Austin's* time, prevailed so far, as to be *Consuetudine universa Ecclesia roboratum*, Who can doubt that considers, that the practice of *Communicating Infants*, had even then got the credit and authority, not only of an universal Custom, 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 approve, 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. *Austin* tells us in the same place, *That the Church may tolerate humane presumptions, and vain superstitions, and those urged more severely then the Commandments of God*: And whether superstition be a sin or no, I appeal to our Saviour's words before cited, and to the consent of your Schoolmen. Besides, if we consider it rightly, we shall find, that the Church is not truly said only to tolerate these things, but rather, that a part, and far the lesser, tolerated and dissembled them in silence, and a part and a far greater, publiquely avowed and practised them, and urged them upon others with great violence, and yet continued still a part of the Church. Now why the whole Church might not continue the Church, and yet do so, as well as a part of the Church might continue a part of it, and yet do so, I desire you to inform me.

49. But now after all this ado, what if S. *Austin* says not this which is pretended of the Church, *viz. That she neither approves, nor dissembles, nor practises any*



*any thing against Faith or good life*, but only of good men in the Church? Certainly, though some Copies read as you would have it, yet you should not have 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 approve, nor dissemble, nor practise.*

50. *Ad Q.* 17. *That Abraham begat Isaac*, is a point very far from being Fundamental; and yet, I hope, you will grant, that Protestants believing Scripture to be the Word of God, may be certain enough of the truth and certainty of it. For what if they say that the Catholique Church; and much more themselves may possibly err in some unfundamental points, is it therefore consequent, they can be certain of none such? What if a wiser man than I may mistake the sense of some obscure place of *Aristotle*, may I not therefore without any arrogance or inconsequence, conceive my self certain that I understand him in some plain places, which carry their sense before them? And then for Points Fundamental, to what purpose do you say, *That we must first know what they be, before we can be assured that we cannot err in understanding the Scriptures*; when we pretend not at all to any assurance that we cannot err, but only to a sufficient certainty, that we do not err, but rightly understand those things that are plain, whether Fundamental or not Fundamental: 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 from dead works, and Faith in Christ, Remission of sins may be obtained*: That *there shall be a Resurrection of the Body*? These we conceive both true, because the Scripture says so, and Truths Fundamental, because they are necessary parts of the Gospel, whereof our Saviour says, *Qui non crediderit, damnabitur.* All which we either learn from Scripture immediately, or learn of those that learn it of Scripture; so that neither Learned nor Unlearned pretend to know these things independently of Scripture. And therefore in imputing this to us, you cannot excuse your self from having done us a palpable injury.

51. *Ad Q.* 18. And I urge you as mainly as you urge D. *Potter* and other Protestants, that you tell us that all the Traditions, and all the Definitions of the Church are Fundamental points, and we cannot wrest from you *a list in particular of all such Traditions and Definitions*, without which, no man can tell whether no he err in points Fundamental, and be capable of Salvation; (For, I hope, erring in our Fundamentals is no more exclusive of Salvation than erring in yours.) And, which is most lamentable, instead of giving us such a Catalogue, you also fall to wrangle among your selves about the making of it; some of you, as I have said above, holding some things to be *matters of Faith*, which others deny to be so.

52. *Ad Q.* 19. I answer, That these differences between Protestants concerning Errors damnable and not damnable, Truths Fundamental and not-Fundamental, may be easily reconciled. 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 error is it self sinful, and consequently in its own nature damnable; As, if by negligence in seeking the Truth, by unwillingness to find it, by pride, by obstinacy, by desiring that Religion should be true which suits best with my ends, by fear of mens ill opinion, or any other worldly fear, or any other worldly hope, I betray my self to any error contrary to any divine revealed Truth, that Error may be justly stiled a sin, and consequently of it self to such a one damnable. But if I be guilty of none of these faults, but be desirous to know the Truth, and deligent in seeking it, and advise not at all with flesh and blood about the choice of my opinions, but only with God, and that Reason that he hath given me, if I be thus qualified, and yet through humane infirmity fall into error, that error cannot be damnable. Again, the party erring may be conceived either to die with contrition

for all his sins known and unknown, or without it; If he die without it, this error, in it self damnable, will be likewise so unto him: If he die with contrition (as his error can be no impediment but he may) his error though in it self damnable, to him, according to your doctrine, will not prove so. And therefore some of those Authors whom you quote, speaking of Errors 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 errors 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 marvel though they have past upon them, some a heavier, and some a milder, some an absolving, and some a condemning sentence. The least of all these errors, which here you mention, having malice enough too frequently mixed with it, to sink a man deep enough into hell: and the greatest of them all, being according to your Principles, either no fault at all, or very Venial, where there is no malice of the will conjoyned with it. And if it be, yet, as the most malignant poyson will not poyson him that receives with it a more powerful Antidote: so, I am confident, your own Doctrine will force you to confess, that whosoever dies with Faith in Christ, and Contrition for all his sins known and unknown (in which heap all his sinful errors must be comprized) can no more be hurt by any the most malignant and pestilent error, than S. *Paul* by the Viper which he shook off into the fire. Now touching the *necessity of Repentance from dead works, and Faith in Christ Jesus the Son 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 go about to chuse out of Scripture all these Propositions and Doctrines which integrate and make up the body of Christian Religion, peradventure there would not be so exact an agreement amongst them, as some say there was between the 70 Interpreters, in translating the Old Testament; yet thus far without controversie they do all agree, that in the Bible all these things are contained, and therefore, that whosoever doth 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 mind*, believe all things Fundamental: It being not Fundamental, nor required of Almighty God, to believe the true sense of Scripture in all places, but only that we should endeavour to do so, and be prepared in mind to do 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 Physicians should find 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 hurtful; 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 he made use of it, he should infallibly find it successful: what wise man would not think they agreed sufficiently for his direction to the recovery of his health? Just so, these Protestant Doctors, with whose discords you make such Tragedies; agreeing in *Thesi* thus far, That the *Scripture evidently contains all things necessary to Salvation*, both for matter of Faith, and of Practice, and that whosoever believes it, and endeavours to find the true sense of it, and to conform his life unto it, shall certainly perform all things necessary to Salvation, and undoubtedly be saved; agreeing, I say thus far, 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 Errors 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 they agree in this, that Truths they are, and pro-



profitable at least, though not simply necessary. And though they differ in the Question, Whether the contrary Errors be destructive of Salvation, or no: yet in this they consent, that Errors they are, and hurtful to Religion, though not destructive of Salvation. Now that which God requires of us, is this, That we should believe the Doctrines of the Gospel to be Truths, not all, necessary Truths, for all are not so; and consequently, the repugnant Errors to be falshoods: yet not all, such falshoods, as unavoidably draw with them damnation upon all that hold them; for all do not so.

53. Yea but *you say, It is very requisite we should agree upon a particular Catalogue of Fundamental 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 self 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 contains all necessary points of Faith*, and know that I believe explicitely all that is expresst in Scripture, and implicitely all that is contained in them: Now he that believes 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 believe 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 Fundamentals. And therefore, if this be all your reason, to demand a particular Catalogue of Fundamentals, we cannot but think your demand unreasonable. Especially having your self 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 absolutely necessary to salvation.* Yet not so seldom, but that out of it I could give you an abstract of the Essential parts of Christianity, if it were necessary, but I have shewed it not so, by confuting your reason, pretended for the necessity of it, and at this time I have no leisure to do you courtesies that are so troublesome to my self. Yet thus much I will promise, that when you deliver a *particular Catalogue of your Church Proposals* with one hand, you shall receive a particular Catalogue of what I conceive Fundamental, with the other. For as yet, I see no such fair proceeding as you talk 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 have given us, in saying, *You are obliged under pain of damnation to believe whatsoever the Catholique visible Church of Christ proposeth as revealed by Almighty God*, it is like a covey of one Partridge, or a flock of one Sheep, or a Fleet composed of one Ship, or an Army of one Man. The Author of *Charity Mistaken*, *demands a particular Catalogue of Fundamental 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 mouths with, be a Catalogue, yet at least such a Catalogue it is not, and therefore as yet you have not performed what you require. For, If to set down such a Proposition, wherein are comprized all points taught by us to be necessary to salvation, will serve you instead of a Catalogue, you shall have Catalogues enough. As, we are obliged to believe all under pain of damnation which God commands us to believe. There's one Catalogue. We are obliged under pain of damnation, to believe all, whereof we may be sufficiently assured, that Christ taught it his Apostles, his Apostles the Church. There's another. We are obliged under pain of damnation to believe God's Word, and all contained in it to be true. There's a third. If these generalities will not satisfie

tisfie you, but you will be importuning us to tell you in particular, what those Doctrines are which Christ taught his Apostles, and his Apostles the Church, what points are contained in God's Word; Then I beseech you do us reason, and give us a particular and *exact Inventory of all your Church-Propofals, without leaving out, or adding any*, such a one which all the Doctors of your Church will subscribe to, and if you receive not then a Catalogue of Fundamentals, I for my part will give you leave to proclaim us Bankrupts.

54. Besides, this deceitful generality of your Catalogue (as you call it) another main fault we find with it, that it is extremely ambiguous; and therefore to draw you out of the Clouds, give me leave 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 be? I would know what you esteem the Propofals of the Catholick visible Church? In particular, whether the Decree of the Pope *ex Cathedra*, that is, with an intent to oblige all Christians by it, be a sufficient and an obliging Propofal? 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 Council, without the *Pope*'s Confirmation, be such an obliging Propofal, or no? Whether it be so in case there be no *Pope*, or in case it be doubtful who is *Pope*? Whether the Decree of a General Council confirmed by the *Pope*, be such a Propofal, and whether he be an Heretique that thinks otherwise? Whether the Decree of a particular Council confirmed by the *Pope*, be such a Propofal? Whether the General uncondemned practice 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 practice to be a Tradition, or to be the Doctrine or practice 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 authorized by the *Roman* Church, to be the true Translation of the Originals of the Prophets, and Evangelists, and Apostles, without any the least alteration? Whether they that lived when 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 Catholick visible Church be always that Society of Christians which adheres to the Bishop of *Rome*? Whether every Christian, that hath ability and opportunity, be not bound to endeavour to know explicitely the Propofals of the Church? Whether Implicite Faith in the Churches Veracity, will not save 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 hath 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 Goslly Father assures him it is so? Whether his Ghostly Father may not err in telling him so, and whether any man can be obliged under pain of damnation, to believe an Error? 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 have, that they neither err, nor deceive him, in this matter? Why Implicite Faith in Christ or the Scriptures should not suffice for a mans Salvation, as well as implicite faith in the Church? Whether when you say, *Whatsoever the Church proposeth*, you mean all that ever she proposed, or that only which she now proposeth; and whether she now proposeth all that ever she did propose? Whether all the Books of Canonical Scripture were sufficiently declared to the Church to be so, and proposed as such by



by the Apostles? And if not, from whom the Church had this Declaration afterward? If so, whether all men ever since the Apostles time, were bound under pain of damnation to believe the Epistle of *S. James*, and the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, to be Canonical: at least, not to disbelieve it, and believe the contrary? Lastly, why it is not sufficient for any mans Salvation to use the best means he can to inform his conscience, and to follow the direction of it? To all these demands when you have given fair and ingenuous Answers, you shall hear farther from me.

55. *Ad Q.* 20. At the first entrance into this Paragraph, From our own Doctrine, *That the Church cannot err in Points necessary, it is concluded, if we are wise, we must forsake it in nothing, lest we should forsake it in something necessary.* To which I answer, First, that the supposition, as you understand it, is falsly imposed upon us, and as we understand it will do you no service. For when we say, that there shall be a *Church always*, some where or other, *unerring* in *Fundamentals*, our meaning is but this, that *there shall be always a Church*, to the very being whereof it is repugnant that it should err in Fundamentals; for if it should do so, it would want the very Essence of a Church, and therefore cease to be a Church. But we never annexed this priviledge *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, have concluded that we could not, in wisdom, *forsake this Church in any one point, for fear 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 always in some place or other, some Church that errs not in Fundamentals*; will you conclude from hence, that we cannot in wisdom forsake this or that, the *Roman* or the *Greek* Church, for fear of erring in Fundamentals?

56. Yea, but you may say, (for I will make the best I can of all your Arguments) *That this Church thus unerring in Fundamentals, when* Luther *Arose, was by our confession the* Roman; *and therefore in wisdom we ought not to have departed from it in any thing*. I answer, First, that we confess 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 that Church, we could have been thus far secured, this argument had some shew of reason. But seeing we are not warranted thus much by any priviledge of that Church, that she cannot err fundamentally, but only from Scripture, which assures us that she doth err very hainously, we collect our hope, that the Truths she retains, and the practice of them, may prove an Antidote to her against the Errors which she maintains in such Persons, as in simplicity of heart follow this *Absalom*; we should then do against the light of our conscience, and so sin damnably if we should not abandon the profession of her Errors though not Fundamental. Neither can we thus conclude, We may safely hold with the Church of *Rome* in all her Points, for she cannot err damnably; For this is false, she may, though perhaps she doth not: But rather thus; These Points of Christianity, which have in them the nature of Antidotes against the poyson of all sins and errors, the Church of *Rome*, though otherwise much corrupted, still retains; therefore we hope she errs not Fundamentally, but still remains 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 errs not Fundamentally, assures us that in many things, and those of great moment, she errs very grievously. And these Errors, though to them that believe them, we hope they will not be pernicious, yet the professing of them against conscience, could not but bring to us certain Damnation. *As for the fear of departing from some Fundamental*

*mental truths withal, while we depart from her errors.* Haply 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 she doth not err, yet we know no priviledges she hath but she may err in them her self: and therefore we had need have better security hereof than her bare Authority. Then secondly, without dependance on her at all, we may be secured that we do not err Fundamentally; I mean by believing all things plainly set down in Scripture, wherein all necessary, and most things profitable, are plainly delivered. Suppose I were travelling to *London*, and knew two ways 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 himself 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, and very dangerous, yet a way; so that going that way we might come to our journies end by the consent of both parties: but he believed my way to be none at all; and therefore I might justly fear, lest out of a desire of leaving the worst way, I left the true and the only way: If now I should not be more secure upon my own knowledge, then frighted by this fallacy, would you not beg me for a fool? Just so might you think of us, if we would be frighted out of our own knowledge by this bugbear. For the only and the main reason why we believe you not to err in Fundamentals, 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 do not err in Fundamentals, as well as we know that you in some sort do not err in Fundamentals, and therefore cannot possibly fear the contrary. Yet let us be more liberal to you, and grant that which can never be proved, that God had said in plain terms, *The Church of* Rome *shall never destroy the Foundation*, but withal had said, *that it might and would lay much hay and stubble upon it*; That you should never hold any Error destructive of salvation, but yet many that were prejudicial to Edification: I demand, Might we have dispensed with our selves in the believing and professing these Errors in regard of the smalness of them? Or, had it not been a damnable sin to do so, though the Errors in themselves were not damnable? Had we not had as plain direction to depart from 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 have it so, the greatness or smalness of the matter was not considerable, the Evidence of the Revelation was all in all. But here we must err with you in small things, for fear of losing your direction in greater: and for fear of departing too far from you, not go from you at all, even where we see plainly that you have departed from the Truth.

57. Beyond all this, I say, that this which you say *in wisdom we are to do*, is not only unlawful, but if we will proceed according to reason impossible. I mean 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 Fundamentals. For whether by skill in Architecture a large structure may be supported by a narrow foundation, I know not; but sure I am, in reason no Conclusion can be larger than the Principles on which it is founded. And therefore if I consider what I do, and be perswaded that your Infallibility is but limited, and particular, and partial; my adherence upon this ground cannot possibly be absolute, and Universal and Total. I am confident, that should I meet with such a man amongst you, (as I am well assured there be many) that would grant your Church infallible only in Fundamentals, which what they are he knows 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



with a fiducial and certain assent in nothing. To make this clear (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 me. First, supposing you hold your Church infallible in Fundamentals, obnoxious to error in other things, and that you know not what Points are Fundamental, I demand, C. Why do you believe the Doctrin of Transubstantiation? K. Because the Church hath taught it, which is infallible. C. What? Infallible in all things, or only in Fundamentals? K. In Fundamentals only. C. Then in other points she may err? K. She may. C. And do you know what Points are Fundamental, what not? K. No, and therefore I believe her in all things, lest I should disbelieve her in Fundamentals. C. How know you then, whether this be a Fundamental Point or no? K. I know not. C. It may be then (for ought you know) an unfundamental Point? K. Yes, it may be so. C. And in these, you said, the Church may err? K. Yes, I did so. C. Then possibly it may err in this? K. It may do so. C. Then what certainty have you that it dos not err in it? K. None at all, but upon this supposition, that this is a Fundamental. 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 Fundamental 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 than 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 than a Protestant is a Catholique. For every Protestant yields such a kind of assent to all the proposals of the Church, for surely they believe them true, if they be Fundamental truths. And therefore you must either believe the Church Infallible in all her proposals, be they foundations, or be they superstructions; or you must believe all Fundamental which she proposes, or else you are no Catholique. K. But I have been taught, that *seeing I believed the Church infallible in points necessary, in wisdom 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 go farther, and believe her infallible in all things, or else you were as good go back again, which will be a great disparagment to you, and draw upon you both the bitter and implacable hatred of our Part, and even, with your own, the imputation of rashness and levity. You see, I hope by this time, that though a man did believe your Church infallible in Fundamentals, yet he hath no reason to do you the curtesie of believing all her Proposals; nay, if he be ignorant what these Fundamentals are, he hath no certain ground to believe her, upon her Authority, in any thing. And whereas you say, it can be no imprudence to err with the Church; I say, it may be very great imprudence, if the question be, Whether we should err 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 wisdom suspect her credit in matters of less moment.* Answ. I have told you already, that this is sadly to suppose, that we 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, unless the matter were past suspition; 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 gratifie the Church so far, as for her sake to disbelieve what God himself hath revealed.

59. Whereas you say, *Since we are undoubtedly obliged to believe her in*

*Fundamentals, and cannot know precisely, what those Fundamentals be, we cannot without hazard of our souls leave her in any Point*; I answer, 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 Fundamental, yet we know, that the Scripture containes all Fundamentals, and more too; and therefore that in believing that, we believe all Fundamentals and more too. And consequently, in departing from you, can be in no danger of departing from that which may prove a Fundamental Truth: For we are well assured that certain Errors can never prove Fundamental Truths.

60. Whereas you add, That *that visible Church which cannot err in Fundamentals, propounds all her definitions without destinction to be believed under Anathema's*: Answ. Again you beg the question, supposing untruly, that there is any *that visible Church*. I mean any Visible Church of one Denomination, which cannot err in Points Fundamental. 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 Doctrin they condemn is evidently damnable. A plain proof hereof is this, that particular Councils, nay, particular Men, have been very liberal of their Anathema's, which yet were never conceived infallible, either 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 doctrin, and yet am very far from dreaming of infallibility.

61. And for the *Visible Churches holding it a Point necessary to Salvation, that we believe she cannot err*, I know no such tenet; unless by the Church, you mean the *Roman* Church, which you have as much reason to do, 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 Pope's setting your Lawyers to dispute whether *Constantine's Donation* were valid or no; whereas the matter of fact was the far 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, we will trouble our selves no farther.

62. The effect of the next Argument is this, *I cannot without grievous sin disobey the Church, unless I know she commands those things which are not in her power to command: and how far this power extends, none can better inform me then the Church. Therefore I am to obey, so far as the Church requires my obedience.* I answer: First, that neither hath the Catholique Church, but only a corrupt part of it, declared her self, nor required our obedience, in the Points contested among us. This therefore is falsly, and vainly supposed here by you, being one of the greatest Questions amongst us. Then secondly, that God can better inform us, what are the limits of the Churches power, than the Church her self, that is, than the *Roman* Clergy, who being men subject to the same passions with other men, why they should be thought the best Judges in their own cause, I do not well understand! But yet we oppose against them, no humane decisive Judges, 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, than in following any Sect or Man applying Scriptures against her Doctrin*: In as 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 have spoken to the purpose, you should have said, that in following her you should sooner have been excused, then in cleaving to the Scripture, and to God himself.

63. Whereas you say, *The fearful examples of innumerable persons, who forsaking*



*forsaking the Church, upon pretence of her errors, have failed even in Fundamental Points, ought to deter 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 far from Charybdis; be sure therefore ye keep close to Charybdis: Divers leaving Prodigality, have fallen into covetousness; therefore be you constant to Prodigality: Many have fallen from worshiping God perversly and foolishly, not to worship him at all; from worshiping many Gods to worship none; this therefore ought to deter men from leaving Superstition or Idolatry, for fear of falling into Atheism and Impiety. This is your counsel and Sophistry: but God says clean contrary; *Take heed you swerve not, either to the right hand or to the left: you must not do evil that good may come thereon*; therefore neither, that you may avoid a greater evil, you must not be obstinate in a certain error, for fear of an uncertain. What if some, forsaking the Church of *Rome*, have forsaken Fundamental 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 far 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 self out of it, though you err 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 madness to perswade any man to leave it. But we protest and proclaim the contrary, and that we have very little hope of their Salvation, who either out of negligence in seeking the truth, or unwillingness to find it, live and die in the errors and impieties of that Church: and therefore cannot but conceive those fears to be most foolish, and ridiculous, which perswade men to be constant in one way to hell, lest haply, 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 reform the Church, are come to affirm that she perished for many ages*: which *D.* Potter *cannot deny to be a Fundamental error, against the Article of the Creed, I believe the Catholique Church, seeing he affirms, Donatists erred Fundamentally in confining it to Africa.* To this I answer, First, that the error of the Donatists was not, that they held it possible that some, or many, or most parts of Christendom, might fall away from Christianity, and that the Church may lose much of her amplitude, and be contracted to a narrow compass, in comparison of her former extent: which is proved not only possible, but certain, by irrefragable experience. For who knows not that Gentilism, and Mahumetism, mans wickedness deserving it, and Gods providence permitting it; have prevailed, to the utter extirpation of Christianity, upon far the greater part of the world? And St. *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 error in the Donatists, that they held it possible that the Church, from a large 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 they had no just ground or reason to do so: and so, upon a vain pretence which they could not justifie, separated 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 himself from all other Communions from which they were divided: which was a condition both unnecessary and unlawful to be required, and therefore the exacting of it was directly opposite to the Churches Catholicism; in the very same nature with their errors who required Circumcision, and the keeping of the Law of

*Moſes*, as neceſſary to ſalvation. For whoſoever requires harder or heavier conditions of men, than God requires of them, he it is that is properly an Enemy of the Churches Univerſality, 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 have made them members of it. And ſeeing the preſent Church of *Rome* perſwades men they were as good (for any hope of ſalvation they have) not to be Chriſtians, as not be *Roman* Catholiques; believe nothing at all, as not believe all which ſhe impoſes upon them; be abſolutely out of the Churches Communion, as be out of her Communion, or be in any other. Whether ſhe be not guilty of the ſame crime, with the *Donatiſts* and thoſe Zealots of the Moſaical Law, I leave it to the judgment of thoſe that underſtand reaſon! This is ſufficient to ſhew the vanity of this Argument. But I add moreover, that you neither have named thoſe Proteſtants who held the Church to have 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 ſplendor and viſibility: Neither have you proved by any one reaſon, but only affirmed it, to be a Fundamental Error, to hold that the Church Militant may poſſibly be driven out of the world, and aboliſhed for a time from the face of the earth.

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

66. *Ad §. 21.* D. *Potter* ſays, *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* ſays not, that you may not depart from any opinion or any practice of the Church: for you tell us in this very place, that he ſays, even the Catholique may err: and every man may lawfully depart from Error. He only ſays, *You may not ceaſe to be of the Church, nor depart from thoſe things which make it ſo to be*; and from hence you infer a neceſſity of forſaking it in nothing. Juſt as if you ſhould argue thus: You may not leave your friend or brother, therefore you may not leave the Vice of your friend, or the Error of your brother. What he ſays of the Catholique Church, p. 75. the ſame he extends preſently after, *to every true, though never ſo corrupted, part of it.* And why do you not conclude from hence, that no particular Church (according to his judgment) can fall into any Error, and call this a Demonſtration too? For, as he ſays, p. 75. That *there can be no juſt cauſe to depart from the whole Church of Chriſt, no more than from Chriſt himſelf*; So p. 76. he tells you, That *whoſoever forſakes any one true member of this body, forſakes the whole.* So that what he ſays of the one, he ſays of the other; and tells you, that neither Univerſal nor particular Church, ſo long as they continue ſo, may be forſaken; he means, *Abſolutely*, no more than Chriſt himſelf 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 himſelf.

67. But then he tells you plainly in the ſame place, *That it may be lawful and neceſſary to depart from a Particular Church in ſome Doctrines and Practices*: And this he would have ſaid even of the Catholick Church, if there had been occaſion,



occaſion, but there was none. For there he was to declare and juſtifie our departure, not from the Catholick Church, but the *Roman*, which we maintain to be a particular Church. But in other places, you confeſs his Doctrine to be, that even the Catholique Church may err in points not Fundamental; which you do not pretend that he ever imputed to Chriſt himſelf. 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 than Chriſt himſelf: but only thus, We may not ceaſe to be of the Church, nor forſake it abſolutely and totally, no more than Chriſt himſelf. And thus we ſee ſometimes, a Mountain may travel, and the production be a Mouſe.

68. *Ad §. 22.* But D. *Potter either contradicts himſelf, or elſe muſt grant the Church infallible; Becauſe*, he ſays, *if we did not differ from the* Roman, *we could not agree with the Catholique: which ſaying ſuppoſes, the Catholique Church cannot err.* Anſwer. This Argument, to give it the right name, is an obſcure and intricate Nothing. And to make it appear ſo, let us ſuppoſe, in contradiction to your ſuppoſition, either that the Catholique Church may err, but doth not, but that the *Roman* actually doth: or that the Catholique Church doth err in ſome few things, but that the *Roman* errs in many more. And is it not apparent in both theſe caſes, (which yet both ſuppoſe the Churches Fallibility) a man may truly ſay, Unleſs 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 do that which you condemn in him, and be driven to ſay, that the ſame man may hold ſome errors with the Church of *Rome*, and at the ſame time with the Catholique Church not to hold but condemn 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 alledged in this laſt Section of this Chapter, or in any one of them, or in any other, Doth God ſay clearly and plainly, *The Biſhop of* Rome, *and that Society of Chriſtians which adheres to him, ſhall be ever the infallible guide of Faith?* You will confeſs, I preſume, he doth not; and will pretend, it was not neceſſary. Yet if the King ſhould tell us, the Lord Keeper ſhould judg 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 nearer for him to an end of contentions? Nay rather, would not the diſſentions about the Perſon who it is, increaſe contentions, rather than end them? Juſt 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 doth 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? Obj. *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.* Anſw. 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. Object. *But that Church is not now in the world, and how then can it pretend to be the Guide of Faith?* Anſw. 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 do plainly teach us, what truth they were led into, and ſo lead us into the ſame truth. Object. *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.* Anſw. If you regard the conception and production of theſe writings, they were the writings of particular men:

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 penned by ſome one man, yet being ratified by the Parliament, is called the Act, not of that man, but of the Parliament. Object. But the *words ſeem clearly enough to prove, that the Church, the Preſent Church of every Age, is Univerſally 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 appear to you, of what colour pleaſes your fancies beſt: and will ſeem to ſay, not what they do ſay, but what you would have them. As ſome ſay, the *Manna* wherewith the *Iſraelites* were fed in the Wilderneſs, had in every mans mouth, that very taſt which was moſt agreeable to his palate. For my part I profeſs, I have conſidered them a thouſand times, and have looked upon them (as they ſay) on both ſides, and yet to me they ſeem to ſay no ſuch matter.

70. Not the firſt. For the *Church may err, and yet the gates of Hell not prevail againſt her.* It may err, and yet continue ſtill a true Church, and bring forth Children unto God, and ſend ſouls to Heaven. And therefore this can do you no ſervice, without the plain begging of the point in queſtion, *viz.* That every error 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 denial without reaſon. For ſeeing you do, and muſt grant, that a particular Church, may hold ſome error, and yet be ſtill a true Member of the Church: Why may not the Univerſal Church hold the ſame error, and yet remain the true Univerſal?

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 error, if this *all*, be not *ſimply all*, but all of ſome kind: which you confeſs to be ſo unqueſtioned and certain, that you are offended with D. *Potter*, for offering to prove it. Secondly, he may fall into ſome error, even contrary to the truth which is taught him, if it be taught him *only ſufficiently, and not irreſiſtibly*, ſo that he may learn it if he will, not ſo that he muſt and ſhall whether he will or no. Now, who can aſcertain me, that the Spirit's 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 Original is ὁδηγήσει, which ſignifies, to be a guide and director only, not to compel or neceſſitate. Who knows 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 ears, and cloſed their eyes, leſt they ſhould hear and ſee?* Of others, *that would not underſtand, leſt they ſhould do good: That the light ſhined, and the darkneſs comprehended it not: That he came unto his own, and his own received him not: That light came into the world, and men loved darkneſs more than light? To what purpoſe ſhould he wonder, ſo few believed his report, and that to ſo few his Arm 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, that God hath taught the Church of *Rome* plain enough in the Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*, that *all things in the Church are to be done for edification*; and that in any publick Prayers, or Thankſgivings, or Hymns, or Leſſons of Inſtruction, to *uſe a language*, which the aſſiſtants *generally underſtand not*, is not for edification?



on? Though the Church of *Rome* will not learn this, for fear of confeſſing an error, and ſo overthrowing her Authority; yet the time will come, when it ſhall appear, that not only by Scripture, they were taught this ſufficiently, and commanded to believe it, but by reaſon and common ſenſe. And ſo for the Communion in both kinds, who can deny but they are taught it by our Saviour, *Joh. 6.* in theſe words, according to moſt of your own expoſitions, *Unleſs you eat the Fleſh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood, you have no life in you.* (If our Saviour ſpeak there, of the Sacrament, as to them he doth, becauſe they conceive he doth ſo.) For 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 Saviour's injunction according to the letter, which yet they *profeſs, is literally always to be obeyed, unleſs ſome impiety, or ſome abſurdity force 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 ſays; *Let a man examine himſelf, and ſo let him eat of this bread, and drink of this Chalice.* This (*a Man*) that is to examine himſelf, is *every man*, that can do it: as is confeſſed on all hands. And therefore it is all one, as if he had ſaid, *Let every man examine himſelf, and ſo let him eat of this bread and drink of this cup.* They which acknowledge S. *Paul*'s Epiſtles, and S. *John*'s Goſpel, to be the Word of God, one would think ſhould not deny, but that they are taught theſe two Doctrins plain enough. Yet we ſee they neither do, 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 Univerſal 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 deal ingenuouſly, and tell me, Who were they of whom our Saviour ſays, *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 ſayes, *I go away and come again unto you*; And *I have told you before it come to paſs*, 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 beginning, becauſe I was with you*, c. 16. v. 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 ye cannot bear them now*? Do 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 behalf 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 paſs? Was your Church with him from the beginning? Was your Church filled with ſorrow, upon the mentioning of Chriſt's departue? 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 bear them now*? as he ſpeaks in the 13. v. immediately before the words by you quoted. And then goes on, *How-*

*beit*

*beit 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 hath but half an eye, that in the 13. he ſpeaks only to them that then were with him? Beſides, in the very Text by you alledged, 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) doth not ſo much as pretend to the ſpirit of Prophecy, 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 halfs; there being in the latter part of it, a clear, and convincing Demonſtration, that you have nothing to do with the former. Unleſs 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. Object. But this *is to confine God's Spirit to the Apoſtles only, or to the Diſciples, that then were preſent with him*: *which is directly contrary to many places of Scripture.* Anſw. I confeſs, that to confine the Spirit of God to thoſe that were then preſent with Chriſt, is againſt Scripture. But, I hope, it is eaſie to conceive a difference, between confining the *Spirit of God* to them, and confining *the promiſes made in this place* to them. God may do many things which he doth not promiſe at all; much more, which he doth not promiſe in ſuch or ſuch a place.

74. Object. 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 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.* Anſw. 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 lives. So that the force, and ſenſe of the words is, that they ſhould never want the Spirit's aſſiſtance, in the performance of their function: And that the Spirit would not (as Chriſt was to do) 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 man's *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 bore his ear through with an awl and he ſhall ſerve him for ever. Pſal. 52. 9. I will praiſe thee for ever, Pſal. 61. 4. I will abide in thy Tabernacle for ever, Pſal. 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 ſhouldſt 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 evinced it muſt be. But what now, if the place produced by you, as a main pillar of your Churches Infallibility, prove upon trial, an engine



engine to batter and overthrow it, at leaſt, (which is all one to my purpoſe) to take away all poſſibility of our aſſurance of it? This will ſeem ſtrange news to you at firſt hearing, and not far from a prodigy. And I confeſs, as you here in this place, and generally all your Writers of Controverſie, by whom this Text is urged, order the matter, it is very much diſabled, to do any ſervice againſt you in this queſtion. For with a bold ſacrilege, and horrible impiety, ſomewhat like *Procruſtes* his cruelty, you perpetually cut off the head and foot, the beginning and end of it; and preſenting to your Confidents, (who uſually read no more of the Bible, than is alledged 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*, conceal in the mean time, the words before, and the words after; that ſo, the promiſe of God's Spirit, may ſeem to be abſolute, whereas it is indeed moſt clearly and expreſly conditional: being both in the words before, reſtrained to thoſe only, that *love GOD, and keep his Commandments:* and in the words after, flatly denied 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 me keep my Commandments, and I will ask 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 thus 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 the Decrees of General Councils: we can have no certainty hereof, but upon this ſuppoſition, that the Spirit of Truth is promiſed to them for their direction in this work: And of this again we can have no certainty, but upon ſuppoſal, that they perform the condition, whereunto the promiſe of the Spirit of Truth is expreſly limited, *viz. That they love God and keep his Commandments*: 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. Another follows, 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, Carnal, Diabolical 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 Councils, which theſe Popes confirm, 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 denied them; and conſequently we can have no certainty, neither of the Decrees, which they confirm, nor of the Churches Infallibility, which guides her ſelf 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 alledged 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 too bold with S. *Paul*; For he ſays not in formal terms, what you make him ſay, *The Church is the Pillar and Ground of Truth*, neither is it certain that he means 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 ſelf, as a Pillar and Ground of the 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 *Elliptis* 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 do, according as he had given other principal men in the Church, the name of Pillars; rather than having

called the Church a *House*, to call it presently a *Pillar*; which may seem somewhat heterogeneous. Yet if you will needs have S. *Paul* refer this not to *Timothy*, but to 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 Universally Infallible.

77. Thirdly, if we grant you out of courtesie (for nothing can enforce us to it) that he both speaks of the Universal Church, and says 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 so to be. For, if they must have been so of necessity, and could not have been otherwise, in vain had he put in them fear of that which follows, *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 be 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 Error.

78. Fourthly and lastly, if we deal most liberally with you, and grant that the Apostle here speaks of the Catholick Church, calls it the *Pillar and Ground of Truth*, and that not only because it should, but because it always 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, unless 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 always shall be 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, than 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 hath 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 do your Cause no service. But the last you suppose will be a Gordian knot, and tye 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. *Until we all meet into the Unity of faith*, &c. *That we be not hereafter Children, wavering and carryed up and down with every wind of Doctrin.* Out of which words this is the only Argument which you collect, or I can collect for you.

There is no means to conserve Unity of Faith, against every wind of Doctrin, unless it be a Church universally infallible.

But it is impious to say, There is no means to conserve Unity of Faith against every wind of Doctrin:

Therefore there must be a Church Universally Infallible.

Whereunto I answer, that your Major is so far from being confirmed, that it is plainly confuted by the place alledged. For that tells us of another means for this purpose, to wit, *the Apostles, and Prophets, and Evangelists, and Pastors, and Doctors*, which Christ gave upon his Ascension, and that their *consummating the Saints, doing the work of the Ministry, and edifying the body of Christ*, was the means 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 Doctrin.* 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 conceit? 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? Unless 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 turn. 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 several Orders of men, clearly distinguished and diversified by the Original 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 parallel place, 1 *Cor.* 12. to which we are referred by your Vulgar Translation, *God hath set some in the Church, first Apostles, secondarily Prophets, thirdly Teachers*; therefore this subterfuge is stopped against you. Object. *But how can they, which died in the first Age, keep us in Unity, and guard us from Error, that live now, perhaps in the last? This seems to be all one, as if a man should say, that* Alexander, *or* Julius Cæsar, *should quiet a mutiny in the King of* Spain's *Army.* Answ. 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 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 error, 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 Ascension, by their writings, which some of them writ, but all approved, are even now sufficient means, to conserve us in Unity of Faith, and guard us from error? 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 immediately, all the Principal and fundamental 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 Council of *Trent*, and the Pope that confirmed them, are they means to conserve you in Unity, and keep 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 Unity, and freedom from Error, to the Persons that made these Decrees; neither will they 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 Unity of Faith, and to keep us from error, 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 the end they aimed at in writing? For if he were both able and willing to do so, then certainly he did do so. And then their writings may be very sufficient means, if we would use them as we should do, to preserve us in Unity, 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, Unity of Faith could not be conserved against every wind of Doctrin:* I answer, That to you which will not understand, that there can be any means to conserve the Unity of Faith, but only that which conserves your Authority over the Faithful, it is no marvel 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 Ascension,* and *he promised to the worlds end.* Besides, though you whom it concerns, may haply 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 imaginations. Lastly, though you are apt to think your selves such necessary instruments for all good purposes, and that nothing can be well done unless you do it; that no unity or constancy in Religion can be maintained, but inevitably Christendom must fall to ruin, and confusion, unless you support it: yet we that are indifferent, and impartial, and well content, that God should give us his own favors, by means of his own appointment, not of our chusing, 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 Ascension,* 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 fail hereof, the Reason is not any insufficiency or invalidity in the means, but the voluntary perverseness 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, than Christ left it, his yoak no heavier than he made it; that the belief of no more difficulties, is required now to Salvation, than was in the Primitive Church; that no error is in it self 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 sincerely endeavour to find the true sense of it, and live according to it, and require no more of others, but to do so; nor denying their Communion to any that do so, would so order their publique service of God, that all which do so may without scruple, or hypocrisie, or protestation against any part of it, joyn with them in it: who doth 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, Unity of Opinion? And, notwithstanding any other differences that are or could be, Unity of Communion, and Charity, and mutual toleration? By which means, all Schism and Heresie would be banished the world, and those wretched contentions which now rend and tear in pieces, not the coat, but the members and bowels of Christ, which mutual pride and Tyranny, and cursing, and killing, and damning, would fain make immortal, should speedily receive a most blessed catastrophe. But of this hereafter, when we shall come to the Question of Schism, wherein I perswade my self, 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 Ecclesiastical Communion harder, and stricter, than they were made at the beginning by Christ and his Apostles: they who talk of Unity, but aim at Tyranny, and will have peace with none, but with their slaves and vassals. In the mean while, though I have shewed how Unity of Faith, and Unity of Charity too,



too, may be preserved without your Churches Infallibility, yet seeing you modestly conclude from hence, not that your Church is, but only *seems to be* universally infallible, meaning to your self, of which you are a better Judge than I: Therefore I willingly grant your Conclusion, and proceed.

82. Whereas you say, That D. *Potter limits those promises and priviledges to Fundamental points*; The truth is, with some of them he meddles not at all, neither doth his adversary give him occasion: Not with those out of the Epistle to *Timothy*, and to the *Ephesians*. To the rest he gives other answer besides this.

83. But *the words of Scripture by you alleadged are Universal, and mention no such restraint to Fundamentals*, as D. *Potter* applies to them: I answer, That, of the five Texts which you alleadge, four are indefinite, and only one universal, and that you confess is to be restrained, & are offended with D. *Potter* for going about to prove 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 appear 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* tells 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 than D.* Potters, *because it is literal.* I answer, His is literal as well as yours: and you are mistaken if you think a restrained sense may not be a literal sense; for to *Restrained, Literal is not* opposed, but *unlimited* or absolute; and to *Literal*, is not opposed *Restrained*, but *Figurative.*

85. Whereas you say, D. *Potters Brethren, rejecting his limitation, restrain the mentioned Texts to the Apostles*, implying hereby a contrariety between them and him: I answer, So doth 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 tells you there, the words in a more restrained sense are true, being understood of the Church Universal.

86. As for your pretence, That *to find the meaning of those places, you confer divers Texts, you consult Originals, you examine Translations, and use all the means by Protestants appointed*, I have told you before, that all this is vain and hypocritical, if (as your manner and your doctrin is) you give not your selves liberty of judgment in the use of these means; if you make not your selves Judges of, but only Advocates for, the Doctrin of your Church, refusing to see what these means shew you, if it any way make against the Doctrin of your Church, though it be as clear as the light at noon. Remove Prejudice, eaven the Ballance, and hold it eaven, make it indifferent to you which way you go to heaven so you go the true, which Religion be true so you be of it, then use the means, and pray for Gods assistance, and as sure as God is true, you shall be led into all necessary Truth.

87. Whereas you say, *you neither do, nor have any possible means to agree, as long as you are left to your selves*: The first is very true, That while you differ, you do not agree. But for the second, That you have no possible means of agreement, as long as you are left to your selves, *i. e.* to your own reasons and judgment, this sure is very false, neither do you offer any proof of it, unless you intend this, that you *do not* agree, for a proof that you *cannot*; which sure is no good consequence, not half so good as this which I oppose against it: D. *Potter* and I, by the use of these means by you mentioned, do agree, concerning the sense of these places, therefore there is a possible means of agreement; and therefore you also, if you would use the same means, with the same minds, might agree so far as it is necessary, and it is not necessary that you should agree farther. Or if there be no possible means to agree about the sense of these Texts, whilst we 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 self same Texts but in the page next before, *These words seem clearly enough to prove that the Church is Universally infallible.* A strange forgetfulness, that the same man, almost in the same breath, should say of the same words, They seem clearly enough to prove such a Conclusion true, and yet that three indifferent men, all presum'd to be lovers of Truth, and industrious searchers of it, should have no possible means, 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 Souls, hath left no certain infallible means 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 than Gods Commandements make. Certainly, God is no way oblig'd either by his Promise or his Love to give us all things, that we may imagine would be convenient for us, as formerly I have 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 means of ending them, is necessary to Salvation, that you have 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 fair shew. And as little care, how you commit those faults your self, which you condemn in others. For you here charge them with great impiety, who imagine that, *God the lover of Souls, hath left no infallible means 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 Jesuits and Dominicans remain undetermined*? You return him this cross Interrogatory, *Who hath assured you that the Point wherein these learned men differ, is a revealed 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 imagin that God hath not left infallible means to decide all differences*; I may answer, It seems you do not believe your self. For in this Controversie which is of as high consequence as any can be, you seem to be doubtful whether there be any means to determine it. On the other side, when you ask D. *Potter*, *Who assured him that there is any means 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 means 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 Jesuits, which includes a difference about the sense of many texts of Scripture, and many other matters of moment, was not included under *this and all other differences*, I cannot imagine. Yet if you can find out any, thus much at least we shall gain by it, *that general speeches are not always to be understood generally, but sometimes with exceptions and limitations.*

89. But if there be any infallible means to decide all differences, I beseech you name them. *You say, it is to consult and hear 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 do) Scripture and Reason, then you foresee that you should be forced to grant, that these are fit means to decide this Controversie, and therefore may be as fit to decide others. Therefore to avoid this, you run 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 submissive acknowledgment of the Churches Infallibility.* As if you should have said, My Brethren, I perceive there is a great Contention amongst you, whether the *Roman* Church be infallible? If you will follow my advice, I will shew you a ready means to end it; you



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 have done in this? Agree that the Pope is supream head of the Church: That the substance of the Bread and Wine in the Sacrament, is turned into the Body and Blood 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 be 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 alwayes, 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 self; and any other thing, by name the Popes Supremacy, or Transubstantiation, is not as fit? Or if for shame you will at length confess, that the Churches infallibility is not fit to decide this difference, Whether the Church be infallible, then you must confess it is not fit to dicdie all: Unless 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 Infallibility cannot possibly be well grounded upon, or decided by it self, then having professed before, that *there is no possible means besides this, for us to agree hereupon*, I hope you will give me leave to conclude, that it is impossible upon good ground for us to agree that the *Roman* Church is infallible. For certainly, light it self is not more clear than the evidence of this Syllogism;

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

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

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

90. Lastly, to the place of S. *Austin, wherein we are advis'd to follow the way of Catholique Discipline, which from Christ himself by the Apostles hath come down even to us, and from us shall descend to all posterity*; I answer, That the way which S. *Austin* spake of, and the way which you commend, being divers wayes, and in many things clean contrary, we cannot possibly follow them both; and therfore for you to apply the same words to them is a vain equivocation. Shew us any way, and do not say, but prove it *to have come from Christ and his Apostles down to us*, and we are ready to follow it. Neither do we expect demonstration hereof, but such reasons as may make this more probable than 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,) and which you must, and some of you do confess to have come into the Church seven hundred years after Christ: if you will bring in things, as you have done the half Communion, with a *non obstante, notwithstanding Christs Institution, and the practice of the Primitive Church, were to the contrary*: If you will do such things as these, and yet would have 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. IV.

### *To ſay that the Creed contains all Points neceſſarily to be believed, is neither* per-tinent *to the Queſtion in hand; nor in it ſelf* true.

I SAY, neither *pertinent* nor *true*. Nor *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 contains all Points neceſſary to be believed: Be it ſo. But doth it likewiſe contain 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 pain of damnation not to reject, as ſoon as we come to know that they are found in holy Scripture? And we having already ſhewed, that whatſoever is propoſed by God's Church as a Point of Faith, is infallibly a truth revealed by God, it followeth that whoſoever denieth any ſuch Point, oppoſeth God's ſacred teſtimony, whether that Point be contained in the Creed, or no. In vain 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 denial whereof deſtroys Salvation; whereas the denial of other Points not Fundamental 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 *Propoſal*, and not of the *Matter* fundamental, or not fundamental. This Catalogue only, can ſhew how far Proteſtants may diſagree without breach of Unity in Faith; and upon this, may other matters depend according to the ground of Proteſtants. But you will never adventure to publiſh ſuch a Catalogue. I ſay more: You cannot aſſign any one Point ſo *great*, or fundamental, that the denial thereof will make a man an Heretique, if it be not ſufficiently propounded, as a divine Truth: Nor can you aſſign 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
(a) Cap. 3. n. 3. Points in the Creed are not of their own nature Fundamental, as I ſhewed (a) before: And yet it is damnable to deny any one Point contained in the Creed. So that it is clear, that to make an error damnable, it is not neceſſary that the matter be of it ſelf fundamental.

3. Moreover, you cannot ground any certainty upon the Creed it ſelf, unleſs firſt you preſuppoſe that the Authority of the Church is univerſally infallible, and conſequently that it is damnable to oppoſe her Declarations, whether they concern matters great, or ſmall, contained, or not contained in the Creed. This is clear. Becauſe we muſt receive 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 contains all Fundamental Points, are grounded upon ſuppoſition, that the *Creed* was made *either by the Apoſtles themſelves, or by the*
(b) Pag. 216. (b) *Church of their times from them*: which thing we could not certainly know, if the ſucceeding and ſtill continued Church may err in her Traditions: neither can we be aſſured, whether all Fundamental 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, unleſs we undoubtedly know that the Apoſtles compoſed the Creed; and *that* they intended to contract all Fundamental 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 contain all Fundamental Points. For if the Church may err in Points not Fundamental, may ſhe not alſo err in the particulars which I have ſpecified? Can you ſhew it to be a Fundamental Point of Faith, that the Apoſtles intended to comprize
(c) Pag. 241. all Points of Faith neceſſary to Salvation in the Creed? Your ſelf ſay no more than that it is very (c) *probable*; which is far from reaching to a Fundamental Point of Faith. Your probability is grounded upon *the Judgment of Antiquity, and even of the* Roman *Doctors*, as you ſay in the ſame place. But if the Catholique Church may err, what certainty can you expect from Antiquity, or Doctors? Scripture is *your* total 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 contain all Fundamental Points of Faith. Which being impoſſible to be done, you muſt for the Creed it ſelf relie upon the infallibility of the Church.

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 contains all Fundamental Points, without ſpecifying; both in what ſenſe the Articles of the Creed be *true*, and alſo in what *true* ſenſe, they be *fundamental*. For, both theſe tasks you are to perform, who teach that all Truth is not Fundamental: and you do but delude the ignorant, when you ſay, that the
(e) Pag. 216. Creed, *taken in a Catholique* (e) *ſenſe*, comprehendeth all Points Fundamental: becauſe, with you all *Catholique ſenſe* is not Fundamental: 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 known, and believed by all, that whoſoever fails therein cannot be ſaved, you trifle, and ſay no more than this, *All Points of the Creed in a ſenſe neceſſary to Salvation, are neceſſary to Salvation.* Or, *All Points Fundamental, are Fundamental.* After this manner it were an eaſie thing to make many true Prognoſtications, by ſaying, it will certainly rain, when it rain-
(f) Pag. 216. eth. 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 Fundamental, or may ſeem more clear, than that, wherein we



we believe JESUS 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 Proteſtants, partly againſt Catholiques, and partly againſt one another? For the ſaid main 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 JESUS CHRIST doth juſtifie alone; that Sacraments have no efficiency in Juſtification; That Baptiſm doth not avail Infants for Salvation, unleſs they have an Act of Faith; That there is no Sacerdotal Abſolution from ſins; That good works proceeding from God's grace are not meritorious; That there can be no Satisfaction for the temporal puniſhment due to ſin, after the guilt or offence is pardoned; No Purgatory; No Prayers for the Dead; No Sacrifice of the Maſs; No Invocation; No Mediation, or Interceſſion of Saints; No inherent Juſtice; No ſupreme Paſtor, yea, no Biſhop by divine Ordinance; No Real preſence; No Tranſubſtantiation, with divers 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 divers Proteſtants, writing againſt Tranſubſtantiation. Let then any judicious man conſider, whether D. *Potter*, or others, do really ſatisfie, when they ſend men to the Creed for a perfect Catalogue, to diſtinguiſh Points Fundamental, from thoſe which they ſay are not Fundamental. If he will ſpeak indeed to ſome purpoſe, let him ſay, This Article is underſtood in this ſenſe; and in this ſenſe it is Fundamental. That other is to be underſtood in ſuch a meaning; yet according to that meaning, it is not ſo fundamental, but that men may diſagree, and deny it without damnation. But it were no policy for any Proteſtant to deal ſo plainly.

6. But to what end ſhould we uſe many arguments? Even your ſelf are forced to limit your own Doctrine, and come to ſay, that the Creed is a perfect Catalogue of Fundamental Points, *taken as it was further opened and explained in ſome parts (by occaſion of emergent Hereſies) in the other Catholique Creeds of Nice, Conſtantinople,* (g) *Epheſus, Chalcedon, and Athanaſius.* But this explication, or reſtriction overthrow- (g) Pag. 216.
eth your aſſertion. For as the Apoſtles Creed was not to us a ſufficient Catalogue, till it was explained by the firſt Council, 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 fundamental, and not fundamental points.

7. I come to the ſecond part: *That the Creed doth not contain all main and principal Points of Faith.* And to the end we may not ſtrive about things either granted by us both, or nothing 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, 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 general heads, as were moſt befitting, and requiſite for preaching the Faith of Chriſt to Jews 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 for both Jews and Gentiles, the Trinity, the Meſſias, and Saviour, his birth, life, death, reſurrection, and glory, from whom they were to hope remiſſion of ſins, and life everlaſting, and by whoſe ſacred name they were to be diſtinguiſhed from all other profeſſions, by being called Chriſtians. According to which purpoſe S. *Thomas of Aquine* (h) doth diſtinguiſh all the Articles of the Creed into theſe general heads: That ſome (h) 2. 2. q. 1. Art. 8.
belong to the Majeſty of the *Godhead*, others to the Myſtery of our Saviour Chriſts *Humane nature*: Which two general objects of Faith, the Holy Ghoſt doth expreſs and conjoyn, *Joan.* 17. *Hac eſt vita aterna, &c. This is life everlaſting, that they know the true GOD, and whom thou haſt ſent JESUS CHRIST.* But it was not their meaning to give us as it were a courſe of Divinity, or a Catechiſm, or a particular expreſſion of all Points of Faith, leaving thoſe things to be performed, as occaſion ſhould require, by their own word or writing, for their time, and afterward for their ſucceſſors in the Catholique Church. Our queſtion then is not, Whether the Creed be perfect, as far as the end for which it was compoſed, did require; For we believe and are ready to give our lives for this; but only we deny, that the Apoſtles did intend to compriſe therein all particular Points of belief, neceſſary to Salvation, as even by D. *Potter*'s own (k) confeſſion, it doth not comprehend *Agenda*, or things belong- (k) Pag. 235. 215.
ing to practice, as *Sacraments, Commandements*, the acts of *Hope*, and duties of *Charity*, which we are obliged not only to practiſe, but alſo to believe to be divine infallible faith. Will he therefore infer that the Creed is not perfect, becauſe it contains not all thoſe neceſſary and Fundamental objects of Faith? He will anſwer, No, becauſe the Apoſtles intended only to expreſs *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 belief which were intended to be ſet down as we explicated before.

9. The ſecond Obſervation is, that to ſatisfie our queſtion what Points in particular be fundamental, it will not be ſufficient to alledge the Creed, unleſs it contains all ſuch Points either expreſly, and immediately; or elſe in ſuch manner, that by evident and neceſſary conſequence they may be deduced from Articles both clearly and particularly contained therein. For if the deduction be *doubtful*, we ſhall not be *ſure*, that ſuch Concluſions be fundamental: or if the Articles themſelves which are ſaid to be fundamental, be not diſtinctly, and particularly expreſſed, they will not ſerve us to know, and diſtinguiſh all Points Fundamental, from thoſe which they call, not Fundamental. We do not deny but that all Points of Faith, both fundamental and not fundamental, may be ſaid to be contained in the Creed, in ſome ſenſe; as for example, implicitly, generally, or in ſuch involved manner. For when we explicitly believe the *Catholick Church*, we do not implicitely believe whatſoever ſhe propoſeth as belonging to Faith: or elſe by way of *reduction* that is when we are once inſtructed in the belief of particular Points of Faith, not expreſſed, nor by neceſſary conſequence deducible from the Creed; we may afterward by ſome analogie, or proportion, and reſemblance, reduce it to one or more of thoſe Articles which are explicitely contained in the Symbole. Thus S. *Thomas* the Cherubim among Divines, teacheth (l) that the mira- (l) 2. 2. q. 1. Art. 8. ad 6.
culous exiſtence of our bleſſed Saviours Body in the *Euchariſt*, as likewiſe all his other *miracles* are reduced to God's *Omnipotency*, expreſſed in the Creed. And D. *Potter* ſaith, *The Euchariſt* (m) *being a Seal of that* (m) Pag. 231.
*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 far from being ſufficient

to infer out of the Articles of *God's Omnipotency*, or of the *Communion of Saints*, that our Saviours body is in the Eucharist, and much less 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 Fundamental. 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, we may refer it to some of those heads expressed in the Creed, and yet so, as S. *Thomas* refers it to one Article, and D. *Potter* to another; and in respect of different analogies or effects, it may be referred to several Articles. The like I say of other Points of Faith, which may in some sort be reduced to the Creed, but nothing to D. *Potter*'s purpose: But contrarily it sheweth, that your affirming such and such Points to be Fundamental or not Fundamental, is meerly arbitrary, to serve your turn, as necessity, and your occasions may require. Which was an old custom amongst Heretiques, as we read in (n) S. *Austin*; *Pelagius* and *Cœlestius, desiring fraudulently to avoid the hateful name of Heresies, affirmed that the question of Original sin may be disputed without danger of faith.* But this holy Father affirms that it belongs to the foundation of Faith. *We may* (saith he) *endure a disputant who errs in other questions not yet diligently examined, not yet diligently established by the whole Authority of the Church, their error may be borne with: but it must not pass so far as to attempt to shake the Foundation of the Church.* We see S. *Augustine* placeth the being of a Point Fundamental or not Fundamental in that it hath been *examined*, and *established* by the Church, although the Points of which he speaketh, namely, Original Sin, be not contained in the Creed.

(n) De peccat. Orig. li. 2. c. 22

10. Out of that which hath been said, I infer, that D. *Potters* pains in alledging Catholique Doctors, the ancient Fathers, and the Council of *Trent*, to prove that the Creed contains all Points of Faith, was needless; since we grant it in manner aforesaid. But D. *Potter* cannot in his conscience believe, that Catholique Divines, or the Council 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 Council define, 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 seem strange. For who is ignorant, that Summaries, Epitomes, and the like brief Abstracts, are not intended to specifie all particulars of that Science, or Subject, to which they belong. For as the Creed is said to contain all Points of *Faith*; so the Decalogue comprehends all Articles (as I may term them) which concern *Charity*, and good life: and yet this cannot be so understood, as if we were disobliged from performance of any duty, or the eschewing of any vice, unless it be expressed in the ten Commandements. For, (to omit the precepts of receiving Sacraments, which belong to practice, or manners, and yet are not contained in the Decalogue) there are many sins, even against the law of nature, and light of reason, which are not contained in the ten Commandements, except only by similitude, analogy, reduction, or some such way. For example, we find not expressed in the Decalogue, either divers sins, as Gluttony, Drunkenness, Pride, Sloth, Covetousness in desiring either things superfluous, or with too much greediness; or divers of our chief obligations, as Obedience to Princes, and all Superiours, not only Ecclesiastical, but also Civil, whose laws *Luther*, *Melancthon*, *Calvin*, and some other Protestants do dangerously affirm not to oblige in conscience, and yet these men think they know the ten Commandments: as likewise divers Protestants defend Usury, to be lawful; and the many Treatises of *Civilians*, *Canonists*, and *Casuists* are witnesses, that divers sins against the light of reason, and law of nature, are not distinctly expressed in the ten Commandements; although when by others diligence they are found unlawful, they may be reduced to some of the Commandements, and yet not so evidently, and particularly but that divers do it in divers manners.

12. My third Observation is, That our present question being Whether or no the Creed contain so fully all Fundamental Points of Faith, that whosoever do not agree in all, and every one of those Fundamental 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 do not agree, both of them cannot expect to be saved, I shall have performed as much as I intend; and D. *Potter* must seek out some other Catalogue for Points Fundamental, than the Creed. Neither is it material to the said purpose, whether such Fundamental Points rest only in knowledge, and speculation or belief, or else be farther referred to work and practice. For the *habit*, or vertue of *Faith*, which inclineth, and enableth us to believe both speculative and practical verities, is of one and the self 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 practice. The reason is, because the *Formal Object*, or motive, for which I yield assent to those different sorts of material objects, is the same in both, to wit, the revelation, or Word of God. Where, by the way I note, that if the *Unity*, 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 practice, which I doubt whether D. *Potter* himself will admit.

13. Hence it followeth, that whosoever denieth any one main practical revealed truth, is no less an Heretique, than if he should deny a Point resting in belief alone. So that when D. *Potter* (to avoid our argument, that all Fundamental 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 essential to constitute a Church) answereth, that the *Sacraments are to be* (p) *reckoned, rather among the* Agenda *of the Church, than the* Credenda; *they are rather Divine Rites and Ceremonies, than Doctrins*; he either grants what we affirm, or in effect sayes, Of two kinds of revealed Truths which are necessary to be believed, the Creed contains one sort only, *ergo*, it contains 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 Practice, 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, than in barren Speculation; in good works, than bare belief; in doing, than knowing. And there are no less contentions concerning practical, than speculative truths: as Sacraments, obtaining remission of sin, Invocation of Saints, Prayers for the dead, Adoration of Christ in the Sacrament, and many other: all which do

(p) Pag. 232.



do so much the more import, as on them, beside right belief, doth also depend our practice, and the ordering of our life. Though D. *Potter* could therefore give us (as he will never be able to do) 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 practice, declaring which of them be fundamental, which not; that so every man might know, whether he be not in some *Damnable* Error, for some Article of Faith, which farther might give influence into *Damnable* works.

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 general it doth not tell us, what Points be fundamental, or not fundamental, which in the way of Protestants is most necessary to be known; in particular, there is no mention of the greatest evils, from which mans calamity proceeded, I mean, the sin of the Angels, of *Adam*, and of Original sin 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 general 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 sins* be understood by Faith alone, or else may admit the efficiency of Sacraments. There is no mention of Ecclesiastical, Apostolical, *Divine Traditions*, one way or other; or of holy Scriptures in general, and much less of every Book in particular; nor of the Name, Nature, Number, Effects, Matter, Form, Ministry, Intention, Necessity of Sacraments: and yet the due Administration of Sacraments, is with Protestants an essential Note of the Church. There is nothing for Baptism of Children, nor against Re-baptization. There is no mention in favour, or against the Sacrifice of the Mass, of Power in the Church to institute Rites, Holy Days, &c. and to inflict Excommunication, or other Censures: or Priesthood, Bishops, and the whole Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, which are very Fundamental Points; of S. *Peters* Primacy, which to *Calvin* seemeth a fundamental error; not of the possibility, or impossibility to keep God's Commandements; of the procession of the holy Ghost from the Father and 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 (r) all sort of Commemoration for the dead. Nothing of the Churches Visibility or Invisibility, Fallibility or Infallibility; nor of other Points controverted betwixt Protestants themselves, and between Protestants and Catholiques, which to D. *Potter* seems so hainous corruptions, that they cannot without damnation joyn 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.

(q) Heb. 11. 6.

(r) Pag. 35.

15. But what need we labour to specifie particulars? There are as many important Points of Faith not expressed in the Creed, as, since the worlds beginning, now, and for all future times there have been, are, and may be innumerable, gross, damnable Heresies, whose contrary truths are not contained in the Creed. For, every Fundamental Error must have a contrary Fundamental Truth; because of two contradictory Propositions in the same degree, if the one is false, the other must be true. As for example, if it be a damnable error to deny the blessed 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 frightful, because life is sweet; and according to Philosophy, the Privation is measured by the Form to which it is repugnant. If therefore the Creed contain in particular all fundamental Points of Faith, it must explicitely, or by clear consequence, comprehend all Truths opposite to innumerable Heresies of all Ages past, present, and to come, which no man in his wits will affirm it to do.

16. And here I cannot omit to signifie how you (s) applaud the saying of D. *Usher*, *That in those Propositions which without all controversie 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* knows, that the Mystery of the B. Trinity is not universally received in the whole Christian world, as appears by very many Hereticks, in *Polony*, *Hungary*, and *Transilvania*, and therefore according to this Rule of D. *Usher*, approved by D. *Potter*, the denial of the B. Trinity, shall not exclude Salvation.

(s) Pag. 255.

17. Let me note, by the way, that you might easily have espied a foul contradiction in the said words of D. *Usher*, by you recited, and so much applouded. 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 heresie, unless it contradict some necessary Truth, which cannot happen in one who is supposed to believe all necessary *Truths*? Besides, if one believing all Fundamental Articles in the Creed may *superinduce damnable heresies*, it followeth, that the Fundamental Truths contrary to those damnable heresies, are not contained in the Creed.

18. According to this Model 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 or 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 an horse, the shoulder of an Ox, the foot of a Lion, &c. I wrong them not herein. For in good Philosophy there is greater repugnancy between assent and dissent, affirmation and negation, *est, est, non, non*, (especially when all these contradictories pretend to rely upon one and the self same *Motive*, the infallible Truth of Almighty God) than between the integral parts, as head, neck, &c. of a man, horse, lion, &c. And thus Protestants are far more bold to disagree even in matters of Faith, than Catholique Divines in questions meerly Philosophical, or not determined by the Church. And while thus



they

they stand only upon *fundamental* Articles, they do 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, than 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 than Church, do give unavoidable occasion of desperation to poor souls. Let some one who is desirous to save his soul repair to D. *Potter*, who maintains these grounds, to know upon whom he may relie, in a matter of so great consequence; I suppose the Doctors answer will be, Upon the truly Catholique Church. She cannot err damnably. What understand you by the Catholique Church? cannot general Councils, which are the Church *representative*, err? Yes, *they may weakly, or* (t) *wilfully misapply, or misunderstand, or neglect Scripture, and so err damnably.* To whom then shall I go for my particular instruction? I cannot confer with the united body of the whole Church about my particular difficulties, as your self affirms, that the Catholique Church *cannot be told* (u) *of private injuries.* Must I then consult with every particular person of the Catholique Church? So it seems by what you write in these words, *The whole* (w) *Militant Church* (*that is, all the members of it*) *cannot possibly err either in the whole Faith, or any necessary Article of it.* You say, M. *Doctor*, I cannot for my instruction acquaint the universal Church with my particular scruples. You say, the Prelates of God's Church meeting in a lawful general Council may err damnably: It remains then that for my necessary instruction, I must repair to every particular member of the universal Church, spred over the face of the earth: and yet you teach 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 conferr. Alas! O most uncomfortable ghostly Father, you drive me to desperation! How shall I confer with every Christian soul, man and woman, by sea and by land, close prisoner or at liberty? &c. Yet, upon supposal 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 relie? Procure (will you say) to know whether he believe all Fundamental Points of Faith. For if he do, his faith, for point of belief, is sufficient for Salvation, though he err in an hundred things of less moment. But how shall I know, whether he hold all Fundamental Points or no? For till you tell me this, I cannot know whether or no his belief be sound in all Fundamental Points. Can you say the Creed? Yes and so can many damnable Hereticks. But why do you ask me this question? Because the Creed contains all fundamental Points of Faith. Are you sure of that? Not sure: I hold it very probable. (y) Shall I hazard my soul on *probabilities*, or even wagers? This yields a new cause of dispair. But what? doth the Creed contain all Points necessary to be believed, whether they rest in the understanding, or else do further extend to practice? No. It was composed to deliver *Credenda*, not *Agenda* to us; Faith, not *Practice*. How then shall I know what Points of belief, which direct my practice, be necessary to Salvation? Still you chalk out new paths for Desperation. Well, are all Articles of the Creed, for their nature and matter, Fundamental? I cannot say so. How then shall I know which in particular be and which be not fundamental? Read my Answer to a late Popish Pamphlet intituled *Charity Mistaken, &c.* there you shall find, that fundamental Doctrins are such *Catholique Verities, 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 capital Doctrins 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 elsewhere calls the first Principles of the Oracles of God, and, the form of sound words.* But how shall I apply these general definitions, or descriptions, or (to say the truth) these only varied words and phrases (for I understand the word *fundamental*, as well as the word *principal essential, grand, and capital doctrins*, &c.) to the particular Articles of the Creed, in such sort, as that I may be able precisely, exactly, particularly, to distinguish Fundamental Articles from Points of less moment? You labour to tell us *what* Fundamental Points be, but not *which* they be: and yet unless you do this, your Doctrin serves only, either to make men dispair, or else to have recourse to those whom you call Papists, and which give 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 self acknowledges that these men do not err in Points Fundamental, I cannot but hold it most safe for me to joyn with them, for the securing of my soul, and the avoiding of desperation, into which this your Doctrin must cast all them who understand and believe it. For the whole discourse, and inferences which here I have made, are either your own direct Assertions, or evident Consequences cleerly deduced from them.

(t) Pag. 167.
(u) Pag. 27.
(w) Pag. 150.
(x) Pag. 151.
(y) Pag. 241.
(z) Pag. 211, 213, 214.

20. But now let us answer some few Objections of D. *Potters*, against that which we have said before, to avoid our argument, that the Scripture is not so much as mentioned in the Creed, he saith, *The Creed is an abstract of such* (a) *necessary Doctrins as are delivered in Scripture*, or collected out of it; and therefore needs not express the Authority of that which it supposes.

(a) Pag. 234.

21. This Answer makes for us. For by giving a reason why it was needless that Scripture should be expressed in the Creed, you grant as much as we desire, namely, that the Apostles judged it *needless* to express all necessary Points of Faith in their Creed. Neither doth the Creed suppose, or depend on Scriptures in such sort as that we can by any probable consequence, insert from the Articles of the Creed, that there is any Canonical Scripture at all; and much less that such Books in particular be Canonical. Yea, the Creed might have 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 Gospel of S. *Mathew*. And so, according to this reason of his, the Scripture should not mention Articles contained in the Creed. And I note in a word, how little connexion D. *Potters* arguments have, while he tels us, that *The Creed* (b) *is an Abstract of such necessary Doctrins as are delivered in Scripture, or collected out of it, and therefore needs not express the authority of that which it supposes*; it doth not follow: The Articles of 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, unless D. *Potter* be of opinion that two Doctors cannot, *at one time*, speak the same truth.

(b) Pag. 234.

22. And notwithstanding, that D. *Potter* hath now told us, it was *needless* that the Creed should express



press 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 Canonical Scripture.* But I would ask him, whether the *Nicene* Creed be not also an Abstract of Doctrins delivered in Scripture, as he said of the Apostles Creed, and thence did infer, that it was needless to express Scripture, *whose authority it supposes*? Besides, we do not only believe in general, that Canonical 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 Canonical. 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 wayes 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 have more in his Creed than the* (c) *Apostles had, and the Church of their times?* I answer, You trifle, not distinguishing between the Apostles belief, 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, than is contained in their Creed, which every unlearned person knows and believes: and I hope you will not deny but the Apostles were endued with greater knowledge than ordinary persons.

(c) Pag. 221.

24. Your pretended proof out of the Acts, that the Apostles *revealed to the Church the whole counsel of God, keeping* (d) *back nothing* with your gloss (*needful for our Salvation*) is no proof, unless you still beg the question, and do suppose, that whatsoever the Apostles revealed to the Church, is contained in the Creed. And I wonder you do not reflect that those words were by S. *Paul* particularly directed to Pastors, and Governors of the Church, as is clear by the other words, *He called the Ancients of the Church.* And afterward, *Take heed to your selves, and to the whole flock wherein the holy Ghost hath placed you Bishops to rule the Church.* And your self say, *that more knowledge is* (e) *necessary in Bishops, and Priests, to whom is committed the government of the Church, and the care of souls, than in vulgar Laicks.* Do you think that the Apostles taught Christians nothing but their Creed? Said they nothing of the Sacraments, Commandements, Duties of Hope, Charity, &c?

(d) Act. 20. 27.
(e) Pag. 244.

25. Upon 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. *Matthew*, and S. *John* believe their writings to be Canonical Scripture? and yet their writings are not mentioned in the Creed. It is therefore more than clear that the Faith of the Apostles is of larger extent, than the Apostles Creed.

(f) Pag. 225, 226.

26. To your demand, Why amongst many things of equal *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 fundamental or necessary to be explicitely and distinctly believed, as above we shewed; Why are these Points which are not fundamental expressed, rather than other of the same quality? Why our Saviours descent to Hell, and Burial expressed, and not his Circumcision, his Manifestation to the three Kings, working of Miracles, &c? Why did they not express Scriptures, Sacraments, and all Fundamental Points of Faith tending to practice, as well as those which rest in belief? Their intention was, particularly to deliver such Articles as were fittest for those times, concerning the Deity, Trinity, and Messias, (as heretofore I have declared) leaving many things to be taught by the *Catholique Church*, which in the Creed we all profess to believe. Neither doth it follow, as you infer, *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 believe we have all, when* (h) *we have 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 Catechisms, wherein, besides the Articles of the Creed, you add divers others particulars. These would be poor consequences, and so are yours. But shall I tell you news; 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 Scripture; 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 have, besides it, holy Scripture; we have unwritten, Divine, Apostolical, Ecclesiastical Traditions. It were a childish Argument, The Creed contains 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 means: *Ergo*, she must teach us without all means, without Creeds, without Councils, without Scripture, &c. If the Apostles had expressed no Article, but that of the Catholique Church, she must have taught us the other Articles in particular, by Creeds, or other means 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 own error, whereby you will needs believe that the Creed must contain *all*. For neither the Apostles nor the Church, nor the Creed it self tell you any such matter; and what necessity is there, that one means of instruction, must involve whatsoever is contained in all the rest? We are not to recite the Creed with anticipated perswasions, 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 contains what we find 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 deceived, by believing we have all in the Creed, when we have not all; and you may in the same manner say, *As well, nay better, the Apostles might have given us no Articles* at all, as have left out Articles tending to practice. For in setting down one, sort of Articles, and not the other, *they make us believe we have all, when we have not all.*

(g) Pag. 223.
(h) Pag. 223.

27. To our Argument, that Baptism is not contained in the Creed, D. *Potters* besides his answer, that Sacraments belong rather to practice than faith, (which I have already confuted, and which indeed maketh against himself, 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 Baptism by name* [con-

(i) Pag. 237.

[*confess one Baptism for the remission of sins.*] Which answer is directly against himself, and manifestly proves that Baptism is an Article of Faith; and yet is not contained in the Apostles Creed, neither explicitly, 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 Council; he will find that Protestants maintain many errors against faith, as being repugnant to definitions of general Councils: as, in particular, that the very Council of *Nice*, which (saith M. *Whitgift*, (k) *is of all wise and learned men reverenced, esteemed and embraced, next unto the Scriptures themselves*) decreed, that *to those who were chosen to the Ministry unmarried, it was not lawful to take any wife afterwards* is affirmed by Protestants. And your grand Reformer *Luther* (*lib. de Conciliis parte prima*) saith, that he understands not the holy Ghost in that Council. For in one Canon it saith, that those who have gelded themselves are not fit to be made Priests, in another it forbids them to have wives. *Hath* (saith he) *the holy Ghost nothing to do in Councils, but to bind and load his Ministers with impossible, dangerous, and unnecessary laws?* I forbear to shew that this very Article, *I confess one Baptism for the Remission of sins*, will be understood by Protestants in a far different sense from Catholiques, yea, Protestants among themselves do not agree, How Baptism forgives sins, nor what grace it confers. Only concerning the Unity of Baptism against re-baptization 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 re-baptize Catholiques, wherein they shew themselves to be greater Heretiques, since it hath pleased the universal Catholick Church not to make Baptism void, even in the very Heretiques themselves.* In which few words, this holy Father delivereth against the Donatists these Points which do also make against Protestants; That to make an Heresie, or an Heretique, known for such, it is sufficient to oppose the definition of God's Church: That a Proposition may be Heretical, though it be not repugnant to any Texts of Scripture. For S. *Augustine* teacheth that the doctrine of re-baptization is heretical, and yet acknowledgeth it cannot be convinced for such out of Scripture. And that, neither the Heresie of re-baptization 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 Unity of Faith, and Spirit, in the same Church, unless there be also a total agreement both in *belief* of other Points of Faith, and in *external 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 Baptism, and in the Creed; but in the Spirit of Unity, and bond of peace, and lastly in the Catholick Church you are not with us.*

(k) In his defence pag. 330.

(l) Lib. de Hæres. in 69.

(m) Aug. ep. 48.

## The ANSWER to the FOURTH CHAPTER.

### *wherein is shewed, that the Creed contains all necessary Points of meer Belief.*

1. AD §. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6. Concerning the Creed's containing the Fundamentals of Christianity, this is D. *Potter's* 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 Fundamentals, by the best learned Romanists, and by Antiquity.*

2. By *Fundamentals* he understands *not the Fundamental Rules of good life and action*, (though every one of these is to be believed to come from God, and therefore virtually includes an Article of Faith;) but the Fundamental *Doctrins of Faith*, such, as though they have influence upon our lives, as every essential doctrin of Christianity hath, yet we are commanded to believe them, and not to do them. The assent of our understandings is required to them, but no obedience from our wills.

3. But these speculative Doctrins again he distinguisheth out of *Aquinas*, *Occham*, and *Canus*, and others, into two kinds: of the first are those which are the *Objects of Faith, in, and for themselves*, which by their own nature and God's prime intention, are essential parts of the Gospel: such as the Teachers in the Church, cannot without Mortal sin omit to teach the learners: such as are intrinsecal 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 *Accidental, Circumstantial Occasional* objects of Faith; millions 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 be



be 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 always; but then only when they do see, and know them to be delivered in Scripture, as divine Revelations.

4. I say when they do so, and not only when they may do. For to lay an obligation upon us of believing, or not disbelieving any Verity, sufficient Revelation on God's part, is not sufficient: For then, seeing all the express Verities of Scripture are either to all men, or at least to all learned men sufficiently revealed by God, it should be a damnable sin, in any learned man actually to disbelieve any one particular Historical 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 Essential, and Fundamental 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 doctrin 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 says is this: It is *very probable, that according to the judgment of the* Roman *Doctors, and the Ancient Fathers, the Apostles Creed is to be esteemed a sufficient summary of all those Doctrines which being meerly* 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 self true.* Your Reasons to prove it *impertinent*, put into form and divested of impertinencies, are these. 1. *Because the question was not, What points were necessary to be explicitely believed, but what Points were necessary not to be disbelieved after sufficient proposal. And therefore to give a Catalogue of Points necessary to be explicitely believed, is impertinent.*

7. *Secondly, because errors may be damnable, though the contrary truths be not of themselves fundamental; as, that* Pontius Pilate *was our Saviours Judge, is not in it self a Fundamental Truth, yet to believe the contrary were a damnable error. And therefore to give a Catalogue of Truths in themselves fundamental, is no pertinent satisfaction to this demand, what errors are damnable?*

8. *Thirdly, because if the Church be not universally infallible, we cannot ground any certainty upon the Creed, which we must receive upon the credit of the Church: and, if the Church be universally 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, thereof it is frivolous to say, the Creed contains all Fundamentals, without specifying in what sense the Articles of it are fundamental.*

10. *Fifthly, because the Apostles Creed (as D.* Potter *himself confesseth) was not a sufficient Catalogue, till it was explained by the first Councel; nor then until it was*

*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 Fundamentals.*

11. Now to the first of these Objections I say, First, that your distinction between Points necessary to be believed, and necessary not to be disbelieved, is more subtil than 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 do very strangely, in saying, That *the Question was, what Point might lawfully be disbelieved, after sufficient Proposition that they are divine Revelation.* You affirm, that none may; and so doth 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 Fundamental? 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, and it was most reasonable, that a List of Fundamentals should be given, the denial whereof destroys Salvation, whereas the denial of other Points may stand with Salvation, although both kinds be equally proposed, as revealed by God.*

12. Let the Reader peruse *Charity Mistaken*, and 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 do 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 demand 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 terms to require this of us. For having first told us, *that the command was what points were necessary not to be disbelieved, after sufficient proposition that they are Divine Truths:* you come to say, *Certainly the Creed contains not all these.* And this you prove by asking, *How many Truths are there in holy Scripture, or 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 Proposal, you require us to set you down all Points contained in Scripture, or evidently deducible from it. And yet this you are pleased to call a *reasonable*, nay, *a most reasonable Demand:* whereas having ingaged your self to give a Catalogue of your Fundamentals, you conceive your ingagement very well satisfied by saying, *All is Fundamental which the Church proposeth*, without going about to give us an endless Inventory of her Proposals. And therefore from us, instead of a perfect Particular of Divine Revelations of all sorts, (of which with a less Hyperbole than S. *John* useth, we might say, *If they were to be written, the world would not hold the books that must be written*;) me-thinks you should accept of this general, All Divine Revelations are true, and to be believed. Which yet I say, not as if I thought the belief of this General sufficient to Salvation; but because I conceive it as sufficient as the belief of your General: and therefore I said not, *Me-thinks all should accept of this General*, but, *Me-thinks you should accept of it.*



13. The very truth is, The main Question in this business 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 belief of Christians, so that that Society, which doth propose, and indeed believe them, hath for matter of Faith, the essence of a true Church; that which doth not, hath 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 total satisfaction to it, yet very effectual, 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 *Practice and Obedience*, he that gives you a sufficient summary of the first sort of necessary Points, hath brought you half way towards your journies end. And therefore that which he doth, is no more to be slighted, as vain and impertinent, than an Architect's work is to be thought impertinent towards the making of a house, because he doth it not all himself. 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 embraced cannot in all reason, but do infinite service, both to the Truth of Christ, and the peace of Christendom. For seeing falshood and error could not long stand against the power of Truth, were they not supported by Tyranny and worldly advantages, he that could assert Christians to that liberty which Christ and his Apostles left them, must needs do Truth a most Heroical service. And seeing the overvaluing of the differences among Christians, is one of the greatest maintainers of the Schisms of Christendom, he that could demonstrate, that only these Points of Belief are simply necessary to Salvation, wherein Christians generally agree, should he not lay a very fair and firm foundation of the peace of Christendom? Now the Corollary, which, I conceive, would produce these good effects, and which flows naturally from D. *Potter*'s Assertion, is this, *That what Man or Church soever believes the Creed, and all the evident consequences of it sincerely and heartily, cannot possibly (if also he believe the Scripture) be in any Error of simple belief which is offensive to God: nor therefore deserve for any such Error 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 again would be this (which highly concerns the Church of *Rome* to think of,) *That whatsoever Man or Church doth for any error of simple belief, deprive any man so qualified as above, either of his temporal life, or livelihood, or liberty, or of the Churches Communion, and hope of Salvation, is for the first, unjust, cruel, and tyrannous: Schismatical, presumptuous, and uncharitable for the second.*

14. Neither yet is this (as you pretend) to take away the necessity of believing 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 believing all things written in Scripture, when once they know them to be there written. For he that believes not all known Divine Revelations to be true, How doth he believe in God? Unless 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 believing 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 meer Faith*, yet no man pretends that it contains the *Rules of obedience*; but for them, all men are referred to Scripture. Besides, he that pretends to believe in God, obligeth himself to believe it necessary to obey that which Reason assures him to be the Will of God. Now Reason will assure him that believes the Creed, that it is the Will of God he should believe the Scripture: even the very same Reason which moves him to believe the Creed: Universal, and never-failing Tradition, having given this testimony both to Creed and Scripture, that they both by the works of God were sealed, and testified to be the words of God. And thus much be spoken in Answer 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 com then *to your second.* And, in Answer to it, deny flatly, as a thing destructive of it self, that any Error can be damnable, unless it be repugnant immediately or mediately, directly or indirectly, of it self or by accident, to some Truth for the matter of it Fundamental. And to your example of *Pontius Pilat's being Judge of Christ*, I say, the denial of it in him that knows it to be revealed by God, is manifestly destructive of this Fundamental Truth, that *All Divine Revelations are true.* Neither will you find any error so much as by accident damnable, but the rejecting of it will be necessarily laid upon us, by a real belief of all Fundamentals, and simply necessary Truths. And I desire you would reconcile with this, that which you have said §. 15. *Every Fundamental Error must have a contrary Fundamental 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 contains the Principles of Faith, I ground it not upon Scripture, and yet not upon the Infallibility of any present, much less 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 find 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's for doing it too much, and not too little. This presumptuous imposing of the senses of men upon the words of God, the special senses of men upon the general words of God, and laying them upon mens consciences together, under the equal penalty of death, and damnation; this Vain conceit that we can speak of the things of God, better than in the words of God: This Deifying our own 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 fountain of all the Schisms of the Church, and that which makes them immortal: the common incendiary of Christendom, and that which (as I said before) tears into pieces, not the coat, but the bowels, and members of Christ: *Ridente Turcâ nec dolente Judæo.* Take away these Walls 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 disclaim it, disclaim it likewise in their actions, In a word, take away Tyranny, which is the Devils instrument to support errors, and superstitions, and impieties, in the several 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, run all to the Ocean, so it may well be hoped by God's blessing, that Universal Liberty thus moderated, may quickly reduce Christendom to Truth and Unity. These thoughts of peace (I am perswaded) may come from the God of peace, and to His blessing I commend them, and proceed.

(a) This perswasion is no singularity of mine but the doctrin which I have learned from Divines of great learning and judgment. Let the Reader be pleased to peruse the seventh book of *Acont. de Strat. Satanæ* And *Zanch* his last *Oration* delivered by him after the composing of the discord between him and *Amerbachius*, and he shall confess as much.



18. *Your fifth and last Objection* stands upon a false and dangerous supposition: That *new Heresies may arise.* For an Heresie being in it self nothing else but a Doctrin 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 profess in plain terms, who yet at the same time are not ashamed to pretend that your whole Doctrin 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:* Dis. 57. in Epist. ad *Rom.* And again in the Margent, *Habet unumquodque 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 little before in these words, *Unius Augustini doctrina Assumptionis B. Deiparæ cultum in Ecclesiam introduxit. The Doctrin of* Augustine *only, hath brought into the Church the Worship of the Assumption of the Mother of God*, &c. Others again mince and palliate the matter with this pretence, that your Church undertakes not to coyn new Articles of Faith, but only to declare those that want sufficient Declaration. But if sufficient declaration be necessary to make any Doctrin an Article of Faith, then this Doctrin, which before wanted it, was not before an Article of Faith; and your Church by giving it the Essential form, and last complement of an Article of Faith, makes it, though not a Truth, yet certainly an Article of Faith. But I would fain know, whether Christ and his Apostles knew this Doctrin, which you pretend hath the matter, but wants the form 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 learned it? If they knew it, then either they concealed or declared it. To say, they concealed any necessary part of the Gospel, is to charge them with far greater sacriledge, than 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 Doctrin, than what they had received from them, which sure could not merit an Anathema, if they left any necessary part of the Gospel untaught. It is in a word, in plain terms to give them the lye, seeing they profess plainly and frequently, that they taught Christians the whole *Doctrin of Christ.* If they did know and declare it, then it was a full and formal Article of faith; and the contrary a full and formal Heresie, without any need of further declaration; and then their Successors either continued the declaration of it, or discontinued it: If they did the latter, How are they such faithful Depositaries of Apostolique Doctrin 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 Successors, and they to theirs, and so on perpetually; then continued it still a full and formal Article of Faith, and the repugnant doctrin a full and formal Heresie, without and before the definition or declaration of a Councel. So that Councels, as they cannot make that a truth or falshood, which

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 doctrin, (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 judgment, touching the sense of some general Articles of the Creed: but to oblige others to receive their declarations under pain 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 confess the judgment of a Council, though not infallible, is yet so far directive, and obliging, that without apparent reason to the contrary, it may be sin 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 fearful than 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 discharge my self, or my Reader with a punctual examination of it, may seem superfluous. First, that which you would have, and which your Arguments wholly drive at, is this, That *the Creed doth not contain all main and principal points of Faith of all sorts, whether they be speculative, or practical*, whether they contain matter of simple belief, or whether they contain matter of practice and obedience. This D. *Potter* grants; *page* 215.235. And you grant that he grants it, §. 8. Where your words are, *even by D.* Potter's *own confession, it (the Creed) doth not comprehend* Agenda, *or things belonging to practice, as Sacraments, Commandements, the Act of Hope, and duties of Charity.* And if you will infer from hence, that therefore *C. M.* hath no reason to rest in the Apostles Creed, as a perfect catalogue of Fundamentals, and a full satisfaction to his demand, I have without any offence of D. *Potter*, granted as much, if that would content you. But seeing you go on, and, because his assertion is not (as neither is it pretended to be) a total satisfaction to the demand, cashеer 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 satisfie your demand, yet sure it were not; to do nothing towards it: Or, as this rejoynder of mine, though it be not an answer to all your Book, but only to the First considerable Part of it, and so much of the Second as is material, and falls into the first, yet I hope you will not deal so unkindly with me, as for this reason, to condemn 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 consigned 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 payment, of the Apostles Creed, as a sufficient Summary of these Articles of Faith, which are *meerly Credenda*, me-thinks he hath little reason to complain, that he hath not been fairly, and squarely dealt with. Especially, seeing, for full satisfaction, by D. *Potter* and all Protestants he is referred to Scripture, which we affirm contains evidently all necessary points of Faith, and rules of obedience: and seeing D. *Potter* in this very place hath subjoyned, though not a Catalogue of Fundamentals, which (because to some more is Fundamental, to others less, 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, instead of a Catalogue. For thus he says, *It seems to be Fundamental to the Faith, and for the salvation of every*



*every Member of the Church, that he acknowledg and believe all such Points of Faith, whereof he may be sufficiently convinced that they belong to the Doctrine of Jesus Christ.* This general rule, if I should call a Catalogue of Fundamentals, I should have a President for it with you above exception, I mean your Self; for, *Chap. 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 Fundamentals, as any you will bring of your Church Proposals, though you take as much time to do it, as he that undertook to make an Ass speak.

20. I come now to shew that you also have requited D. *Potter* with a mutual courteous acknowledgment of his Assertion, That the Creed is a sufficient Summary of all the necessary Articles of Faith, which are meerly *Credenda*.

21. First then, §. 8. you have these words, *It cannot be denyed 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 general heads as were most befitting and requisite for preaching the Faith of Christ, to* Jews *and* Gentiles, *and might be briefly and compendiously set down, and easily learned and remembred.* These words, I say, being fairly examined, without putting them on the rack, will amount to a full acknowledgment 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 Doctrin of *Repentance from dead works*, which S. *Paul* saith, was one of the two only things which he preacht, and the Doctrin of *Charity, without which* (the same S. *Paul* assures us that) *the knowledge of all mysteries, and all faith is nothing*, were Doctrins more necessary and requisite, and therefore more fit to be preacht to *Jews* and *Gentiles* than 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 Fundamental.*

22. And upon this grant, I will ask 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 Doctrins of Repentance and Charity, to restrain your Assertion, as D. *Potter* doth his, and (though you speak indefinitely) to say you meant it, only of those heads of Faith, which are *meerly 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 general heads of Faith, which being points of *simple belief*, were most fit and requisite to be preached to Jews and 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 Gospel was preached, particularly to know and believe, were most fit and requisite, nay more then so, necessary to be preached to all both Jews and Gentiles, and might be briefly and compendiously set down, and easily learned and remembred. Therefore the Apostle's 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 Syllogism 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 those 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 Doctrins which we

speak

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 Jews and Gentiles.

Now that all theſe Doctrins we ſpeak of, may be briefly and compendiouſly ſet down and eaſily, learned and remembred he that remembers, that we ſpeak only of ſuch Doctrins as are neceſſary to be taught and learned, will require hereof no farther demonſtration. For, (not to put you in mind of what the Poet ſays, *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 learned eaſily, which is to be learned 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 eaſie 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 Fundamental, are more requiſite to be preached than thoſe which are not ſo, (this is evident.)

But the Apoſtles have put into their Creed ſome Points that are not in themſelves Fundamental: (ſo you confeſs, *ubi ſupra.*)

Therefore if they have put in all moſt requiſite to be preached, they have put in all that in themſelves are Fundamental.

Thirdly and laſtly, from your own words, §. 26. thus I conclude for 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 deſign in compoſing it, or that they had none at all. For whereas you ſay, *Their intent was, to comprehend in it ſuch general 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 terms. For otherwiſe, inſtead of ſuch general heads, and ſuch Articles, why did not you ſay plainly, All ſuch, or ſome ſuch? This had been plain dealing, but I fear, croſs to your deſign, 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*, affirm, *viz.* That the Apoſtles Creed contains 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 univerſal 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 confirms, than any way invalidates my Aſſertion. For How could it ſtand with the Apoſtles wiſdom, to put in any points circumſtantial and not neceſſary, and, at the ſame time, to leave out any that were eſſential



eſſential and neceſſary for that end, which you ſay, they propoſed to themſelves, in making the Creed, that is, *The preaching of the Faith to Jews and Gentiles*?

24. Neither may you hope to avoid the preſſure of theſe acknowledgments, by pretending as you do §. 10. that you do indeed acknowledg 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 implyed in any other, which is not deducible from it; nor ſecondly, that the Article of the Catholique Church, wherein you will have all implyed, implyes nothing to any purpoſe of yours, unleſs out of meer favour we will grant the ſenſe of it to be, that the Church is infallible, and that yours is the Church: to paſs 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 implicitely; to be delivered particularly in the Creed, and only to be reducible to it; I ſuppoſe are repugnancies hardly reconcileable. And therefore, though we deſire you, not to grant, that the Creed contains all Points of Faith of all ſorts, any other way than by implication or reduction, no nor ſo neither; yet you have granted, and muſt grant, of the Fundamental 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 punctual manner, than 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 and Modern Doctors, alleadged to this purpoſe by D. *Potter* in great abundance, will be turned off, with this general deceitful Anſwer, That the Allegation of them was needleſs to prove, that the Creed contains 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 do 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 explicitely contained in the Creed; and that your Gloſs of Implication and Reduction, had it been confronted with their ſentences, would 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) *A brief comprehenſion of the Faith, and a ſum of all things to be believed, and, as it were, a ſign or cognizance whereby Chriſtians are to be differenced and diſtinguiſhed, from the impious and miſ-believers, who profeſs 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 expreſly contained in it, and all the prime foundations of Faith*: And, *That the Apoſtles were not ſo forgetful as to omit any prime principal foundation of Faith in that Creed which they delivered to be believed by all Chriſtians.* The words of *Filliucius* are pregnant to the ſame purpoſe; (c) *There cannot be a fitter Rule, from whence Chriſtians may learn what they are explicitely to believe, than 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 compoſed by the Apoſtles, that Chriſtians might have a form whereby they might profeſs themſelves Catholiques.* But certainly, the Apoſtles did this in vain, if a man might profeſs this, and yet for matter of Faith be not a Catholique.

(a) *Azor. part. 1. l. 5.*

(b) *Cont. 2. c. 10. n. 10.*

(c) *Moral. queſt. Tr. 2. c. 2. n. 34.*

(d) *In 2. 2. qu. 2. Art. 3. Dub. ult.*

26. The words of *Cardinal Richelieu*, (e) exact this ſenſe, and refuſe your gloſs as much as any of the former: *The Apoſtles Creed is the Summary and Abridgement of that Faith which is neceſſary for a Chriſtian; Theſe holy perſons being by the Commandement of Jeſus Chriſt to diſperſe themſelves over the world, and in all parts*

(e) *Inſtruction du Chriſtien Lecon. premiere.*

by

*by preaching the Gospel to plant the Faith, esteemed it very necessary to reduce into a short sum, 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 Form, that it might be the easier remembred. For this effect, they called this Abridgement a Symbole, which signifies a mark, or sign, which might serve to distinguish true Christians which imbraced it, from Infidels which rejected it.* Now I would fain know how the composition of the Creed could serve for this end, and secure the Preachers of it, that they should preach the same thing, if there were other necessary Articles, not comprized in it. Or how could it be a sign 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?

(f) *Ch. 3 Confid. 1. Sect 5. p. 119.*

27. The words of the (f) *Author of the Consideration of four heads propounded to King James*, require the same sense, and utterly renounce your qualification. *The Symbole is a brief yet entire Methodical sum of Christian Doctrin, including all Points of Faith, either to be 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 faithful Christians and mis-believing Infidels.*

(g) *2. 2. dist. 1. q. 2. p. 4. in fin.*

28. Lastly, (g) *Gregory of Valence* affirms our Assertion even in terms: *The Articles of Faith contained in the Creed, are, as it were, the first principles of the Christian Faith, in which is contained the sum of Evangelical Doctrin, which all men are bound explicitely to believe.*

29. To these Testimonies of your own Doctors, I should have added the concurrent Suffrages of the ancient Fathers, but the full and free acknowledgment of the same *Valentia* in the place above quoted will make this labour unnecessary. *So judg* (saith he) *the holy Fathers affirming that this Symbole of Faith was composed by the Apostles, that all might have a short sum of those things which are to be believed, and are dispersedly contained in Scripture.*

30. Neither is there any discord between this Assertion of your Doctors, and their holding themselves obliged to believe all the Points which the Council of *Trent* defines. For Protestants and Papists may both hold, that all Points of Belief necessary to be known and believed, are summed up in the Creed: and yet both the one and the other think themselves bound to believe whatsoever other Points they either know, or believe to be revealed by God. For the Articles which are necessary to be known that they are revealed by God, may be 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 Subject to which they belong.* Yes, if they be intended for perfect Summaries, they must not omit any necessary doctrin 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 principal Definitions and Divisions, and Rules of Logick, and call it a Summary or Abstract of Logick. But sure, this were no more a Summary, than that were the picture of a man in little, that wanted any of the parts of a man; or that a total sum, 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 have already told us, *That it is most full and compleat to that purpose for which it was intended.* Lay all this together, and I believe the product will be, That the Apostles Creed is a perfect Summary of the Fundamentals of the Christian Faith; and what the duty of a perfect Summary is, I have already told you.

32. Whereas therefore to disprove this Assertion, in divers particles of this Chapter, but especially the fourteenth, you muster up whole Armies of Doctrins, which



which you pretend are necessary, and not contained in the Creed; I answer, very briefly thus: That the Doctrins you mention, are either concerning matters of practice, and not simple Belief; or else they are such Doctrins wherein God hath not so plainly revealed himself, but that honest and good men, true Lovers of God and of Truth, those that desire above all things to know his will and do it, may err, and yet commit no sin at all, or only a sin of infirmity, and not destructive of Salvation; or lastly, they are such Doctrines which God hath plainly revealed, and so are necessary to be believed, when they are known to be divine, but not necessary to be known and believed; not necessary to be known for divine, that they may be believed. Now all these sorts of Doctrins 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 be believed upon the supposal of divine Revelation, were specified in the Creed. For this he affirms, only of such speculative divine Verities, which God hath commanded particularly to be preached to all, and believed by all. Now let the Doctrins 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. *Potter's* Assertion, there will not remain so much as one.

33. First, the Questions touching the conditions to be performed by us to obtain remission of sins; 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 far 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 Fundamentals, is profitable, but not fundamental. He that believes all Fundamentals, cannot be damned for any error in Faith, though he believe more or less to be Fundamental than is so. That also of the procession of the Holy-Ghost from the Father and the Son, of Purgatory, of the Churches Visibility, of the Books of the New-Testament, which were doubted of by a considerable part of the Primitive Church: (until I see better reason for the contrary than the bare authority of men) I shall esteem of the same condition.

35. Thirdly, These Doctrins; That *Adam* and the Angels sinned: that there are Angels good and bad: that those Books 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, and 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 and woman is bound under pain of damnation particularly to know them 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 Doctrins above-mentioned, which were never pretended to have place in the Creed. There remains one only Point of all that Army you mustered together, reducible to none of these heads, and that is, that God is, and is a Remunerator, which you say is questioned by the denial of Merit. But if there were such a necessary indissoluble coherence between this Point and the Doctrine of Merit, me-thinks with as much reason, and more charity you might conclude, That we hold Merit, because we hold this Point; than that we deny this Point, because we deny Merit. Besides, when Protestants deny the Doctrin of Merits, you know right-well, for so they have declared themselves a thousand times, that they mean nothing else, but with *David*, that *their well-doing extendeth not, to not truly beneficial to God*: with our Saviour *when they have done all which they are commanded, they have 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 than

doing) *is not worthy to be compared to the glory which shall be revealed.* So that you must either misunderstand their meaning in denying Merit, or you must discharge their Doctrin of this odious consequence, or you must charge it upon *David*, and *Paul*, and *Christ* himself. Nay you must either grant their denial of true Merit just and 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 equal unto and well worthy of eternal glory which is prepared for them. As for the inconvenience which you so much fear, That the denial of Merit makes God a Giver only, and not a Rewarder; I tell you, good Sir, you fear where no fear is: And that it is both most true on the one side, that you in holding good Works meritorious of eternal glory, make God a Rewarder only, and not a Giver, contrary to plain Scripture, affirming that *The gift of God is eternal life*; And that it is most false on the other side, that the Doctrin of Protestants makes God a Giver only, and not a Rewarder; In as much as their Doctrin is, That God gives not Heaven but to those which do something for it, and so his Gift is also a Reward; but withal, that whatsoever they do 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 honor and means of a Cardinal, would you not, not only in humility, but in sincerity have professed, that you had not merited such a Reward? And yet the Pope is neither your Creator, nor Redeemer, nor Preserver, nor perhaps your very great Benefactor; 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 have done him hath been really advantagious to him: and lastly not altogether unproportionable to the forementioned Reward. And therefore if by the same work you will pretend that either you have or hope to have deserved immortal happiness, I beseech you consider well whether this be not to set a higher value upon a Cardinals cap, than a Crown of immortal glory; and with that Cardinal to prefer a part in *Paris*, before a part in *Paradise*.

37. In the next Paragraph you beat the air again, and fight manfully with your own shadow. The Point you should have spoken to, was this, That there are some Points of simple belief necessary to be explicitely believed which yet are not contained in the Creed. Instead hereof you trouble your self in vain to demonstrate, That *many important Points of Faith are not contained in it*, which yet D. *Potter* had freely granted, and you your self take particular notice of his granting of it. All this pains 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 near it. But such a one I must intreat to remember, there be many more Points of Faith, than there be Articles of Simple belief, necessary to be explicitely 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 vain; and that whatsoever may be an Heresie, that is so; and whatsoever is so, that always hath been so, ever since the publication of the Gospel of Christ. The Doctrin of your Church may like a Snow-ball increase with rowling and again, if you please, melt away and decrease: But as *Christ Jesus*, so his Gospel, *is yesterday, and to day, and the same for ever.*

38. Our Saviour sending his Apostles to preach, gave them no other Commission than this, *Go teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, the Son, 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 pleaseth, and



and call it the Gospel 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 esteem 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 kinds: and as high a degree of presumption, to enjoyn men to believe, that there are or can be any other Fundamental Articles of the Gospel of Christ, than what Christ himself 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 *Archbishop* 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 ways 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 several Sects of Christians, ought to be no hinderance to their Unity in Communion.

40. Now the former of these is not to be hoped for without a miracle, unless that could be done, which is impossible to be performed, though it be often pretended; that is, unless it could be made evident to all men, that God hath appointed some visible Judge of Controversies, to whose judgment all men are to submit themselves. What then remains, 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, than upon these matters of less moment wherein they differ; and understand, that agreement in those, ought to be more effectual to joyn them in one Communion, than their difference in other things of less 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 lawful; and a mutual 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, than 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 than God? Why should any error exclude any man from the Churches Communion, which will not deprive him of eternal Salvation? Now that Christians do 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 Books 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 Books, 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 Books they have comprehended the whole substance of the Gospel 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 Gospel of Christ, would do so great a work of God after such a negligent fashion? Suppose *Xaverius* had been to write the Gospel of Christ for the *Indians*, think you he would have left out any Fundamental Doctrine of it? If not, I must beseech you to conceive as well of S. *Matthew*, and S. *Mark*, and S. *Luke*, and S. *John*, as you do of *Xaverius*. Besides, if every one of them have not in them all necessary Doctrines, how have they complied with their own design, which was, as the Titles of their Books shew, to write *the Gospel of Christ*, and not a part of it? Or how have they not deceived us, in giving them such Titles? By the whole Gospel 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 Gospel of S. *Mark*, and S. *John*, I believe every considering man will be inclinable to believe that then without doubt, it is contained, with the advantage of many other profitable things, in the larger Gospels of S. *Matthew*, and S. *Luke*. And that S. *Mark*'s Gospel wants no necessary Article of this Covenant, I presume you will not deny, if you believe *Irenæus*, when he says, Matthew *to the Hebrews in their tongue published the Scripture of the Gospel: When* Peter *and* Paul *did preach the Gospel, and found the Church, or a Church at* Rome, *or of* Rome, *and after their departure* Mark *the scholar of* Peter, *delivered to us in writing those things which had been preached by* Peter; *and* Luke, *and the follower of* Paul, *compiled in a Book the Gospel which was preached by him: And afterwards* John, *residing in* Asia, *in the City of* Ephesus, *did himself also set forth a Gospel.*

41. In which words of *Irenæus*, it is remarkable that they are spoken by him against some Heretiques, that pretended (as you know who do now adays) that *some necessary Doctrins of the Gospel were unwritten*, and that *out of the Scriptures, truth* (he must mean sufficient truth,) *cannot be found by these which know not Tradition.* Against whom to say, that part of the Gospel which was preached by *Peter*, was written by S. *Mark*, and some other necessary parts of it omitted, had been to speak impertinently, and rather to confirm than confute their error. It is plain therefore, that he must mean, as I pretend, that all the necessary Doctrine of the Gospel which was preached by S. *Peter*, was written by S. *Mark*. Now you will not deny, I presume, that S. *Peter* preached all, therefore you must not deny that S. *Mark* wrote all.

42. Our next inquiry let it be touching S. *John*'s intent in writing his Gospel, whether it were to deliver so much truth, as being believed and obeyed would certainly bring men to eternal life, or only part of it, and to leave part unwritten? A great man there is, but much less than 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 justifie what I have undertaken, that at least all the four Evangelists have in them, all the necessary parts of the Gospel of Christ. Neither will I deny, but S. *John*'s 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. *John*, which is in none of the other Evangelists, hath not so well considered them as he should do, before he pronounce sentence of so weighty a matter. And for his prime intent in writing his Gospel, what that was, certainly no Father in the world understood it better than himself. Therefore let us hear him speak: *Many other signs* (saith he) *also did Jesus in the sight of his Disciples, which are not written in this Book: But these are written, that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ the Son 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 signs* are written. Take it which way you will, this conclusion will certainly follow, That either all that which S. *John* wrote in his Gospel, or less than all, and therefore all much more was sufficient to make them believe that, which being believed with lively faith, would certainly bring them to eternal life.

43. This which hath been spoken (I hope) is enough to justifie my undertaking to the full, that it is very probable that every one of the four Evangelists hath in his Book the whole substance, all the necessary parts of the Gospel of Christ. But for S. *Luke*, that he hath written such a perfect Gospel, in my judgment, it ought to be with them that believe him, no manner of question. Consider first the introduction to his Gospel, 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*



*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.* Add to this place, the entrance to his *History of the Acts of the Apostles*: *The former Treatise have I made, O* Theophilus, *of all that Jesus began both to do and teach, until 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* doth not undertake the very same thing which he says, *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 Gospel 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 beginning, delivered not the whole Gospel of Christ?* 5. Whether he doth 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 Gospel 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 Gospel of Christ; 9. Whether in the other Text, *All things which Jesus began to do and teach*, must not at least imply, all the Principal 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 Principal and most necessary things which *Jesus* taught? 12. And lastly, Whether many things which St. *Luke* hath wrote in his Gospel, be not less principal, and less necessary, than all and every one of these? When you have well considered these Proposals, 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 chuse 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 Canonical 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 Propositions, which without Controversie 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 walk according to this rule, neither overthrowing that which they have builded, by superinducing any damnable Heresie 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 denial of it shall not exclude Salvation.* The other, that *the Bishop contradicts himself, in supposing a man may believe all necessary Truths, and yet superinduce some damnable Heresies.*

45. To the first I answer, what I conceive he would, whose words I here justifie, that he hath declared plainly in this very place, that he meant, not an absolute, but a limited Universality, and speaks not of propositions universally believed by all Professions of Christianity that are, but only, by all those several 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 deniers of the doctrin of the Trinity, as being but a handful 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

are ſo much beholding, *Paulus Veridicus*, in his ſcurrilous and ſophiſtical Pamphlet, againſt B. *Uſher*'s 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 ſeveral Profeſſions of Chriſtianity, which have any large ſpread in the World: Theſe Articles for example, may be the Unity of the Godhead, the Trinity of Perſons, the immortality of the Soul*, &c. Where you ſee that your friend, whom you ſo much magnifie, hath plainly confeſſed, that notwithſtanding the Biſhop's words, the denial of the Doctrine of the Trinity may exclude Salvation; and therefore in approving and applauding his Anſwer to the Biſhop's Sermon, you have unawares allowed this Anſwer of mine to your own greateſt Objection.

46. Now for the foul contradiction, which you ſay the *Doctor* might eaſily have eſpied in the Biſhop's ſaying, he deſires your pardon for his overſight, for *Paulus Veridicus* his ſake; who though he ſet himſelf to find faults with the Biſhop's Sermon, yet it ſeems this he could not find, or elſe queſtionleſs we ſhould have heard of it from him. And therefore, if D. *Potter*, being the Biſhop's friend, have not been more ſharp-ſighted than 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 leſs any foul contradiction, in the Biſhop's words; but as *Antiferon*'s Picture, which he thought he ſaw in the Air before him, was not in the Air, but in his diſturbed fancy: ſo all the contradiction which here you deſcant upon, is not indeed in the Biſhop's ſaying, but in your imagination. For wherein, I pray, lies this foul contradiction? *In ſuppoſing* (ſay you) *a man may believe all Truths neceſſary to ſalvation, and ſuperinduce a damnable Hereſie.* I anſwer, It is not certain that his words do ſuppoſe this: neither, if they do, doth he contradict himſelf. I ſay, it is not certain that his words import any ſuch matter. For ordinarily men uſe to ſpeak and write ſo, as here he doth, when they intend not to limit or reſtrain, but only to repeat, and preſs, and illuſtrate what they have ſaid before. And I wonder, why with your Eagles eyes you did not eſpy another foul 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 foul 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 than holy obedience; and think ſimple error a more capital crime than ſins committed againſt knowledge and conſcience? Or was it becauſe your Reaſon told you, that herein he meant only to repeat and not to limit what he ſaid before? And why then had you not ſo much candour to conceive that he might have the ſame meaning in the former part of the disjunction; and intend no more but this, Whoſoever walks according to this rule of believing all neceſſary Truths, and holy Obedience, (neither poyſoning 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? *St. Athanaſius* in his Creed tells us, *The Catholick Faith is this, that we worſhip one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity, neither confounding the Perſons, nor dividing the Subſtance*; and why now do you not tell him that he contradicts himſelf, 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 Commandments of God, committing no ſin either againſt the love of God, or the



the love of his neighbour, is a perfect man: Or thus, he that will live in conſtant health had need be exact in his dyet, neither eating too much, nor too little: Or thus, he that will come to *London*, muſt go on ſtraight forward in ſuch a way, and neither turn to the right hand nor to the left, I verily believe you would not find any contradiction in his words, but confeſs 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 kind, and 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 himſelf. For though there can be no damnable Hereſie, unleſs it contradict ſome neceſſary Truth, yet there is no contradiction but the ſame man may at once believe 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 have 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 believe Contradictions. Secondly, they which believe there is no certainty in Reaſon, muſt believe 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 mind or no, I deſire to be informed;) Therefore there be divers in the world who believe contradictions may be true. Thirdly, They which do captivate their underſtandings to the belief of thoſe things which to their underſtanding ſeem irreconcileable contradictions, may as well believe real contradictions: (For the difficulty of believing ariſes not from their being repugnant, but from their ſeeming to be ſo:) But you do captivate your underſtandings to the belief 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 errors, and perſwaded out of them; but no mans error can be confuted, who together with his error doth not believe and grant ſome true Principle that contradicts his Error: for nothing can be proved to him who grants nothing, neither can there be (as all men know) any rational diſcourſe but out of grounds agreed upon by both parts. Therefore it is not impoſſible but abſolutely certain, that the ſame man at the ſame time may believe contradictions. Fifthly, It is evident, neither can you without extream madneſs and uncharitableneſs, deny that we believe the Bible, thoſe Books, I mean, which we account Canonical: 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 contradictions, or elſe you will run into a greater inconvenience, and be forced to confeſs, that no part of our Doctrine contradicts the Bible. Sixthly, I deſire you to vindicate from contradiction theſe following Aſſertions: That there ſhould be Length and nothing long: Breadth, and nothing broad: Thickneſs, and nothing thick: Whiteneſs, and nothing white: Roundneſs, and nothing round: Weight, and nothing heavy: Sweetneſs, and nothing ſweet: Moiſture, and nothing moiſt: Fluidneſs, 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 Form, or the Accidents of Chriſt. That Bread ſhould be turned into nothing, and at the ſame time with the ſame action turned into Chriſt, and yet Chriſt ſhould not be nothing. That the ſame thing at the ſame

time

time should have its just dimensions, and just distance of its parts, one from another, and at the same time not have it, but all its parts together in one and the self 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 several points in the Bread and Wine. That the same thing at the same time should be wholly above it self, and wholly below it self, within it self, and without it self, on the right hand, and on the left hand, and round about it self. That the same thing at the same time should move to and from it self, 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 spaces between Heaven and Earth. That to be one, should be to be undivided from it self, and yet that one and the same thing should be divided from it self. That a thing may be, and yet be no where. That a Finite thing may be in all places at once. That a Body may be in a place, and have there its dimensions, and colour, and 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, and yet know nothing but by our senses. That that which is, and was long ago, 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 self. That it should be truly and really in a place, and yet without Locality. Nay, that he which is Omnipotent, 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, do neither, but dine or sup: There speak, here be silent. That he may in one place freeze for cold, in another place 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 Thief in one place, and honest in another. That he may be a Papist, and go to Mass in *Rome*; A Protestant and go to Church in *England*. That he may die in *Rome*, and live in *England*: or dying in both places may go to Hell from *Rome*, and to Heaven from *England*. That the Body and Soul of Christ should cease to be where it was, and yet not go to another place, nor be destroyed. All these, and many other of the like nature are the unavoidable, and most of them the acknowledged Consequences of your Doctrin of Transubstantiation, as is explained one way or other by your Schoolmen. Now I beseech you, Sir, to try your skill, and, if you can compose their repugnance, and make peace between them, certainly, none but you shall be *Catholique Moderator*. But if you cannot do it, and that after an intelligible manner, then you must give me leave to believe, that either you do 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 do, 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 do so, I willingly grant: But to say, it is impossible to be done, is against every mans experience, and almost as unreasonable, as to do 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 terms; especially if he believe it to be a contradiction, yet



yet for men being cowed and awed by superstition, to perswade themselves upon slight and trivial 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 veiled or disguised a little, with some empty unintelligible non-sense distinction; or if it be not expresst but implyed, nor direct but by consequence, so that the parties, to whose faith the propositions are offered 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 Sophism, grounded upon an affected mistake of the sense of the word *Fundamental*.

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 shameless calumny, not only because D. *Potter* in this Point delivers not his own judgment, but relates the opinion of others, M. *Hooker*, and M. *Merton*; 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 Jesus the Son of God and Saviour of the World*, but also *submission to his Doctrin in mind and will*. Now I beseech you Sir, tell me ingenuously, whether the Doctrin 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 Christians of all Professions do agree with one consent, in the belief of all those Books 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 hypocrisie, pretend to believe in Christ, but of necessity he must do 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 Belief*? *Nothing but this Article only, 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 sincerely to the Doctrin 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 himself, to deliver obscurely or ambiguously, yet thus far 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 Devil hopes to make their Divisions eternal, were pulled down; and error were not supported against Truth, by human 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 scarse a number: the truth is clean contrary; That those Divine Verities Speculative and Practical, 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 Points 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 and obedience of the entire

Covenant, ratified by Christ between God and man. Yet I would not be so mistaken, as if I thought the errors even of some Protestants unconsiderable things, and matters of no moment. For the truth is, I am very fearful, 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 them, yet) are too frequent occasions of our remissness, and slaknes, in running the race of Christian Profession, of our deferring Repentance, and Conversion to God, of our frequent relapses into sin, and not seldom of security in sining; and consequently, though not certain causes, yet too frequent occasions of many mens damnation: and such I conceive all these Doctrins, which either directly or obliquely, put men in hope of eternal happiness by any other means saving only the narrow way *of sincere and universal obedience*, grounded upon a true and lively Faith. These errors therefore, I do not elevate or extenuate: and, on condition the ruptures made by them might be composed, do heartily wish, that the cement were made of my dearest bloud, 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, and joynt-heirs of the glory of the Church Triumphant.

50. Your other palpable untruth is, that *Protestants are far more bold to disagree even in matters of Faith, than Catholique Divines* (you mean your own) *in Questions meerly Philosophical, or not determined by the Church.* For neither do they differ at all, in *matters of Faith*, if you take the word in the highest sense, and mean, by matters of Faith, such Doctrins as are *absolutely necessary* to Salvation to be believed, or not to be disbelieved. And then in those wherein they do differ, with what colour or shadow of Argument, can you make good, that *they are more bold to disagree, than you are in Questions meerly Philosophical, 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 which are not determined by your Church; and they theirs, in things not plainly determined in Scripture. And wherein then consists their greater, *their far greater boldness*? And what if they in their contradictory opinions, pretend both to relie upon the truth of God, doth this make their contradictions ever a whit the more repugnant? I had always thought, that all contradictions had been equally contradictions, and equally repugnant; because the least of them are as far 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 Pope's Infallibility) upon what other motive do you relie? Do not you cite Scripture, or Tradition, or both, on both sides? And do 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 Fundamental Articles, which cannot make up the whole fabrick of the Faith, no more than 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 Fundamental Articles, we mean all those which are necessary. And you your self, in the very leaf after this, take notice that D. *Potter* doth so. Where to this Question, How shall I know in particular which Points be, and which be not Fundamental? 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 Fundamental Doctrins 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 words



words he used, not to tell what Points be Fundamental, as you dishonestly impose upon him, but to explain what he meant by the word Fundamental. May it please you therefore now at last, to take notice, that by *Fundamental*, 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 Fundamental to Salvation: Unless you will say, that more is necessary, than that which is necessary.

53. *Ad §.* 19. This long discourse, so full of un-ingenuous dealing with your adversary, perhaps would have done reasonably in a Farce or a Comedy, and I doubt not but you have made your self and 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, and have put you in mind of these old School-Proverbs, *Ex falso supposito sequitur quodlibet*, and *Uno 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, *Upon the true Catholique Church*, I suppose upon better 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 himself. 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 doctrin it self 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 himself. 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 Universal Tradition. And that he might not instruct him as partial in this advice, he might farther tell him, that a Gentleman that would be nameless, 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 *Julius Cæsar*, or *Cicero*, that there are such Cities 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 counsel him to rely upon, and to believe that the Book which we call Scripture, was confirmed abundantly by the works 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 contains all necessary direction to eternal happiness, because it affirms it self to do so. Nay, he might tell him that so far is the whole Book, from wanting any necessary direction to his eternal Salvation, that one only Author, that hath writ but two little Books of it, S. *Luke* by name, in the beginning of his *Gospel*, and in the beginning of his *Story*, shews 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 do their true endeavour to know the will of God, and to do 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 find, that God himself has engaged himself by promise, that if he would love him, and keep his Commandements and pray earnestly for his Spirit, and be willing to be directed by it, he should undoubtedly receive it, even the *Spirit of Truth which shall lead him into all truth*, that is certainly, at least into all necessary Truths, and suffer him to fall into no pernicious error. The sum of his whole direction to him briefly would be this, believe the Scripture to be the Word of God, use your true endeavour to find the true sense of it, and to live according to it, and then you may rest securely that you are in the true way to eternal happiness. 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 fools, unless they will, cannot err from it. Because, not knowing absolutely all truth, nay not all profitable truth, and being free from error; but endeavouring to know the truth and obey it, and endeavouring to be free from error, is by this way made the only 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 doctrin of Christ; he utterly disclaims it, and truly very justly: There being no certain way to know that any Company is a true Church, but only by their professing the true doctrin of Christ. And therefore as it is impossible I should know that such a company of Philosophers are Peripateticks, or Stoicks; unless I first know what was the doctrin 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 doctrin of Christ, the Profession whereof constitutes the visible Church, the Belief and Obedience the invisible. And therefore whereas you would have him be directed by the Catholique Church to the doctrin of Christ; the contrary rather is most certain and necessary, that by the fore-knowledg of the doctrin of Christ, he must be directed to a certain assurance, which is the Catholique Church, if he mean not to choose at a venture, but desire to have certain direction to it. This supposition therefore, being the hinge whereon your whole Discourse turns, is the *Minerva* of your own Brain; and therefore, were it but for this, have we not great reason to accuse you of strange immodesty, in saying as you do, That *the whole Discourse and Inferences which here you have made, are either D.* Potters *own direct assertions, or evident consequences clearly deduced from 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 own fictions obtruded on him.

54. To the next Question, *Cannot General Councils err*? You pretend he answers, *They may err damnably*. Let the Reader see the place, and he shall find, *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 seems so by his words; The whole militant Church, that is, all the members of it cannot possibly err either in the whole faith, or any necessary Article of it*: which is very certain, for should it do 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 err; If he said that God in his own person, or his Angels could not err in these matters, you might have 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 be spoken with? And is it not apparently impossible, that any man should speak with all the members of the Militant Church? Or, if he had spoken with them All, know that he had done so? Nay does not D. *Potter* say as much in plain terms? Nay more, do not you take notice that he does so in the very next words before these, where you say, *he affirms that the Catholique Church cannot be told of private injuries*: unless 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 affirms simply (as appears to your shame by your own quotations) that *the Catholique Church cannot be told of private injuries*: and then, that the *whole Militant Church cannot err*. 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 blind zeal to your superstition hath transported you beyond all bounds of honesty and discretion, and made you careless 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 lawful Council may err damnably*: and from this you collect, *It remains then, for your necessary instruction you must repair to every particular member of the Universal 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* says it, And the consequence as far from it as *Gades* from *Ganges*; and as coherent as a rope of Sand. A general Council may err; therefore you must travel 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 Doctrin of Protestants, (for so you must say,) there were nothing to be consulted with, but only a general Council, or all the Word! Have 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 piece of your *Gento, A General Council may err damnably*? are there not these plain words, *In searches of Truth* (he means 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, and pretend that your whole discourse, is either his own direct assertions, or evident consequences, clearly deduced from them? You add, that yet he teaches (as if he contradicted himself) *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*: unless it be such an one, as hath such a strong affection to this word, *Church*, that he will not go to Heaven, *unless he hath a Church to lead him thither*. For what though a Council may err, and the whole Church cannot be consulted with, yet this is not to send you on the Fool's *Pilgrimage for Faith*, and bid you go and *confer 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 Universal Tradition directs you to the Word of God, and the Word of God directs you to Heaven. And therefore here is no cause of desperation, no cause for you to be so vain, and tragical, as here you would seem. *Yet upon Supposal* (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 Answer for the Doctor, *Procure to know whether he believe all Fundamental Points of Faith*: Whereas in all the Doctors Book, there is no such Answer to any such Question, or any like it. Neither do you, as your custom is, note any Page where it may be found; which makes me suspect, that sure you have some private license 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 Fundamental Points or no*? For, whereas hereunto D. *Potter* having given one Answer fully satisfactory to it, which is, *If he truly believe the undoubted Books of Canonical Scripture, he cannot but believe all Fundamentals*; and another, which is but something towards a full satisfaction of it, That *the Creed contains all the Fundamentals of simple Belief*: you take no notice of the former, and pervert the latter, and make him say, *The Creed contains all Fundamentals of Faith*. Whereas you know, and, within six or seven lines after this, confess, that he never pretended it to contain *all simply*, but *all of our sort*, all *necessary Points of simple belief*. Which assertion

because

becauſe he modeſtly delivers as very probable (being willing to conclude rather leſs than more than his reaſons require,) hereupon you take occaſion to ask: *Shall I hazzard 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 *Prudential motives*, which you do 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 himſelf, much leſs another to be a true Pope, or a true Prieſt; nay, to have a Moral 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, and 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 Council which he ſhall confirm: Particularly, it will be, at leaſt an even wager, that all the Decrees of the Council 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 confeſs 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 inform 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 contains 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 mind it ſeems to be diſpairing, and therefore, having propoſed your Queſtion, will not ſuffer him to give you an Anſwer, but ſhut your ears and tell him, *ſtill he chalks 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 of ſcurrility and diſhoneſty runs clean through it, from the beginning to the end. Your next demand then is, *Are all the Articles of the Creed for their nature and matter Fundamental?* 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 be not Fundamental?* D. *Potter* would have anſwered, It is a vain queſtion: believe all, and you ſhall be ſure to believe all that is Fundamental.

60. But what ſays now his prevaricating Proxy? What does he make him ſay? This which follows: *Read my Anſwer to a late Popiſh Pamphlet, intituled, Charity Miſtaken: There you ſhall find that Fundamental doctrins, 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 Capital Doctrins 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 form 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 do you think that againſt an Heretique



Heretique nothing is unlawful? Certainly, if he doth anſwer thus, I will make bold to ſay, he is a very fool. But if he does not, (as indeed he does not) then——: But I forbear you, and beſeech the Reader to conſult the places of D. *Potter*'s Book; and there he ſhall find, that, in the former half of theſe (as you call them) varyed words and phraſes, he declared only what he meant by the word *Fundamental*, which was needful to prevent miſtakes, and caveling about the meaning of the word, which is metaphorical, and therefore ambiguous; and that the latter half of them, are ſeveral places of Scripture imployed by D. *Potter*, to ſhew that his diſtinction of Fundamental and not Fundamental hath expreſs ground in it. Now of theſe two places, very pertinent unto two very good purpoſes; you have exceeding fairly patcht together a moſt ridiculous Anſwer, to a Queſtion, that D. *Potter* never dreamed 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 Soveraign, amongſt the many excellent vertues, which have made your Majeſties perſon ſo dear 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 Fundamentals?

62. But *unleſs this queſtion may be anſwered, his doctrin (you ſay) ſerves only either to make men deſpair, or elſe to have recourſe to theſe whom we call Papiſts*. It ſeems, a little thing will make you deſpair, if you be ſo ſullen as to do ſo, becauſe men will not trouble themſelves to ſatisfie 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 Fundamental, though you be ignorant which are ſo, and which are not ſo. Now, I believe, your deſire to know which are Fundamentals, proceeds only from a deſire to be aſſured that you do 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 ſelf herein one whit by having recourſe to them whom we call Papiſts; for they are as far to ſeek as we in this Point, which of the Articles of the Creed are, for their nature, and matter, Fundamental, 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 Burial, his Deſcent into Hell, and the Communion of Saints, be Points of their own nature and matter Fundamental. Such I mean, as without the diſtinct and explicite knowledg of them no man can be ſaved.

63. But you will ſay, *at leaſt they give this certain Rule, that all Points defined by Chriſt's 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 Canonical, and ſubmits himſelf indeed to this, as to the rule of his belief, muſt of neceſſity believe all things Fundamental; 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 do 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 ſelf to danger of imbracing damnable errors inſtead of Fundamental truths. But you will ſay, D. *Potter himſelf acknowledges, that you do not err in Fundamentals*. If he did ſo, yet me-thinks you have no reaſon to reſt upon his acknowledgement with any ſecurity, whom you condemn of error in many other matters. Perhaps, exceſs of Charity to your perſons,

persons, may make him censure your errors more favourably than he should do. But the truth is, and so I have often told you, though the Doctor hopes 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 proclaims them *damnable*, and such as, he fears, 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. *Potter*'s Arguments against that which you said before. But presently forgetting your self, instead 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 contains not all things necessary to be believed.* 2. *Baptism 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 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 proposal, 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: Now neither of these objections do any way infringe or impeach the truth of this Assertion. Not the first because according to your own doctrin, all men are not bound to know explicitely what books of Scripture are Canonical. Nor the second, because Baptism is not a matter of Faith, but practice: 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 than builds upon in answering these objections, as the Creeds being collected out of Scripture, and, supposing the Authority of it, which *Gregory* of *Valentia* in the place above cited, seems to me to confess, to have been the Judgment of the Ancient Fathers: and the *Nicene* Creeds intimating the authority of Canonical Scripture, and making mention of Baptism: These things were said *ex abundanti*; and therefore I conceive it superfluous to examine your exceptions against them. Prove that D. *Potter* did affirm that the Creed contains 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 explicitely believed, which is not contained either in terms, or by consequence in the Creed, and then I will either answer your Reasons, or confess I cannot. But all this while you do but trifle, and are so far from hitting the Mark, that you rove quite beside the Butt.

65. *Ad §. 23, 24, 25.* D. *Potter* demands, *How it can be necessary for any Christian to have more in his Creed than the Apostles had, and the Church of their times?* You Answer, *That he trifles, not distinguishing between the Apostles belief, and that abridgment 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 do, and what we are to believe, with their belief of that part of it, which contains not duties of obedience, but only the necessary Articles of simple Faith. Now though the Apostles Belief be, in the former sense, a larger thing than 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 self have formerly confessed, though somewhat fearfully, and inconstantly: and here again unwillingness 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



the Creed, or those that are *in* it? Those that are *in* it, it comprehends at large, and therefore it is not an abridgment 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 abridgment of the Faith, this would be sense, and signifie thus much, That all the necessary Articles of the Christian Faith are comprised 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 begs the Question, supposing that the Apostles believed no more than is contained in their Creed,* I answer, He supposes no such matter; but only that they knew no more necessary Articles of simple belief, than 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. *Potter*'s, was equivalent to a Negation, and intended for one: *How can it be necessary for any Christian to have more in his Creed, than 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 than our Saviour left it? Shall it be a fault to straiten and encumber the King's high way with publique nuisances; And is it lawful by adding new Articles to the Faith, to retrench any thing from the Latitude of the King of Heavens high way to eternal Happiness? The yoke of Christ, which he said was easie, may it be justly made heavier by the Governors of the Church in after-ages? The Apostles profess they revealed to the Church the whole Counsel of God, keeping back nothing needful for our Salvation: What tyranny then, to impose any new unnecessary matters on the Faith of Christians, especially (as the late Popes have don) under the high commanding form,* Qui non crediderit, damnabitur. *If this may be done, Why then did our Saviour reprehend the Pharisees so sharply, 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 seem to me to contain so many plain and convincing Arguments of the premised Assertion; to all which (one excepted,) according to the advice of the best Masters of Rhetorick in such Cases, you have answered very discreetly, by saying O. But when you write again, I pray take notice of them: and, if you can devise no fair, and satisfying Answer to them, then be so ingenuous as to grant the Conclusion, That no more can be necessary for Christians to believe now, than was in the Apostles time. A conclusion of great importance, for the decision of many Controversies, and 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 this, you have shewed plainly that it was wisely done of you to decline the rest. You tell D. *Potter*, That *needful for salvation* is his gloss, which perhaps you intended for a piece of an Answer. But, good Sir, consult the place, and you shall find, that there S. *Paul* himself says 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 needful for salvation, is very profitable.

70. But then you say, *This is no proof unless 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 begs the Question, but you that mistake it: which is not here in this particular place, Whether all Points of simple Belief necessary for the salvation of the Primitive Christians, were contained in the Apostles Symbol? (for that and the proofs of it follow after, in the next §. p. 223. of

D. *Potter*'s Book:) but, Whether any thing can be neceſſary for Chriſtians to believe now, which was not ſo from the beginning? D. *Potter* maintains the Negative; and to make good his opinion, thus he argues S. *Paul* declared to the *Epheſians* the whole Counſel of God touching their Salvation; Therefore that which S. *Paul* did not declare, can be no part of the Counſel of God, and therefore not neceſſary. And again: 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 principii*, in D. *Potter*; but rather *Ignoratio Elenchi*, in you.

71. Neither is it material, that theſe words were particularly directed by S. *Paul*, to the Paſtors 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 appears 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* (ſay 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 Jews, and alſo to the Greeks, Repentance towards God, and Faith towards our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.* And a little after, *I know that ye all, among whom I have gone Preaching the Kingdom 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 Counſel of God.* And again, *Remember that by the ſpace of three years I ceaſed not to warn every one, night and day with tears.* Certainly, though he did all theſe things to the Paſtors among the reſt, nay above the reſt, yet, without Controverſie, they whom he taught publikely, and from houſe to houſe: The *Jews* and *Greeks* to whom he teſtified, (1.) preached Faith and Repentance: Thoſe all, amongſt whom he went preaching the kingdom of God: Thoſe Every one, whom for the three years 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, Commandments, *&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 Belief*, 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 off, with ſo egregious tergiverſation, urges five ſeveral Arguments.

73. The ſenſe of the firſt is this, *If all the neceſſary Points of ſimple Belief be not comprized in the Creed, it can no way deſerve the name of the Apoſtles Creed, as not being their Creed in any ſenſe, but only a part of it.* To this you anſwer §. 25. *Upon the ſame affected ambiguity*, &c. Anſ. 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 belief which they taught as neceſſary to be explicitely believed, be not contained in it? And if thus much at leaſt of Chriſtian Religion, be not comprized in it, I again deſire you to inform me, How it could be called the Apoſtles Creed!

74. Four other Reaſons D. *Potter* urges to the ſame purpoſe, grounded upon the practice of the Ancient Church; The laſt whereof you anſwer in the ſecond part of your Book. But to the reſt, drawn from the ancient Churches appointing her Infants to be inſtructed (for matters of ſimple belief,) only in the Creed: From her admitting Catechumens unto Baptiſm: and of Strangers to her Communion upon their only profeſſion of the Creed, you have not, for ought I can perceive, thought fit to make any kind of Anſwer.

75. The difficulties of the 27. and laſt §. of this Chapter, have been ſatisfied. So that there remains unexamined only the 26. *Section*, wherein you exceed your ſelf



ſelf in Sophiſtry: Eſpecially in that trick of Cavillers, which is to anſwer objections by other objections; an excellent way to make controverſies endleſs! D. *Potter* deſires to be reſolved, *why amongſt many things of equal neceſſity to be believed, the Apoſtles ſhould diſtinctly ſet down ſome in the Creed, and be altogether ſilent of others?* Inſtead of reſolving him in this difficulty, you put another to him, and that is, *Why are ſome Points not Fundamental expreſſed in it, rather than 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 it in ſuch Articles as were fitteſt for thoſe times? Unleſs (which were wondrous ſtrange) unneceſſary Articles were fitter for thoſe times, than 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 Chriſt's Paſſion; The third day, of the Reſurrection. Neither doth the adding of them make the Creed ever a whit the leſs portable, the leſs fit to be underſtood, and remembred. And for the contrary reaſons, other unneceſſary things might be left out. Beſide, 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 eſſential 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 Saviour's deſcent to Hell, and Burial 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. *John* 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 Jeſus was the Chriſt, and believing have eternal life.* He therefore that believes this may be ſaved, though he have no explicite and diſtinct faith of any Miracle that our Saviour did. His Circumciſion and 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 have any near 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 ſelf to be known. If you ask, why more than 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 *forgetful after the receiving of the Holy Ghoſt, as to leave out any prime and principal foundation of the Faith*, which are the very words of your own *Gordonius Huntleus, Contr.* 2 *c.* 10. *num.* Likewiſe his Burial was put in perhaps as neceſſary of it ſelf to be known. But though it were not, yet hath it manifeſtly ſo near relation to theſe that are neceſſary, his Paſſion, and Reſurrection; being the Conſequent of the one, and the Antecedent of the other, that it is no marvel 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 do not affirm, becauſe I cannot prove it, that there is nothing in the Creed but what is neceſſary. You demand thirdly, *Why did they not expreſs Scriptures, Sacraments, and all Fundamental Points of Faith tending to practice, as well as thoſe which reſt in Belief?* I anſwer; Becauſe their purpoſe was to comprize in it only thoſe neceſſary Points which reſt in Belief: which appears, becauſe of practical Points there is not in it ſo much as one.

77. D. *Potter* ſubjoyns to what is ſaid above, *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 believe 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 Doctrin were true, this ſhort Creed, *I believe the Roman Church to be Infallible*, would have been better, that is, more effectual to keep the believers of it from Hereſie, and in the true Faith, than 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, do not rightly apprehend the force of the Reaſon, I will endeavour briefly to add ſome light and ſtrength to it, by comparing the effects of theſe ſeveral ſuppoſed Creeds.

78. The former Creed therefore would certainly produce theſe effects in the believers of it: An impoſſibility of being in any formal Hereſie: A neceſſity of being prepared in mind to come out of all Error in Faith, or material Hereſie; which certainly you will not deny; or if you do, you pull down the only pillar of your Church and Religion, and deny 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 uneffectual for theſe good purpoſes, that you your ſelf tell us of innumerable, groſs, 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 belief 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 miſchiefs, that it is more likely to enſnare them into them, by ſeeming and yet not being a full comprehenſion of all neceſſary Points of Faith: which is apt (as experience ſhews,) to miſ-guide men into this (as you conceive it) pernitious error, That believing the Creed, they believe all neceſſary Points of Faith, whereas indeed, according to you, they do not ſo. Now upon theſe grounds I thus conclude: That Creed, which hath great commodities and no danger, would certainly be better than 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 doctrin be true) is of the former condition, and the latter, that is, the Apoſtles Creed, is of the latter, Therefore the former (if your doctrin be true) would without controverſie be better than the latter.

80. But (ſay you) by this kind of arguing, one might infer quite contrary. *If the Apoſtles Creed contain all Points neceſſary to Salvation, what need have we 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. *Potter*'s 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 leſs why the whole Creed's containing all things neceſſary ſhould make the belief 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 doth it follow ſo well as D. *Potter*'s Argument follows, That if the Apoſtles Creed contains all things neceſſary, that all other Creeds and Catechiſms, wherein are added divers other Particulars, are ſuperfluous. For theſe other Particulars may be the duties of obedience, they may be profitable Points of Doctrin, 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* than an apple is like an oiſter.

81. But this conſequence after you have ſufficiently ſlighted and diſgraced it, at length you promiſe *us news, 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 than



than now they have done? This is D. *Potter*'s inference out of your Doctrin; and truly, if you ſhould grant this, this were news indeed? *Yes*, ſay you, *I will grant it, but only thus far, that Chriſt hath referred us only to his Church.* Yea, but this is clean another thing, and no news 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 proffer me a courteſie, and pretend that he would oblige himſelf by a note under his hand, to give me twenty pound; and inſtead of it write, that I owe him forty, and deſire me to ſubſcribe to it and be thankful. Of ſuch favours as theſe it is very ſafe to be liberal.

82. You tell us afterward (but how it comes in I know not) that *it were a childiſh argument, The Creed contains not all things neceſſary*; Ergo, *It is not profitable*: Or, *The Church alone is ſufficient to teach us by ſome convenient means*: Ergo, *She muſt teach us without means*. Theſe indeed are childiſh arguments; but, for ought I ſee, you alone are the father of them: for, in D. *Potter*'s book, I can neither meet with them, nor any like them. He indeed tells you, that if (by an impoſſible ſuppoſition) your Doctrin were true, another and a far 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 which we have, unprofitable; becauſe he ſays another that might be conceived upon this falſe ſuppoſition, would be more profitable: or, that he lays a neceſſity upon the Church, of teaching without means: or, of not teaching this very Creed which now is taught; theſe things are ſo ſubtil 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 Catechiſms, or Councels, or any other means which ſhe ſhould make choice of; for, being Infallible, ſhe could not chuſe amiſs.

83. Whereas therefore you ſay, *If the Apoſtles had expreſt no Article but that of the Catholique Church, ſhe muſt have taught us the other Articles in particular by Creeds, or other means*: This is very true, but no way repugnant to the truth of this which follows, that the Apoſtles (if your doctrin be true) had done better ſervice to the Church, though they had never made this Creed of theirs which now we have, if, in ſtead thereof, they had commanded in plain terms that for mens perpetual 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 have taught the Church the ſubſtance of Chriſtian Religion; For then the Church not having learnt it of them, could not have taught it us, This therefore I do not ſay: but, ſuppoſing they had written theſe Scriptures as they have written, wherein all the Articles of their Creed are plainly delivered, and preached that Doctrin which they did preach, and done all other things as they have done, beſides the compoſing their Symbol: I ſay, if your doctrin were true, they had done a work infinitely more beneficial to the Church of Chriſt, if they had never compoſed their Symbol, which is but an imperfect comprehenſion of the neceſſary Points of ſimple Belief, and no diſtinctive mark (as a Symbol ſhould be) between thoſe that are good Chriſtians, and thoſe that are not ſo; But inſtead thereof, had delivered this one Propoſition, which would have been certainly effectual 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 have all in the Creed when we have 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 whitherſoever they lead me; Now, I ſay, they have led me into this perſwaſion, becauſe they have given me great reaſon to believe it, and none to the contrary. The reaſon they have given me to believe it, is, becauſe it is apparent

apparent and confest, they did propose to themselves in composing it, some good end or ends: As *that Christians might have a form, by which* (for matter of Faith) *they might profess themselves Catholiques.* So *Putean* out of *Tho. Aquinas*: *That the faithful might know, what the Christian people is to believe explicitly.* 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 Card. *Riclieu.* Now for all these and for any other good intent, I say, it will be plainly uneffectual, unless it contain at least all Points of simple Belief, which are, in ordinary course, necessary to be explicitly 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 do if I believe not this. And therefore, what *Richardus de sancto Victore* says of God himself, 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 error 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 have which I would not as willingly forsake as keep, if I could see sufficient reason to induce me to believe, that it is the will of God I should forsake it. Neither do I know any opinion I hold against the Church of *Rome*, but I have more evident grounds then this whereupon to build it. For let but these Truths be granted: That the authority of the Scripture is independent on your Church, and dependent only in respect of us upon universal 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 be 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, and all who began or continue the Separation from the external Communion of the Roman Church, are guilty of the proper, and formal sin of Schism.*

THE Searcher of all Hearts is witness with how unwilling minds, we Catholiques are drawn to fasten the denomination of Schismatiques, or Heretiques, on them, for whose souls, if they employed their best blood, they judge that it could not be better spent! If we rejoyce, that they are contristated at such titles, our joy riseth not from their trouble or grief, but, as that of the Apostles did, from the fountain of Charity, *because they are contristated to repentance*; that so, after unpartial examination, they finding themselves to be what we say, may, by God's holy grace, begin to dislike, what themselves are. For our part, we must remember that our obligation is, to keep within the mean, betwixt uncharitable bitterness, and pernitious flattery, not yielding 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 seem to speak; according to the wholsom advice of S. *Gregory Nazianzen* in these divine words: *We do not affect peace with* (a) *prejudice of the true doctrine, that so we may get a name of being gentle, and mild, and yet we seek to conserve peace, fighting in a lawful manner, and containing our selves within our compass, and the rule of Spirit. And of these things my judgment is, and, for my part, I prescribe the same law to all that deal with souls, and treat of true Doctrine, that neither they exasperate mens minds by harshness, nor make them haughty or insolent, by submission; but that, in the cause of Faith they behave themselves prudently, and advisedly, and do not in either of these things exceed the mean.* With whom agreeth S. Leo, saying: *It behoveth us in such causes to be* (b) *most careful, that without noise of contentions, both Charity be conserved, and Truth maintained.*

(a) Orat. 32.

(b) Epist. 8.

2. For better method, we will handle these Points in order. First, we will set down the nature, and essence, or, as I may call it, the *Quality* of *Schism*. In the second place, the greatness, and grievousness, or (so to term it) the *Quantity* thereof. For the Nature, or Quality, will tell us who may without injury be judged Schismatiques: and by the greatness, or quantity, such as find themselves guilty thereof, will remain acquainted with the true state of their soul, and whether they may conceive any hope of Salvation or no. And because Schism will be found to be a division from the Church, which could not happen, unless there were always 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 been such a Visible Congregation of Faithful People. Fourthly, we will demonstrate, that *Luther, Calvin*, and the rest, did separate themselves from the Communion of that always visible Church of Christ, and therefore were guilty of *Schism*. 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 divisions, are Schismatiques by reason of their separation from the Church of *Rome*.

3. For



3. For the first Point touching the *Nature*, or *Quality* of Schism: As the natural perfection of man consists in his being the *Image* of God his Creator, by the powers of his soul; so his supernatural perfection is placed in *similitude* with God, as his last End and Felicity; and, by having the said spiritual faculties, his *Understanding* and *Will* is linked to him. His Understanding is united to God by *Faith*, his Will, by *Charity*. The former relies upon his infallible *Truth*: The latter carrieth us to his infinite *Goodness*. *Faith* hath a deadly opposite, *Heresie*. Contrary to the Union, or Unity 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 *Separation* 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 principal reference and Union of one man with another: because the chiefest Unity is that of the *Whole*, to which the particular Unity of *Parts* is subordinate. This Unity, or Oneness, (if so I may call it) is effected by Charity, uniting all the members of the Church in one *Mystical Body*; contrary to which, is *Schism*, from the Greek word signifying *Scissure*, or *Division*. Wherefore upon the whole matter, we find that *Schism*, as the Angelical Doctor, S. *Thomas* defines it, is; *A voluntary separation* (c) *from the Unity of that Charity, whereby all the members of the Church are united.* From hence he deduceth, that *Schism* is a special and particular vice, distinct from *Heresie*, because they are opposite to two different Vertues: Heresie, to Faith: Schism to Charity. To which purpose he fitly alledgeth S. *Hierom* upon these words, (*Tit.* 3.) *A man that is an Heretique after the first and second admonition avoid*, saying: *I conceive that there is this difference betwixt Schism and Heresie, that Heresie involves some perverse assertion: Schism for Episcopal dissention doth separate men from the Church.* The same Doctrin is delivered by S. *Austin* 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 break from fraternal 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 diverse Faith, but the divided society of Communion doth make Schismatiques.* It is then evident that Schism is different from Heresie. Neverthelesss (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*) Schism speedily degenerates to Heresie, as S *Heirom* after the rehearsed words teacheth, saying: *Though Schism in the beginning may in some sort be understood different from Heresie; yet there is no Schism which doth not faign some Heresie to it self, that so it may seem to have departed from the Church upon good reason.* Neverthelesss when Schism proceeds originally from Heresie, Heresie 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 *Schism*, though in process of time they fell into some *Heresie*, and by that means are indeed both Schismatiques and Heretiques.

1. Point. The nature of Schism.

(c) 2. 2. q. 39. art. in corp. & ad 3.

(d) Lib. de Fid. & Symbol. cap. 10.

(e) Qu. Evang. ex Mat. q. 11.

(f) Ubi supra

4. The reason why both Heresie and Schism are repugnant to the being of a good *Catholique*, is: Because the *Catholique*, or Universal Church signifies *One* Congregation, or Company of faithful people, and therefore implies not only *Faith*, to make them *Faithful* believers, but also *Communion*, or *common Union*, to make them *One* in Charity, which excludes Separation, and *Division*: and therefore in the Apostles Creed, *Communion of Saints*, is immediately joyned to the *Catholique Church*.

5. From this definition of Schism may be inferred, that the guilt thereof is contracted, not only by division from the Universal Church; but also, by a Separation from a particular Church or Diocess which agrees with the universal. 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 himself a particular Congregation against S. *Peter* Archbishop of *Alexandria* his lawful Superiour, and by that means 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 ancient 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, not a true Church. And, that Schism may be committed by division from a particular Church, we read in *Optatus Milevitanus* (i) these remarkable words, (which do well declare who be 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 means his next predecessour, but one, in the Bishoprick,) *but* Majorinus *from* Cæcilianus: *neither did* Cæcilianus *depart from the Chair of* Peter, *or of* Cyprian (who was but a particular Bishop,) *but* Majorinus, *in whose Chair thou sittest, which had no beginning before* Majorinus *himself. Seeing it is manifestly known that these things were so done, it evidently appeareth, that you are heirs both of Traditors* (that is, of those who delivered up the holy Bible to be burned) *and of Schismatiques.* And it seemeth that this kind of Schism must principally be admitted by Protestants, who acknowledge no one visible Head of the whole Church, but hold that every particular Diocess, Church, or Countrey is governed by it self independently of any one Person, or General Council, to which all Christians have obligation to submit their judgments, and wills.

(h) Hæres. 68.

(i) Lib. 1. cont. Parmen.

6. As for the grievousness or quantity of Schism (which was the second Point proposed) S. *Thomas* teacheth, that amongst sins against our Neighbour, *Schism* (l) is the most grievous; because it is against the spiritual good of the *multitude, or Community.* And therefore as in a *Kingdom or Commonwealth*, there is as great difference between the crime of rebellion or sedition, and debates among private men, as there is inequality betwixt one man, and a whole kingdom; so in the Church, *Schism* is as much more grievous than *Sedition* in a *Kingdom*, as the spiritual good of souls surpasseth the civil and political weal. And S. *Thomas* adds further, and they lose the spiritual *Power* of *Jurisdiction*; and if they go about to absolve from sin, or to excommunicate, their actions are invalid; which he proves out of the

2. Point. The grievousness of Schism.

(l) Supra. art. 2. ad 3.

the Canon *Novitianus. Causa* 7. *quæst.* 1. which saith: *He that keepeth neither the Unity of spirit, nor the peace of agreement, and separates himself 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 ordain Priests, &c.) they cannot lawfully exercise.

7. In the judgment of the holy Fathers, Schism is a most grievous offence. S. *Chrysostom* (m) compares these Schismatical dividers of Christ's *mystical* body, to those who sacrilegiously pierced his *natural* body, saying: *Nothing doth so much incense God, as that the Church should be divided. Although we should do innumerable good works, if we divide the full Ecclesiastical Congregation, we shall be punished no less than they who tore his* (natural) *body. For that was done to the gain of the whole world, although not with that intention: but this hath no profit at all, but there ariseth from it most great harm. These things are spoken, not only to those who bear office, but also to those who are governed by them.* Behold how neither a moral good life (which conceit deceiveth many) nor authority of Magistrates, not any necessity of Obeying Superiours can excuse Schism from being a most hainous offence. *Optatus Milevitanus* (o) calls Schism, *Ingens flagitium, a huge crime.* And speaking to the *Donatists*, saith, *That Schism is evil in the highest degree, even you are not able to deny.* No less pathetical is S. *Augustine* upon this subject. He reckons Schismatiques amongst Pagans, Heretiques, and Jews, 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 Jews; but amongst those alone who are called Christian Catholiques, or Orthodox, that is, lovers of Unity in the whole body, and followers of truth.* Nay, he esteems them worse than Infidels and Idolaters, saying: *Those whom the Donatists* (q) *heal from the wound of Infidelity and Idolatry, they hurt more grievously with the wound of Schism.* Let here those men who are pleased untruly to call us Idolaters, reflect upon themselves, and consider, that this holy Father judgeth Schismatiques (as they are) to be worse than Idolaters, which they absurdly call us. And this he proveth by the example of *Core, Dathan,* and *Abiram,* and other rebellious Schismatiques of the old Testament, who were conveyed alive down into Hell, and punished more openly than Idolaters. *No doubt* (saith this holy Father) *but* (r) *that was committed most wickedly, which was punished most severely.* In another place he yoaketh Schism with Heresie, saying upon the Eighth Beatitude: *Many* (s) *Heretiques under the name of Christians, deceiving mens souls,* do 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 Justice. But where there is not sound 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 heap of Unity, and the bond of Charity, thou shouldst be punished with eternal death, though thou shouldst be burned alive for the name of Christ.* And in another place, he hath these words: *If he hear not the Church, let him be to* (u) *thee, as an Heathen or Publican; which is more grievous than if he were smitten with the sword, consumed with flames, or cast to wild beasts.* And elsewhere. *Out of the Catholique Church* (saith he) *one* (w) *may have Faith, Sacraments, Orders, and in sum, all things except Salvation.* With S. *Augustine*, his Countryman and second self 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 Son, and the Holy Ghost, if before the end of his life he be not reconciled to the Catholique Church, what Alms soever he give, yea though he should shed his blood for the name of Christ, he cannot obtain Salvation.* Mark again, how no moral honesty of life, no good deeds, no Martyrdom, can without repentance avail any Schismatique for Salvation. Let us also add that D. *Potter* saith: Schism is no less (y) dammable than Heresie.

8. But O you Holy, Learned, zealous Fathers, and Doctors of God's Church; out of these premises, of the grievousness of Schism, and of the certain damnation which it bringeth (if unrepented) what conclusion draw you for the instruction of Christians? S. *Augustine* maketh this wholsom inference. *There is* (z) *no just necessity to divide Unity.* S. *Irenæus* concludeth: *They cannot* (a) *make any so important reformation, as the evil of the Schism is pernitious.* S. *Denis of Alexandria* saith: *Certainly,* (b) *all things should rather be endured, than to consent to the division of the Church of God: those Martyrs being no less glorious, that expose themselves to hinder the dismembring of the Church, than those that suffer rather than they will offer sacrifice to 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.

9. We have just and necessary occasion, eternally to bless 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 Doctrin of the total 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 *Jewel*, saying: *The truth was unknown* (c) *at that time, and unheard of, when* Martin Luther, *and* Ulderick Zwinglius *first came unto the knowledge and preaching of the Gospel. Perkins* saith: *We say, that* (d) *before the dayes of* Luther *for the space of many hundred years, an Universal 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 year of* (e) *Christ three hundred and sixteen, the Antichristian and Papistical raign hath begun, raigning universally, and without any debatable contradiction, one thousand two hundred sixty years,* (that is, till *Luther's* time:) And that, *from the year 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 years.* And that, *the* (g) *Pope and Clergy have possessed the outward Visible Church of Christians, even one thousand two hundred threescore years.* And that, *the* (h) *true Church abode latent, and invisible.* And *Brocard* (i) upon the *Revelations*, professeth to joyn in opinion with *Napper*. *Fulk* affirmeth, *that in the* (k) *time of* Boniface *the third,* which was the year six hundred and seven, *the Church was invisible, and fled into the wilderness, 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 conference at *Ratisbon*, affirmeth (m) that the true Church was interrupted by Apostasie from the true Faith. *Calvin* saith: *It is absurd in the very* (n) *beginning to break one from another, after we have been forced to make a separation from the whole world.* It were over-long to alledge the words of

*Joannes*

(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. l.* 2. *c.* 6.
(s) *De serm. Dom. in monte, cap.* 5.
(t) *Epist.* 204.
(u) *Cont. adv. leg. & Prophet. l.* 2 *cap.* 17
(w) *De gest. cum Emerit.*
(x) *De fide ad Pet.*
(y) *Pag.* 42.
(z) *Cont. Parm. l.* 2. *cap.* 62
(a) *Cont. hæres. l.* 4. *cap.* 62
(b) *Apud Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib.* 6.
3. Point. Perpetual Visibility of the Church.
(c) *Apol. part.* 4. *c.* 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. cap.* 12. *Pag.* 161. *col.* 3.
(g) *Ibid. in cap.* 11. *pag.* 145.
(h) *Ibid. pag.* 191.
(i) *Fol.* 110. & 123.
(k) Answer to a counterfeit Catholique. *pag.* 16.
(l) *In præfat. operum suorum.*
(m) *In suo Acatholico. vol.* 2. *l. c. cap.* 9. *p.* 479.
(n) *Epist.* 141.



*Joannes Regius, Daniel Chamierus, Beza, Ochinus, Castalio,* and others to the same purpose. The reason which cast them upon this wicked Doctrin, was a desperate voluntary necessity: because they being resolved not to acknowledge the *Roman* Church to be Christ's 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 affirm, that upon earth Christ had no visible Church: which they would never have avouched, if they had known how to avoid the aforesaid inconvenience (as they apprehended it) of submitting themselves to the *Roman* Church.

10. Against these exterminating spirits, D. *Potter*, and other more moderate Protestants, profess, that Christ always had, and always will have, upon earth a Visible Church: otherwise (saith he) *our Lord's* (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 Christ's body, he seeketh to clear himself and others from *Schism*, because (saith he) *the property* (q) *of Schism is* (*witness 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 zeal may be excused, but their charity and wisdom cannot be justified.* And elsewhere he acknowledgeth, that the *Roman* Church hath *those main and* (r) *essential 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 Christ's visible Church cannot perish, it will be needless 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 think, 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 prophesied, about which greater contentions were to rise, that it might turn to the condemnation of them who have seen it, and yet gone forth.* And in another place he saith: *How do we confide* (t) *to have received manifestly Christ himself 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 affairs of his soul, if upon earth there be no Visible Church of Christ? Beside, 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 do; 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, unless labouring also for the* (u) *Salvation of others, we profess with our mouths, the same Faith which we bear in our hearts.* And if any man hold it lawful to dissemble, and deny matters of Faith, we cannot be assured, but that they actually dissemble, and hide Anabaptism, Arianism, yea Turcism, and even Atheism, or any other false belief, under the outward profession of Calvinism, Do 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, or none at all. No wonder then, if S. *Austin* account this Heresie so gross, that he saith against those who in his time defended the like error: *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 sustained with no truth, inlightned with no wisdom, seasoned with no salt, vain, 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 do 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 *Gregory's*) *time, from whence did* Donatus (Luther) *appear? 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 *Schism* 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.

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 external Communion of Christ's Visible Church, and by that separation became guilty of Schism. And that they are properly Schismatiques clearly followeth from the grounds which we have laid, concerning the nature of Schism, which consists in leaving the external Communion of the Visible Church of Christ our Lord; and it is clear by evidence of fact, that *Luther* and his followers forsook the Communion of that Ancient Church.

For they did not so much as pretend to joyn with any Congregation, which had a being before their time; for they would needs conceive that no Visible Company was free from errors in Doctrin, and corruption in practice: And therefore they opposed the Doctrin; 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 do out of a perswasion, that they were bound (forsooth) in conscience so to do, unless 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 gross 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 *Doctrin*, since he durst not communicate with *Rome*? He will not be able to assign 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, which soever it was, whether that of *Rome*, or any other; of which Point I do not for the present dispute. Yea this the *Lutherans* do 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 Doctrin; and that* Luther *should receive it from them, and not they from* Luther.

(o) *Pag.* 154.
(p) *Mat.* 16. 18.
(q) Pag. 76.
(r) Pag. 83.
(s) *In Psal.* 30. *Conc.* 2.
(t) *Epist.* 48.
(u) *S. Aug. de Fide & Symbol. c.* 1.
(w) *In Psal.* 101.
(x) *De ovib. c.* 1.
(y) *De Bapt. cont. Donat.*
(z) *Lib.* 3. *cont. Parm.*
4. Point. *Luther* and all that follow him are Schismaticks.
(a) Pag. 68.
(b) *Georgius Milius in Aug. Confess. art.* 7 *de Eccles. Pag.* 137.
(c) *Bened. Morgenstern tract. de Eccles. pag.* 145.



Ano-

Another speaketh roundly, and saith, It is *impudency* to say, that *many learned men* (d) *in* Germany *before* Luther, *did bold the Doctrin of the Gospel*. And I add: That far *greater impudency*, it were to affirm, 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 general; *We were*, even, *forced* (e) *to make a separation from the whole world*. And, *Luther* of himself in particular: *In the beginning* (f) *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, greatness, and amplitude so much hath been spoken, both in the old Testament, and in the New.

(d) Conrad. Schlusselb. in Theol. Calvin. lib. 2. fol. 130.

(e) Epist. 141.

(f) In praefat. operum suorum.

13. D. *Potter* endeavours to avoid this evident Argument by divers evasions; but by the confutation thereof I will (with God's holy assistance) take occasion, even out of his own Answers and grounds, to bring unanswerable reasons to convince them of *Schism*.

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 calm Protestants, who affirm, that those errors did not destroy the *being*, but only deform 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 sinful persons, perished, or perished not? Answer; 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 Baptism,* (that is, *without* a second baptism, or rebaptization, and I may say, without *Luther*'s Reformation) *answer me I pray you, What madness did move the Sect of* Donatus *to separate themselves from her upon pretence to avoid the communion of bad men!* I beseech the Reader to ponder every one of S. *Augustine*'s words; and to consider, whether any thing could have been spoken more directly against *Luther*, and his followers of what sort soever.

(g) Lib. 2. cont. Epist. Gaudent. cap. 7.

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 courtesie, to free them from meer *Schism*: but all men touched with any spark of zeal to vindicate the wisdom and goodness of our Saviour from blasphemous injury, cannot chuse but believe and proclaim them to be superlative Arch-heretiques. Nevertheless, if they will needs have the honour of Singularity, and desire to be both *formal 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, for those corporeal Angels, or invisible men, because *they* held external 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 external *Communion* of them, with whom they agree in *Faith*, which is Schism in the most formal, and proper signification thereof. Moreover, according to D. *Potter*, those boisterous Creatures are properly Schismatiques. For, the reason why he thinks himself, and such as he is, to be cleared from Schism, notwithstanding their division from the *Roman* Church, is, because (according to his Divinity) the property of (h) *Schism*; *is*, (*witness 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 spake, *cut off from the Body of Christ, and the hope of Salvation*, the Church from which they separated themselves; and they do it directly as the *Donatists* (in whom you exemplifie) did, by affirming that the true Church had perished: and therefore they cannot be cleared from *Schism*, if you may be their Judge. Consider, I pray you, how many prime Protestants both domestical and forraign you have at one blow struck off from hope of Salvation, and condemned to the lowest pit for the grievous sin of *Schism*. And withal it imports you to consider, that you also involve your self, and other moderate Protestants in the self-same crime, and punishment, while you communicate with those, who according to your own principles, are properly, and formally *Schismatiques*. For, if you held your self obliged under pain of damnation to forsake the Communion of the *Roman* Church, by reason of their Errors and Corruptions, which yet you confess were *not Fundamental*; shall it not be much more damnable for you, to live in Communion and Confraternity, with those who defend an error of the failing of the Church; which in the *Donatists* you confess (i) to have been *properly heretical 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 find alledged in the next number. And this may suffice for confutation of the aforesaid Answer, as it might have relation to the rigid *Calvinists*.

(h) Pag 76.

(i) Pag. 126.

17. For Confutation of those Protestants, who hold that the Church of Christ had always a being, and cannot err in Points Fundamental, and yet teach that she may err in matters of less moment, wherein, if they forsake her, they would be accounted not to leave the Church, but only her corruptions; I must say that they change the state of our present Question, not distinguishing between *internal* Faith, and *external Communion*, not between *Schism* and *Heresie*. This I demonstrate out of D. *Potter* himself, who in express 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 Fundamental.* And afterwards speaking of the *Universal Church*, he saith: *It is comfort* (l) *enough for the Church, that the Lord in mercy will secure her from all capital dangers, and conserve her on earth against all enemies; but she may not hope to triumph over all sin and error, till she be in heaven.* Out of which words I observe, that, according to D. *Potter*, the self-same Church, which is the Universal Church, remaining the Universal true Church of Christ, may fall into errors and corruptions: from whence it clearly followeth, that it is impossible to leave the *external Communion* of the Church so corrupted, and retain *external* communion with the Catholique Church; since the Church Catholique, and the Church so corrupted is the self-same one Church, or company of men. And the contrary imagination talks in a dream,

(k) Pag. 151.

(l) Pag. 153.



dream, as if the errors and infections of the Catholick 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 themselves; for men cannot be said to live, in, or out of, the Communion of any dead creature, but with persons, endued with life and reason; and much less 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 themselves from the corruptions of the Church, but not from the Church her self, seeing the corruptions of the Church were inherent in the Church. All this is made more clear, if we consider, that when *Luther* appeared, there were not two distinct visible true Catholique Churches, holding contrary Doctrines, and divided in external Communion; one of the which two Churches did *triumph over all error*, and corruption in Doctrine and practice; but the other was stained with both. For to faign this diversity of two Churches, cannot stand with record of histories, which are silent of any such matter. It is against D. *Potter*'s own grounds, that the Church may err in Points not Fundamental, which were not true, if you will imagin a certain visible Catholique Church free from error even in Points not Fundamental. It contradicteth the words in which he said, the Church may *not hope to triumph over all error, 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 *Schism*. We must therefore truly affirm, 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 external Communion of that corrupted Church, he could not remain in the Communion of the Catholique Church, no more than it is possible to keep company with D *Christopher Potter*, and not keep company with the Provost of Queens Colledge in Oxford, if D. *Potter* and the Provost be one and the self-same man: For so one should be, and not be, with him at the same time. This very Argument, drawn from the Unity 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 lawful ordination*, Novatianus *is not in the Church*. I purposely here speak only of *external communion* with the Catholique Church. For in this Point there is great difference between *internal acts* of our understanding, and will; and of *external deeds*. Our Understanding 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 real external deeds do take things in gross as they find them, not separating things which in reality are joyned together. Thus, one man may consider and love a sinner as he is a man; friend, benefactor, or the like; and at the same time not consider him, nor love him as he is a sinner; because these are acts of our Understanding and Will, which may respect their objects under some one formality, or consideration, without reference to other things contained in the self-same objects. But if one should strike, or kill a sinful man, he will not be excused by alledging that he killed him, not as a man, but as a sinner; because the self-same person being a man, and the sinner, the *external* 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, and many of them affectedly mistaken: For one may in some Points believe as the Church believeth, and disagree from her in other. One may love the truth which she holds and detest her (pretended) corruptions. But it is impossible that a man should really separate himself from her external Communion, as she is corrupted, and be really within the same external Communion as she is found; because she is the self-same Church which is supposed to be found in some things, and to err in others. Now, our question for the present doth concern only this Point of *external Communion*: because *Schism*, as it is distinguished from *Heresie*, is committed when one divides himself from the *External Communion* of that Church with which he agrees in *Faith*; Whereas Heresie doth necessarily imply a difference in matter of *Faith*, and belief: and therefore to say, that they left not the visible Church; but her errors, can only excuse them from *Heresie* (which shall be tryed in the next Chapter) but not from *Schism*, as long as they are really divided from the *external Communion* of the self-same visible Church; which, notwithstanding those errors wherein they do in judgment 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 clear, that their chiefest Answer changeth the very state of the question; confoundeth internal acts of the Understanding with the *external Deeds*, doth not distinguish between *Schism* and *Heresie*; and leaves this demonstrated against them, That they divided themselves 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 *Schism*, I refer to the unpartial Judges heretofore (n) alledged; as to S. *Irenaeus*, who plainly saith: *They cannot make any so important* REFORMATION, *as the Evil of the Schism is pernitious*. To S. *Denis* of *Alexandria*, saying: *Certainly all things should be endured rather than to consent to the division of the Church of God: those Martyrs being no less glorious that expose themselves to hinder the dismembring of the Church, then those that suffer rather than they will offer sacrifice to Idols.* To S. *Augustine*; who tells us: That not to hear the Church; *is a more grievous thing than if he were stricken with the sword, consumed with flames, exposed to wild Beasts.* And to conclude all in few words, he giveth this general 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 than from Christ himself.* But I have 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 do 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 doctrin? Corruption in manners yields no sufficient cause to leave the Church, otherwise men must go not only out of the Church, but out of the world, as the Apostle (t) saith. Our blessed Saviour foretold that there would be in the Church tares with choice Corn, and sinners with just men. If then Protestants wax zealous, with the *Servants*, to pluck up the weeds, let

(t) 1 Cor. 5. 10.

let them firſt hearken to the wiſdom of the *Maſter*: *Let both grow up.* And they ought to imitate them, (u) Ep. 162. who as S. *Auguſtine* ſaith, *Tolerate for the good of* (u)*Unity, that which they deteſt for the good of equity.* And to whom the more frequent, and foul ſuch ſcandals are, by ſo much the more is the merit of their perſeverance in the Communion of the Church, and the Martyrdom of their patience, as the ſame Saint calls it. If they were offended with the life of ſome Eccleſiaſtical perſons, muſt they therefore deny obedience to their Paſtors, and finally break with Gods Church? The Paſtor of Paſtors teacheth us another leſſon. (w) Mat. 23. *Upon the chair of Moſes* (w) *have ſitten the Scribes and Phariſees. All things therefore whatſoever they ſhall ſay to you, obſerve ye, and do ye: but according to their works, do you not.* Muſt people except againſt laws, and revolt from Magiſtrates, becauſe ſome are negligent, or corrupt in the execution of the ſame laws, and performance of their office? If they intended reformation of manners, they uſed a ſtrange means for the atchieving of ſuch an end, by denying the neceſſity of Confeſſion, laughing at auſterity of Penance, condemning the Vows of Chaſtity, Poverty, Obedience, breaking Faſts, &c. And no leſs unfit were the *Men*, than the *Means*. I love not recrimination. But it is well known to how great crimes *Luther*, *Calvin*, *Zuinglius*, *Beza*, and others of the prime Reformers were notoriouſly obnoxious; as might be eaſily demonſtrated by the only tranſcribing of what others have delivered upon that ſubject: whereby it would appear, that they were very far from being any ſuch Apoſtolical men as God is wont to uſe in ſo great a work. And whereas they were wont, eſpecially in the beginning of their revolt, maliciouſly to exaggerate the faults of ſome Clergy men, *Eraſmus* ſaid well, (*Ep. 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 Council of *Trent*, which might tend to Reformation of manners. And finally, the vices of others are not hurtful to any but ſuch as imitate, and conſent to them; according to the ſaying of S. *Auguſtine*: *We* (y) Ep. 116. *conſerve* (y) *innocency, not by knowing the ill deeds of men, but by not yielding conſent to ſuch 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 yield ſufficient cauſe to leave the Church; I reply with S. *Auguſtine*, that the Church doth (as the pretended Reformers ought to have done) tolerate or bear with ſcandals and corruptions, but neither doth, nor can approve them, *The Church* (ſaith he) *being placed* (z) *be-* (z) Pag. 73. *twixt much chaff and cockle, doth bear with many things; but doth not approve, nor diſſemble, nor act thoſe things which are againſt Faith, and good life.* But becauſe to approve corruption in manners as lawful, were an error againſt Faith, it belongs to corruption in Doctrin, which was the ſecond part of my demand.

19. Now then, that corruptions in Doctrin (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. *Potter*'s own confeſſion; that the Catholique Church neither hath, nor can err, in Points *Fundamental*, as was ſhewed out of his own expreſs words, which he alſo of ſet purpoſe delivereth in divers other places, & all they are obliged to maintain the ſame, who teach that Chriſt had always a viſible Church upon earth: becauſe any one *Fundamental* error overthrows 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 err in Points neceſſary to Salvation, or damnably, and 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 fundamental Article of Faith, the belief thereof cannot be damnable. But D. *Potter* teacheth, that the Catholique Church *cannot*, and that the *Roman* Church *hath not* erred againſt any Fundamental Article of Faith: Therefore it cannot be damnable to remain in her Communion; and ſo the pretended corruptions in her doctrins could not induce any obligation to depart from her Communion; nor could excuſe them from Schiſm, who, upon pretence of neceſſity in Point of Conſcience, forſook her. And D. *Potter* will never be able to ſalve a manifeſt contradiction in theſe his words: *To depart from the Church of* Rome *in ſome Doctrins and practiſes, there might be neceſſary cauſe, though ſhe wanted nothing neceſſary to Salvation.* For if, notwithſtanding theſe Doctrins and practiſes, *ſhe wanted nothing neceſſary to Salvation*; how could it be *neceſſary to Salvation* to forſake her? And therefore we muſt ſtill conclude, that to forſake her was properly an act of *Schiſm*.

20. From the ſelf-ſame ground of the infallibility of the Church in all Fundamental 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 Doctrin; as long as, for the truth of her Faith and belief, 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 do. But (even according to D. *Potters* Aſſertions) the Church performeth all theſe things, as long ſhe erreth not in Points fundamental, although ſhe were ſuppoſed to err in other Points not Fundamental: 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 Doctrin. The *Major*, or firſt Propoſition, of it ſelf is evident. The *Minor*, or ſecond Propoſition, doth neceſſarily follow out of D. *Potter*'s own Doctrin above-rehearſed, that the *promiſes of our Lord* (b) Pag. 151 *made to his Church for his aſſiſtance, are to be* (b) *extended only to Points of Faith, or Fundamental*; (Let me note here by the way that by his (*or*) he ſeems to exclude from Faith all Points which are not (c) Pag. 155. Fundamental, 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 capital dangers,* &c. *but ſhe may not hope to triumph over all ſin and error, till ſhe be in heaven.* For it is evident, that the Church (for as much as concerns the truth of her Doctrins and belief) ows no more duty to God and her Neighbour; neither doth our Saviour exact more at her hands, nor is it in her power to do, more than God doth aſſiſt her to do; which aſſiſtance is promiſed only for Points Fundamental; and conſequently as long as ſhe teacheth no Fundamental 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 than our Saviour* (d) Pag. 281. *left it,* &c? ſince he himſelf obligeth men under pain of damnation to forſake the Church, by reaſon of errors; againſt which our Saviour thought it needleſs 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



Church to do more than ſhe *may* even hope for, or to perform on earth that which is proper to heaven alone?

21. And as from your own Doctrin concerning the infallibility of the Church in Fundamental Points, we have proved that it was a grievous ſin to forſake her: ſo do we take a ſtrong argument from the fallibility of any who dare pretend to reform the Church, which any man in his wits will believe to be indued with at leaſt as much infallibility as private men can challenge; and D. *Potter* expreſly affirmeth, that Chriſts promiſes of his aſſiſtance *are not intended* (e) *to any particular perſons or Churches*: (e) Pag. 151, and therefore to leave the Church by reaſon of errors, was at beſt hand but to flit from one erring company to another, without any new *hope* of triumphing over errors, and, without neceſſity, or utility, to forſake that Communion of which S. *Auguſtine* ſaith, *There is* (f) *no juſt neceſſity to divide Unity.* (f) Ep. cont. Parmen. l. 2. c. 11. Which will appear to be much more evident, if we conſider, that though the Church had maintained ſome falſe Doctrins, yet to leave her Communion to remedy the old, were but to add a new increaſe of errors, ariſing from the innumerable diſagreements of Sectaries, which muſt needs bring with it a mighty maſs of falſehoods, 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 err in Points Fundamental, in which any private *Reformer* may fail: 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 ſelf affirms (*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 corruption, ſtill remaining in your Church, which you can only excuſe by ſaying they are not Fundamental, as likewiſe thoſe in the *Roman* Church are confeſſed to be not Fundamental. What man of judgment will be a Proteſtant, ſince that Church is confeſſedly a corrupt one?

22. I ſtill proceed to impugn 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 capital dangers: but ſhe may not hope to triumph over all ſin, and error, till ſhe be in heaven* Now if it be comfort *enough* to be ſecured from all capital dangers, which can ariſe only from error in Fundamental Points: why were not your firſt Reformers content with *enough*, but would needs diſmember the Church, out of a pernicious greedineſs of more than *enough*? For, this *enough*, which according to you is attained by not erring in Points Fundamentel, was enjoyed before *Luther*'s reformation, unleſs you will now againſt your ſelf affirm, that long before *Luther* there was no Church free from error in Fundamental Points. Moreover if (as you ſay) no Church may hope *to triumph over all error till ſhe be in heaven*; You muſt either grant, that errors not Fundamental cannot yield ſufficient cauſe to forſake the Church, or elſe you muſt affirm that all Community may, and ought to be forſaken, and ſo there will be no end of Schiſms: or rather indeed there can be no ſuch thing as Schiſm, becauſe, according to you, all communities are ſubject to errors not Fundamental, for which, if they may be lawfully forſaken, it followeth clearly that it is not Schiſm to forſake them. Laſtly, ſince it is not lawful 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 ſin and error*: You muſt grant, that, as ſhe ought not to be left by reaſon of ſin; ſo neither by reaſon of errors not Fundamental: becauſe both *ſin*, and *error* are (according to you) impoſſible to be avoided, till ſhe be in heaven.

23. Furthermore, I aſk, Whether it be the *Quantity* and *Number*, or *Quality* and *Greatneſs* of doctrinal errors that may yield ſufficient cauſe to relinquiſh the Churches Communion? I prove that neither. Not the *Quality*, which is ſuppoſed to be beneath the degree of Points Fundamental, or neceſſary to Salvation. Not the *Quantity* or Number: for the foundation is ſtrong enough to ſupport all ſuch *unneceſſary additions*, as you term them. And if they once weighed ſo heavy as to overthrow the foundation, they ſhould grow to Fundamental errors, into which your ſelf teach the Church cannot fall. *Hay and ſtubble* (ſay you) *and ſuch* (g) *unprofitable ſtuff, laid on the roof, deſtroys not the houſe,* (g) Pag. 155. *whilſt the main pillars are ſtanding on the foundation.* And, tell us, I pray you, the preciſe number of errors which cannot be tollerated? I know you cannot do 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 ſeventy ſeven times, that is, without limitation of quantity of time, or quality of treſpaſſes; and why then dare you alledge his command, that you muſt not pardon his Church for errors, acknowledged to be not Fundamental? What excuſe can you feign to your ſelves; who for Points not neceſſary to Salvation, have been occaſions, cauſes, and Authors of ſo many miſchiefs, as could not but unavoidably accompany ſo huge a breach in Kingdoms, in Common-wealths, in private perſons, in publique Magiſtrates, in body, in ſoul, in goods, in life, in Church, in the State, by Schiſms, by rebellions, by war, by famin, by plague, by blood-ſhed, by all ſorts of imaginable calamities upon the whole face of the earth, wherein as in a map of Deſolation, the heavineſs of your crime appears, under which the world doth paint?

24. To ſay for your excuſe, that you left not the Church, but her errors, doth not extenuate, but aggravate your ſin. For by this device, you ſow ſeeds of endleſs Schiſms, and put into the mouth of all Separatiſts, a ready Anſwer how to avoid the note of *Schiſm* from your Proteſtant Church of *England* or from any other Church whatſoever. They will, I ſay, anſwer as you do prompt, that your Church may be forſaken, if ſhe fall into errors, though they be not Fundamental: 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 Fundamental, the Churh ought not to be forſaken, *There neither was* (ſaith he) *nor can be* (h) *any juſt cauſe to depart from the* (h) Pag. 75. *Church of Chriſt, no more than from Chriſt himſelf. To depart from a particular Church, and namely from the Church of* Rome, *in ſome Doctrins and practiſes, there might be juſt and neceſſary cauſe, though the Church of* Rome *wanted nothing neceſſary to Salvation.* Mark his Doctrin, that there *can be no juſt cauſe to depart from the Church of Chriſt*: and yet he teacheth, that the Church of Chriſt may err in Points not Fundamental; Therefore (ſay I) we cannot forſake the *Roman* Church for Points not Fundamental, for then we might alſo forſake the Church of Chriſt, which your ſelf deny: and I pray you conſider, whether

ther do you not plainly contradict your self, while in the words above 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 err in Points not Fundamental: 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 Curch, but her *corruptions*.

26. Another evasion D. *Potter* bringeth, to avoid the imputation of *Schism*, and it is, because they still acknowledge the Church of *Rome* to be a *Member of the body of Christ*, and not *cut off from the hope of*
(i) Pag. 76. *Salvation. And this* (saith he) *clears us from the* (i) *imputation of Schism, 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 Answer which perhaps you may get some one to approve, if first you can put him out of his wits. For what prodigious Doctrins 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 *Schism*: 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 *judged*, that she retained all means necessary to Salvation. I say, *because* they so *judged*. For the very reason for which he acquitteth himself, and condemneth those others as Schismatiques, is, because he holdeth that the Church which both of them forsook, 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 do 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 rebelleth to be his lawful Soveraign? And yet D. *Potter* thinks himself free from Schism, 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 means to Salvation. But I will no further urge this most solemn foppery, and do much more willingly put all Catholiques in mind what an unspeakable comfort it is, that our Adversaries are forced to confess, that they cannot clear themselves from *Schism*, otherwise than by acknowledging that they do not, nor cannot, *cut off from the hope of Salvation* our Church. Which is as much as if they should in plain terms say: They must be damned, unless we may be saved. Moreover, this evasion doth indeed condemn your zealous brethren of *Heresie*, for denying the Churches perpetuity, but doth not clear your self from *Schism*, which consists in being divided from that true Church, with which a man agreeth in all points of Faith, as you must profess your self to agree with the Church of *Rome* in all Fundamental Articles. For otherwise, you should cut her off from the hope of Salvation, and so condemn your self of *Schism*. And lastly, even according to this your own definition of *Schism*, you cannot clear your self from that crime, unless you be content to acknowledge a manifest contradiction in your own Assertions. For if you do 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 of* Rome, *there might be just and necessary*
(k) Pag. 20. (l) *cause*? That *they that have the understanding and means to discover their error, and neglect to use*
(l) Pag. 77. *them* (m) *we dare not flatter them* (say you) *with so easie a censure*, of hope of Salvation? If then it
(m) Pag. 79. be (as you say) a property of *Schism*, to cut off from the hope of Salvation, the Church from which it separates: how will you clear your self from *Schism*, who dare not flatter us with so easie a censure? and who affirm that a reconciliation with us is *damnable*? But the truth is, there is no constancy in your Assertions; by reason of difficulties which press you on all sides. For, you are loath to affirm cleerly, that we may be saved, lest 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 affirm that our Church erred in Points Fundamental, or necessary to Salvation, you know not how, nor where, nor among what company of men, to find a perpetual visible Church of Christ, before *Luther*: And therefore your best shift is to say, and unsay, as your occasions command. I do not examine your Assertion, that it is the property of Schism, 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 formal and proper *Heretiques*, and not *Schismatiques*, as *Schism* is a vice distinct from *Heresie*. Besides, although the *Donatists*, and *Luciferians* (whom you also alledge) had been meer Schismatiques, yet it were against all good Logick, from a particular, to infer a general Rule, to determine what is the property of *Schism*.

28. A third device I find in D. *Potter* to clear his brethren from Schism, *There is* (saith he) *great*
(n) Pag. 75. *difference between* (n) *a Schism from them, and a Reformation of our selves.*

29. This, I confess, is a quaint subtilty, by which all Schism and Sin may be as well excused. For what devil incarnate could meerly 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 self-same thing. Nay we see, that although they infinitely disagree in the particulars of their reformation, yet they symbolize, and consent in the general Point of forsaking our pretended corruptions: An evident sign that the thing, upon which their thoughts first pitched, was not any particular Model, or Idæa of Religion, but a setled resolution to forsake the Church of *Rome*. Where-
(o) *Casu non voluntate in has turbas incidi, Deum ipsum testor.* fore this Metaphysical speculation, that they intended only to reform themselves, cannot possibly excuse them from *Schism*, unless first they be able to prove that they were obliged to depart from us. Yet for as much as concerns the fact it self; it is clear, that *Luther*'s revolt did not proceed from any zeal of reformation. The motives, which put him upon so wretched, and unfortunate a work, were,
(p) *Act. & Mon.* pag. 404. Covetousness, 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 witness, that he *fell into these*
(q) *Sleidan. l.* 16. *fol.* 232. *troubles casually, and* (o) *against his will*, not upon any intention of Reformation, not so much as *dream-*
(r) *Sleid. lib.* 12. *fol.* 177. *ing or suspecting any change which might* (p) *happen*. And he *began to preach* (against Indulgences)
(s) *Luth. in colloq. mensal.* *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 own undertaken
(t) *Act. Mon.* pag. 404. course, oftentimes (saith he) *wishing* (s) *that I had never begun that business*. And *Fox* saith: *It is apparent that* (t) Luther *promised Cardinal* Cajetan *to keep silence, provided also his adversaries would do the like*.



*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 seeen in (w) *Brereley*. But this is (u) *Cowp. in his Chronicle.* sufficient to shew, that *Luther* was far enough from intending any Reformation. And if he judged a (w) *Tract.* 2. *cap.* 2. *Sect.* 11. *subd.* 2. *Reformation* to be necessary, what a huge wickedness was it in him, to promise *silence, if his adversaries would do 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 from damnable *Schism*? And this is the true manner of *Luther*'s revolt, taken from his own acknowledgments, and the words of the more ancient Protestants themselves, whereby D. *Potter*'s faltring, and mincing the matter, is clearly discovered, and confuted. Upon what motives our Country was divided from the *Roman* Church by King *Henry* the Eighth, and how the Schism was continued by Queen *Elizabeth*, I have no heart to rip up. The world knoweth, it was not upon any zeal of *Reformation*. (x) Pag. 81, 82.

30. But you will prove your former evasion by a couple of Similitudes: *If a Monastery* (x) *should reform it self, and should reduce into practise, ancient good discipline, when others would not; in this case could it in reason be charged with Schism from others, or with Apostasie 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 truly accused for making a Schism from the Church, seeing all they did, was to reform themselves.*

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 maintain the lawfulness of Schism from the Church, and Apostasie from a Religious Order. Yet before you make your final resolution, hear a word of advice Put case; That a Monastery did confessedly observe their substantial vows and all principal Statutes, or Constitutions of the Order, though with some neglect of lesser Monastical Observances: And that a Reformation were undertaken, not by authority of lawful Superiors, but by some One, or very few in comparison of the rest: And those few known 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 fellows confessed, to have been time out of mind understood, and practised as now they were: And further, that the pretended Reformers acknowledge that themselves as soon 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 than they *did*, or *could* do in their Monastery, which we suppose to be *secured* from all substantial corruptions, for the avoiding 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 reform it self, &c* and tell me if you could excuse such Reformers from Schism, Sedition, Rebellion, Apostasie, &c? what would you say of such Reformers in your Colledge? or tumultuous Persons in a Kingdom? Remember now your own Tenents, and then reflect how fit a similitude you have picked out, to prove your self a *Schismatique*. You teach that the Church may err in Points not Fundamental, but that for all Fundamental Points she is secured from error: You teach that no particular Person, or Church, hath any promise of assistance in Points Fundamental: You, and the whole world can witness 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 confess the Antiquity of our Doctrin and Practice, and to several and many Controversies, acknowledge that the Ancient Fathers stood on our Side: Consider, I say, these Points, and see whether your similitude do not condemn your Progenitors of *Schism* 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 Hospital *of persons universally 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*, than 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 mortal, 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 eat 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 senselesness 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* (y) Pag. 154. *and toes*, but yet who hath not *lost* any *vital part*: you acknowledg that out of her society no man is secured from damnable Error, and the world can bear witness what unspeakable mischiefs and calamities ensued *Luther*'s 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.

33. But alas, to what pass hath Heresie brought men, who term 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 err in any one Point of Faith, although not Fundamental.

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 sin in leaving her. And you speak very strangely 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

For if they do not separate themselves from the Society of the infected persons; how do they free themselves and depart from the common disease? Do 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 own 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 publick 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 them away; even their Superiours both Spiritual and Temporal, as is notorious. Or if they had not power to expel 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 external Communion, and company of the Catholique Church, for which, as your self (z) confess, *There neither was nor can be any just cause, no more than to depart from Christ himself.* We do therefore infer, that *Luther* and the rest who forsook that visible Church which they found upon earth, were truly, and *properly Schismatiques*.

(z) Pag. 75.

15. 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 Meliviteanus* proveth, that not *Cæcilianus*, but *Parmenianus* was a Schismatique, saying, *For*, Cæcilianus *went* (a) *not out of* Majorinus *thy Grandfather, but* Majorinus *from* Cæcilianus: *neither did* Cæcilianus *depart from the Chair of* Peter, *or* Cyprian, *but* Majorinus, *in whose Chair thou sittest, which had no beginning before* Majorinus. *Since it manifestly appeareth that these things were acted in this manner, it is clear, that you are heirs 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 began; and proves, That *going out*, convinceth those who go out, to be Schismatiques; but not those from whom they depart: That to forsake the Chair of *Peter* is *Schism*; yea, that it is *Schism* to erect a Chair which had no origin, or as it were predecessor before it self: That to continue in a division begun by others, is to be *Heirs 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 *Schism*, and consequently, that although Protestants, who deny the Pope to be supream Head of the Church, do think by that *Heresie* to clear *Luther* from Schism, in disobeying the Pope: Yet that will not serve to free him from *Schism*, as it importeth a division from the obedience, or Communion of the particular Bishop, Dioces, Church, and Country where he lived.

(a) Lib. 1. cont. Parmen.

36. But it is not the Heresie of Protestants, or any other Sectaries, that can deprive S. *Peter*, and his Successors, 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 judgment 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 chief Protestants. And we must say with S. *Cyprian*: *Heresies* (c) *have sprung, and schisms 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 do plainly condemn *Luther*, whether he will understand them as spoken of a *Universal*, or of every *particular* Church. For he withdrew himself both from the obedience of the Pope, and of all particular Bishops and Churches. And no less clear is the said *Optatus Meliviteanus*, saying: *Thou canst not deny* (d) *but that thou knowest, that in the City of* Rome, *there was first an Episcopal Chair placed for* Peter, *wherein* Peter *the head of all the Apostles sate, whereof also he was called* Cephas; *in which one Chair, Unity was to be kept by all, lest the other Apostles might attribute to themselves, each one his particular Chair; and that he should be a Schismatique and sinner, who against that one single Chair should erect another.* Many other authorities of Fathers might be alledged to this purpose, which I omit; my intention being, not to handle particular controversies.

(b) Tract. 1. Sect. 5. fol. 10.
(c) Ep. 55.
(d) Lib. 2. cont. Parmen.

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 err 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. *Augustin*, 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 err in any one Point of Doctrin, nor can approve any corruption in manners; they cannot with any colour avoid the just imputation of *eminent* Schism, according to the verdict of the same holy Father in these words: *The most manifest* (f) *sacriledge of Schism is eminent, when there was no cause of separation.*

(e) Ep. 48.
(f) De Bap. lib. 5. cap. 1.

38. Lastly, I prove that the Protestants cannot avoid the note of Schism, at least by reason of their mutual 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 *Protestants*, of *England*. So that if *Luther* were in the right, those other Protestants who invented Doctrins far different from his, and divided themselves from him, must be reputed *Schismatiques*: and the like argument may proportionably be applyed to their further divisions, and subdivisions. Which reason I yet urge more strongly out of D. *Potter*, (g) who affirms, 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 Fundamental Points. Now, since among Protestants there is such diversity of belief, that one denieth what the other affirmeth, they must be convicted in conscience that one part is in error (at least not Fundamental,) and, if D. *Potter* will speak consequently, that a reconciliation between them is *impossible*, and *damnable*: and what greater division, or *Schism* can there be, than when one part must judge a reconciliation with the other to be *impossible*, and *damnable*.

(g) Pag. 20.

39. Out of all which premisses, this *Conclusion* follows: That *Luther* and his followers were *Schismatiques*; from the universal visible Church; from the Pope Christs Vicar on earth, and Successour to S. *Peter*; from the particular Dioces in which they received Baptism; from the Country or Nation to



to which they belonged; from the Bishop under whom they lived; many of them from the Religious Order in which they were profissed; from one another; And Lastly, from a mans self (as much as is possible) because the self-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. *Potter*'s grounds, is both *impossible*, and *damnable*.

40. It seems D. *Potter*'s last refuge to excuse himself and his Brethren from Schism, is, because they proceeded according to their conscience, dictating an obligation, under damnation, to forsake the errors maintained by the Church of *Rome*. His words are: *Although we confess the* (h) *Church of* Rome *to be (in some sense) a true Church, and her errours to some men not damnable: yet for us who are convinced in conscience, that she errs 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 Uncharitable, in saying, Protestants cannot be saved; while your self avouch the same of all learned Catholiques, whom ignorance cannot excuse. If this your pretence of conscience may serve, what Schismatique in the Church, what popular seditious brain in a Kingdom, may not alledge the dictamen of conscience to free themselves from *Schism*, or *Sedition*? No man wishes them to do 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 do, even according to your own affirmation, that we Catholiques want no means necessary to Salvation. Easie to do? Nay not to do 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 means necessary to Salvation, and yet I cannot hope to be saved in that Church? or, Who can enjoyn in one brain (not crackt) these Assertions: After due examination I judge the *Roman* errors not to be in themselves fundamental, 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 errors; there is no other remedy, but that you must rectifie your erring conscience, by your other judgment, that her errors are not fundamental, nor damnable. And this is no more Charity, than you daily afford to such other Protestants as you term Brethren, whom you cannot deny to be in some errors, (unless you will hold, That of contradictory Propositions both may be true) and yet you do not judge it damnable to live in their Communion, because you hold their errors not to be fundamental. You ought to know, that according to the Doctrin of all Divines, there is great difference between a speculative perswasion, and a practical dictamen of conscience: And therefore although they had in speculation conceived the visible Church to err in some doctrins, of themselves not damnable; yet with that speculative judgment they might, and ought to have entertained this practical dictamen, that for Points not substantial to Faith, they neither were bound, nor lawfully could break the bond of Charity, by breaking unity in God's Church. You say that, *hay and stubble* (i) *and such unprofitable stuff* (as are corruptions in Points not fundamental) *laid on the roof, 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 stuff, 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 Christian world; rather than bear with some errors 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 have 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 heaps of examples, that almost all Catholiques may know, that they ought to receive the Doctors with the Church, and not forsake the Faith of the Church with the Doctors*: And much less should they forsake the Faith of the Church to follow *Luther*, *Calvin*, and such other Novellists. Moreover, though your first Reformers had conceived their own opinions to be *true*, yet they might, and ought to have doubted, whether they were *certain*: because your self first 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 have found a safe way to satisfie their zealous conscience, without a publick 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 self set down to free S. *Cyprian* from *Schism*; 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 quietness have rectified their consciences about the pretended errors of the Church. S. *Cyprian* (say you) *was a peaceable* (l) *and modest man, dissentid from others in his judgment, but without any breach of Charity, condemned no man (much less any Church) for the contrary 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 less 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 fundamental, or *necessary*, and why do you not thence infer the like THEREFORE, he should not have *proceeded to censure others*? In a word, since their disagreement from us concerned only Points which were not fundamental, they should have believed that they might have been deceived, as well as the whole visible Church, which you say may err in such Points; and therefore their Doctrins being not certainly *true*, and certainly *not necessary*, they could not give sufficient cause to depart from the Communion of the Church.

(i) Pag. 155.
(k) Adv. haref. c. 27.
(l) Pag. 124.

42. In other places you write so much, as may serve us to prove, that *Luther* and his followers ought to have deposed, and rectified their consciences: As for example, when you say, *When the Church* (m) *hath declared her self in any matter of opinion, or of rites; her declaration obliges all her children to peace and external obedience. Nor is it fit, or lawful for any private man to oppose his judgment to the publique, (as Luther and his fellows did) He may offer his opinion to be considered of, so he do it with evidence, or great probability of Scripture;*

(m) Pag. 105.

*ture, or reason, and very modestly, still containing himself within the dutiful respect which he oweth : but if he will factiously advance his own conceits* (his own conceits ? and yet grounded upon evidence of Scripture) *and despise the Church so far as to cut off her Communion ; he may be justly branded and condemned for a Schismatique yea and an Heretique also in some degree, and* in foro exteriori, *though his opinion were true, and much more if it be false.* Could any man, even for a Fee, have spoken more home to condemn your Predecessors of *Schism*, or Heresie? Could they have stronger Motives to oppose the Doctrin of the Church, and leave her Communion, than evidence of Scripture ? And yet according to your own words, they should have answered, & rectified their conscience, by your Doctrin, that though their opinion *were true*, and grounded upon evidence of *Scripture*, or *Reason* yet it was not lawful for any *private man to oppose his judgment to the publique*, which obligeth all Christians *to peace and external 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 *behave* themselves *in the face of all Christian Churches*, as if indeed they were not Reformers, but *Schismatiques*, and *Heretiques*, or as Pagans and Publicans. I thank you for your ingenuous confession : in recompence whereof, I will do a deed of Charity, by putting you in mind, into what Labyrinths you are brought, by teaching that the Church may err in some Points of Faith, and yet that it is not lawful for any man to oppose his judgment, or leave her Communion, though he have evidence of Scripture against her. Will you have such a man to dissemble against his conscience, or externally deny a truth, known to be contained in holy Scripture? How much more coherently do Catholiques proceed, who believe the universal 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, yields as much as we have alledged out of you, *The will of God is* (saith he) *to have* (n) *them do whatsoever the sentence of judicial and final decision shall determine, yea though it seem 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 be guilty of *Schism* ? And must not M. *Hooker* either acknowledge the universal infallibility of the Church, or else drive men into the perplexities and labyrinths of dissembling against their conscience, whereof now I speak ? Not unlike to this, is your Doctrin delivered elswhere, *Before the Nicene Council* (say you) *many* (o) *good Catholique Bishops, were of the same opinion with the* Donatists, *that the Baptism of Heretiques was ineffectual ; and with the Novatians, that the Church ought not to absolve some grievous sinners. These errors therefore (if they had gone no further) were not in themselves Heretical, 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 unity in her government : 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 from Schismatiques. For us, the* Mistaker *will never prove that we oppose any declaration of the Catholique Church, &c. and therefore he doth unjustly charge us either with Schism, or Heresie.* These words manifestly condemn your Reformers, who opposed the visible Church in many of her Declarations, Doctrins, and Commands imposed upon them, for silencing all disputes, *and settling peace and Unity in the government*, and therefore they still remaining obstinately disobedient, are justly *charged with Schism, and Heresie.* And it is to be observed, that you grant the *Donatists* to have been *very justly branded for Schismatiques*, although their opposition against the Church, did concern (as you hold) a Point not Fundamental to the Faith, and which according to S. *Augustin*, cannot be proved out of Scripture alone ; and therefore either doth evidently convince that the Church is universally infallible, even in Points not Fundamental ; or else that it is *Schism*, to oppose her Declarations, in those very things wherein she may err ; and consequently that *Luther*, and his fellows were *Schismatiques*, by opposing the visible Church for Points not Fundamental, though it were (untruly) supposed that she erred in such Points. But by the way, How come you on the sudden to hold the Determination of a General Council (of *Nice*) to be the declaration of the Catholique Church, seeing you teach, That General Councils may err even fundamentally ? And do 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 ?

(n) In his preface to his Books of Ecclesiastical Polity. *Sect.* 6. *Pag.* 28.

(o) Pag. 131.

43. It is therefore most evident, that no pretended Scruple of *conscience* could excuse *Luther* ; which he might, and ought to have rectified by means 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 love they bear to that sacred ransom of their souls, the Blood of our Blessed Saviour, attentively to ponder, and unpartially to apply to *their own 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, object against me that most strong argument ; Art thou only wise ? Do so many worlds err ? 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 : *Dost 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, and all to err ; why may he not permit thee to err ? To this belong those arguments, the Church, the Church, the Fathers, the Fathers, the Councils, the Customs, the multitudes, and greatness of wise men : Whom do not those Mountains of arguments, these clouds, yea these seas of Examples overthrow ?* And these thoughts wrought so deep in his soul that he *often wisht and desired that he had* (r) *never begun this business* : wishing yet further that *his Writings were burned and buried* (s) *in eternal oblivion.* Behold what remorse *Luther* felt, and how he wanted no strength of malice to cross 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, hear an example or two for that purpose. Of Communion under both kinds, thus he saith : *If the Council* (t) *should in any case decree this, least of all would we then use both kinds ; yea rather, in despight of the Council, 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 Saviours command ? Is this, only *to offer his opinion to be considered of*, as you said all men ought to do ? 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*

(p) *Tom.* 2. *Germ. Jen fol.* 9. *& tom.* 2. *Witt. of anno* 1562. *de abrog. Miss. privat. fol.* 244.
(q) *Tom* 5. *Ann not. brevis.*
(r) *Colloq. mensal. fol.* 158.
(s) *Praefat. in tom. German. Jen.*

(t) *De formula missae.*

(u) *the*



(u) *the Elevation of the Sacrament to be Idolatrical ; yet neverthelesse I did retain it in the Church* at Wittemberg, *to the end I might vex the Devil* 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 blaspheme) if he could retain it in his own Church at *Wittemberg*? If *Carolostadius*, *Luther*'s off-spring, was the Devil, who but himself must be his Dam ? Is Almighty God wont to send such Furies to preach the Gospel? And yet further (which makes most directly to the point in hand) *Luther* in his Book of abrogating the *Private Mass*, exhorts the *Augustine* Fryers of *Wittemberg*, who first abrogated the Mass, 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 *Joannes 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 means *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 *Schism*, 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 ?

(u) *In parva Confess.*

*Vid. Tan. tom.* 2. *disput.* 1. *q.* 2. *dub.* 4. *n.* 168.
(w) *In orat. Germ.* 12 *de Luth.*

44. Some are said to flatter themselves with another pernicious conceit, that they (forsooth) are not guilty of sin ; Because they were not the *first Authors*, but only are the *continuers* of the *Schism*, which was already begun.

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 final account. For according to this reason no Schism will be damnable, but only to the Beginners : Whereas contrarily, the longer it continues the worse it grows to be, and at length degenerates to *Heresie* ; as Wine by long keeping grows to be Vinegar, but not by continuance returns again to his former nature of Wine. Thus S. *Augustine* saith, that *Heresie is* (x) *Schism inveterate.* And in another place : *We object to you only the* (y) *crime of Schism, which you have also made to become Heresie, by evil persevering therein.* And S. *Hierom* saith : *Though Schism* (z) *in the beginning may be in some sort understood to be different from Heresie ; yet there is no Schism which doth not fain to it self some Heresie, that it may seem to have departed from the Church upon just cause.* And so indeed it falleth out. For men may begin upon passion, but afterward by instinct of corrupt nature, seeking to maintain their Schism as lawful, they fall into some Heresie, without which their Separation could not be justified with any colour : as in our present case the very affirming, that it is lawful to continue a Schism unlawfully begun, is an error against the main principle of Christianity, that it is not lawful 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 me.* We heard above *Optatus Milevitanus* saying to *Parmenianus*, that both he, and all those other who continued in the Schism begun by *Majorinus*, did inherit their Fore-fathers Schism ; and yet *Parmenianus*, was the third Bishop after *Majorinus* in his Sea, and did not *begin*, but only *continue* the Schism, *For* (saith this holy Father) Caecilianus (c) *went not out of* Majorinus *thy Grand-father, but* Majorinus *from* Caecilianus : *neither did* Caecilianus *depart from the Chair of* Peter, *or* Cyprian, *but* Majorinus, *in whose chair thou sittest, which before* Majorinus (Luther) *had no beginning. Seeing 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 clear that you be HEIRS both of the givers up of the Bible to be burned, and of SCHISMATIQUES.* And the Regal Power, or example of *Henry* the Eighth could not excuse his subjects from Schism, according to what we have heard out of S. *Chrysostom*, saying : *Nothing doth so much provoke* (d) *the wrath of Almighty God, as that the Church should be divided. Although we should do innumerable good deeds, if we divide the full Ecclesiastical Congregation, we shall be punished no less, than they who did rend his* (natural) *Body ; for that was done to the gain 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 sin of *Schism*, if they break the unity of Gods Church. The words of S. *Paul* can in no occasion be verified more than in this of which we speak. *They who do such things* (e) *are worthy of death : and not only they that do them, but they also that consent with the doers.* In things which are indifferent of their own nature, Custom 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 unlawful : and therefore division from Christs Mystical Body, being of the number of those Actions, which Divines teach to be *intrinsecè malas, evil of their own nature and essence*, no difference of Persons or Time can ever make it lawful. D. *Potter* saith : *Their neither was, nor can be any cause to depart from the Church of Christ, nomore than from Christ himself.* And who dares say, that it is not damnable to *continue* a Separation from Christ ? *Prescription* cannot in conscience run, 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 strayes, that after a certain time of wandring from their right home, fall from their owner to the Lord of the Soil ; but as long as they retain the *indelible Character* of Baptism, and live upon earth, they are obliged to acknowledge subjection to Gods Church. Humane Laws may come to nothing by discontinuance of time, but the Law of God, commanding us to conserve Unity in his Church, doth still remain. The continued disobedience of Children cannot deprive Parents of their parental right, nor can the Grand-child be undutiful to his Grand-Father, because his Father was unnatural to his own Parent. The longer Gods Church is so disobeyed, the profession of her Doctrin denied ; her Sacraments neglected ; her Liturgy condemned ; her Unity violated : the more grievous the fault grows to be : As the longer a man withholds a due debt, or retains his neighbours goods, the greater injustice he commits. Constancy in evil 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 Schisms, and yet after some space of time, none could be accused of Schism, nor be obliged to return to the visible Church of Christ : and so there should remain no one true visible Church. Let therefore these men who pretend to honour, reverence, and believe the Doctrin, and practice of the visible Church, and to condemn their forefathers who forsook her, and say, They would not have done so, if they

(x) *Lib.* 2. *cont. Cresc. c.* 7.
(y) *Ep.* 164.
(z) Upon these words *ad Tit.* 3. *Hereticum hominem, &c.*

(a) Mat. 18.
(b) Luk. 10 16.

(c) *Lib.* 1 *cont. Parm.*

(d) *Hom.* 11. *in ep. ad Eph.*

(e) Rom. 1. 31.



had

had lived in the dayes 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 Fathars dayes, we had not been their fellows in the bloud of the Prophets. Therefore you are a teſtimony to your own ſelves, that you are the ſons of them that killed the Prophets; and fill up the meaſure of your Fathers.*

(f) Mat. 23. ver. 29, &c.

46. And thus having demonſtrated that *Luther*, his Aſſociates, and all that continue in the Schiſm by them begun, are guilty of *Schiſm*, by departing from the viſible true Church of Chriſt; it remaineth that we examin 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 return: and then we ſhall have performed what was propoſed to be handled in the fifth 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 Dioceſs of *Rome*, but of all viſible Churches diſperſed throughout the whole world, agreeing in Faith with the Chair 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 out of which *Luther* departed, is proved by your own confeſſion, who aſſign for notes of the Church, the true Preaching of God's Word, and due adminiſtration of Sacraments, both which for the ſubſtance you cannot deny to the *Roman* Church, ſince you confeſs, that ſhe wanted nothing Fundamental, or neceſſary to Salvation, and for that very cauſe you think to clear your ſelf from Schiſm, *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 fellows 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*, unleſs you will acknowledge your ſelf to deſerve the juſt imputation of *Schiſm*. Neither can you deny, her to be truly Catholique by reaſon of (pretended) corruptions, not Fundamental. For your ſelf avouch, and endeavour to prove, that the true Catholique Church may err in ſuch Points. Moreover, I hope, you will not ſo much as go 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 Doctrins: and you cannot deny, but that *England* in thoſe days 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 affirm the *Roman* Church to have loſt the nature and being of a true Church, do 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 maintain, that the *Roman* Church is free from Fundamental, 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 have proceeded* (h) *to heavier cenſures, their zeal may be excuſed, but their Charity and wiſdom 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 Schiſmatical *Grecians*, do 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 Chriſm; Extream Unction; All the ſeven Sacraments; Prayer, Sacrifice, Alms for the dead; Monachiſm; 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 *Wittemburg*, intituled, *Acta Theologorum Wittembergenſium, & Jeremiæ 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 affirm, that the Doctrins *debated between the Proteſtants* (l), *and* Rome, *are only the partial and particular fancies of the* Roman *Church; unleſs 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 Hereſie of the *Grecians*, that the Holy-Ghoſt proceeds not from the Son, I ſuppoſe, that Proteſtants diſavow them in that error, as we do.

(i) Pag. 225.

(k) De ſtatu Eccleſ. pag. 153.

(l) Pag. 225.

49. D. *Potter* will not (I think) ſo much wrong his reputation, as to tell us, that the *Waldenſes, Wickliffe, Huſs*, or the like, were Proteſtants, becauſe in ſome things they diſagreed from Catholiques. For he well knows 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 Eccleſiaſtical Hierarchy, nor Succeſſion of Biſhops, Prieſts, and Paſtors. They differed among themſelves, and from Proteſtants alſo. They agreed in divers things with us againſt Proteſtants. They held Doctrins manifeſtly abſurd, and damnable hereſies.

50. The *Waldenſes* began not before the year 1218. ſo far were they from Univerſality of all Ages. For their Doctrin: firſt, they denied all Judgments 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 means to make their Maſter *Waldo*, a meer 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 Barn. Fifthly, that men ought not to take an Oath in any caſe. Sixthly, that thoſe perſons ſinned mortally, who accompanied without hope of iſſue. Seventhly, 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 civil Magiſtrate, being guilty of mortal ſin, did enjoy their dignity, or were to be obeyed. Ninthly, they condemned Princes and Judges. Tenthly, they affirmed ſinging in the Church to be an helliſh clamor. Eleventhly, they taught that men might diſſemble their Religion, and 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 the form of Religion in his time*,

(m) Act. Mon. pag. 628.



*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 groſs hereſies of *Waldo*. The followers of *Waldo*, were like their Maſter, ſo unlearned, that *ſome of them* (ſaith (n) *Fox*) *expounded the words. Joan. 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.

(o) Tract 2. cap. 2. ſect. ſubd. 5.

51. Neither can it be pretended, that theſe are ſlanders forged by Catholiques. 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, unleſs you will ſay perhaps, that they were Prophets, and ſome hundred years ago, did both foreſee that there were to be 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, and diſagreed from them in others? And upon what ground can they believe our Author for that part wherein the *Waldenſes* were like to Proteſtants, and imagin they lyed in the reſt?

52. Neither could *Wickliffe* continue a Church never interrupted from the time of the *Waldenſes*, after whom he lived more than one hundred and fifty years; to wit, the year 1371. He 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 ſeems to me* (p) *impoſſible, that we ſhould be rewarded without the interceſſion of the Virgin Mary.* He held ſeven Sacraments, Purgatory, and other Points. And againſt both Catholiques and Proteſtants he maintained ſundry damnable Doctrins, as divers Proteſtant Writers relate. As firſt: If a Biſhop, or Prieſt be in deadly ſin, he doth not indeed either give Orders, Conſecrate, or Baptize. Secondly, That Eccleſiaſtical Miniſters ought not to have any temporal poſſeſſions, nor propriety in any thing, but ſhould beg; and yet he himſelf brake into hereſie, becauſe he had been deprived by the Archbiſhop of *Canterbury* of a certain Benefice, as all Schiſms, and Hereſies begin upon paſſion, which they ſeek to cover with the cloak of Reformation. Thirdly, he condemned lawful Oaths, like the Anabaptiſts. Fourthly, he taught that all things came to paſs by abſolute neceſſity. Fifthly, he defended humane merits as the wicked *Pelagians* did, namely, as proceeding from natural forces, without the neceſſary help of Gods grace. Sixthly, that no man is a Civil Magiſtrate, while he is in mortal ſin, and that the people may at their pleaſure correct Princes, when they offend: by which Doctrin he proves himſelf both an Heretique, and a Traitour.

(p) In ſerm. de Aſſump. Mariæ.

53. As for *Huſs*, his chiefeſt Doctrins were: That Lay people muſt receive in *both kinds*; and. That Civil Lords, Prelates, and Biſhops loſe all right, and authority, while they are in mortal ſin. For other things he wholly 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 Civil Dominion was forbidden to the Clergie*; 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 evil.* By theſe particulars, it is apparent that *Huſs* agreed with Proteſtants againſt us, in one only Point of *both kinds*, 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 kind is adminiſtred, uſe one kind only, as others do.* *Melancthon* likewiſe holds it a thing) (ſ) indifferent: and the ſame is the opinion of ſome other Proteſtants. All which conſidered, it is clear, that Proteſtants cannot challenge the *Waldenſes, Wickliffe* and *Huſs* for members of their Church: and although they could, yet that would advantage them little towards the finding them out a perpetual viſible Church of theirs, for the reaſons above (t) ſpecified.

(q) In epiſt. ad Bohemos.

(r) De utraq; ſpecie Sacram.

(ſ) In Cen. epiſt. Theol. pag. 225.

(t) Numb. 49.

54. If D. *Potter* would go ſo far off, as to fetch the *Muſcovites, Armenians, Georgians, Æthiopians*, or *Abiſſines* into his Church, they would prove over dear bought: For they either hold the damnable Hereſie of *Eutyches*, or uſe Circumciſion, or agree with the *Greek*, or *Roman* Church: And it is moſt certain that they have nothing to do with the Doctrin 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 follows, that ſhe is the true Catholique 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 *Schiſm*, by dividing themſelves from the *Communion of the Roman Church.* Which is clearly 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 confeſs himſelf conſequently to forſake the whole.* Since therefore in the ſame place he expreſly acknowledges the *Church of Rome to be a member of the body of Chriſt*, and that it is clear they have forſaken her; it evidently follows, that they have forſaken the *whole*, and therefore are moſt properly *Schiſmatiques*.

(u) Pag. 67.

56. And laſtly, ſince the crime of *Schiſm* is ſo grievous, that, according to the Doctrin of holy Fathers rehearſed above, no multitude of good works, no moral 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 ſin from damnation; I leave it to be conſidered, whether it be not true Charity to ſpeak as we believe, and to believe as all Antiquity hath taught us, That whoſoever either *begins*, or *continues*, a diviſion from the *Roman Church*, which we have proved to be Chriſt's true *Militant* Church on earth, cannot without effectual 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 Unity whatſoever they work, though they ſeem to do it with great care and diligence, can no more avail them againſt the wrath of God, than the Spider's 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

## The ANSWER to the FIFTH CHAPTER.

*The ſeparation of Proteſtants from the Roman Church, being upon juſt and neceſſary cauſes, is not any way guilty of Schiſm.*

1. AD §. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7. In the ſeven firſt Sections of this Chapter, there be many things ſaid, and many things ſuppoſed by you which are untrue, and deſerve a cenſure. As,

2. Firſt, *That Schiſm could not be a Diviſion from the Church, or that a Diviſion from the Church could not happen, unleſs there always 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 Schiſm might now be, and be a Diviſion from the preſent viſible Church. As though in *France* there never had been until now a lawful 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 Soveraign Authority.

3. *That it is a point to be granted by all Chriſtians, that in all Ages there hath been a viſible Congregation of faithful people.* Which Propoſition howſoever you underſtand it, is not abſolutely certain. But if you mean by *Faithful*, (as it is plain you do) *free from all error in faith*, then you know all Proteſtants with one conſent affirm it to be 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 Schiſm, it is certainly conſequent, that all who perſiſt in this Diviſion muſt be ſo likewiſe.* Which is not ſo certain as you pretend. For they, which alter without neceſſary cauſe the preſent government of any State, Civil or Eccleſiaſtical, do commit a great fault; whereof notwithſtanding 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 have 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 faithful maintainers of the common liberty againſt the pretences of the King of *Spain*.

5. Fourthly, *That all thoſe which a Chriſtian is to eſteem neighbours do concur to make one company, which is the Church.* Which is falſe: for a Chriſtian is to eſteem thoſe his neighbours, who are not members of the true Church.

6. Fifthly, *That all the Members of the Viſible Church, are by charity united into one Myſtical body.* Which is manifeſtly untrue; for many of them have no Charity.

7. Sixthly, *That the Catholique Church ſignifies one company of faithful 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. Seventhly, *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 external 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:



Church: and divers times it hath happened, as in the caſe of *Chryſoſtom* and *Epiphanius*, that particular men, and particular Churches, have upon an over-valued 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 ſhew, or pretence of proof. The reſt is impertinent common place, wherein Proteſtants and the cauſe in hand, are abſolutely unconcern'd. And therefore I paſs to the *eighth Section.*

10. *Ad §.* 8. Wherein you obtrude upon us a double Fallacy; 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 falſhood, which yet are maintained by more than 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. *Auſtin* c. 62. l. 2. *cont. Parm.* inferrs out of the former premiſes, *That there is no neceſſity to divide Unity*: to let paſs your want of diligence, in quoting the 62. Chapter of that Book, which hath but 23. in it: to paſs by alſo, that theſe words which are indeed in the 11. Chapter, are not inferred out of any ſuch premiſes as you pretend; this, I ſay, is evident, that he ſays not abſolutely, that there never is, or can be any neceſſity to divide Unity, (which only were for your purpoſe,) but only in ſuch a ſpecial caſe, as he there ſets down: That is, *when good men tolerate bad men, which can do them no ſpiritual hurt, to the intent they may not be ſeparated from thoſe, who are ſpiritually good*; *Then* (ſaith he) *there is no neceſſity to divide Unity.* Which very words do clearly give us to underſtand, that it may fall out (as it doth in our caſe,) that we cannot keep Unity with bad men, without ſpiritual hurt, *i. e.* without partaking with them in their impieties, and that then there is a neceſſity to divide Unity from them: I mean, to break off conjunction with them in their impieties. Which that it was S. *Auſtin's* 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 corruped?* he anſwers, *Very true, this is not poſſible, if he be joyned with them; that is, if he commit any evil with them, or favour them which do commit it. But if he do neither of theſe, he is not joyned 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 unlawful, 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 ſays not ſimply (which only would do you ſervice,) There cannot poſſibly be any ſo important Reformation, as to juſtifie a ſeparation from them who will not reform: But only, *they cannot make any corruption ſo great, as is the pernitiouſneſs of a Schiſm*: 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 ſeen, that what *Irenæus* ſays, 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 war*; *ſuch as ſtrain at gnats, and ſwallow Camels. And theſe*, ſaith he, *can make no reformation of any ſuch importance, as to countervail 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 juſtifie,) becauſe we will not be partakers with her in ſuperſtition, Idolatry, Impiety, and moſt cruel Tyranny, both upon the bodies and ſouls of men, Who can ſay, that the cauſes of our ſeparation, may be juſtly eſteemed *Modicæ & quælibet 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

many great Churches, for not conforming to him in an indifferent matter, upon a difference, *Non de Catholico dogmate, sed de Ritu, vel Ritus potius tempore; Not about any Catholique doctrin, 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 sharply and bitterly for it, by most of the Bishops of the world, as *Eusebius* testifies, and (as Cardinal *Perron* though mincing the matter, yet confesseth) by this very *Irenæus* himself 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 Ecclesiastical Story of those times, mentions no other notable example of any such Schismatical presumption, but this of *Victor*; certainly we have great inducement to imagine, that *Irenæus* in this place by you quoted, had a special aim 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 clearly, 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 ensue upon it.

*Euseb. hist. l. 5. c. 24. Perron Replic. 3. l. 2. c.*

12. Lastly S. *Denis* of *Alexandria*, says indeed and very well, *that all things should be rather endured, than we should consent to the division of the Church*: I would add Rather than consent to the continuation of the division, if it might be remedied. But then, I am to tell you, that he says not, All things should rather *be done*, but only, All things should rather *be endured or suffered*: wherein he speaks not of the evil of Sin, but of Pain and Misery: Not of tolerating either Error or Sin in others (though that may be lawful,) much less of joyning with others for quietness sake, (which only were to your purpose) in the profession of Error, and practice of Sin: but of suffering any affliction, nay even martyrdom in our own persons, rather than consent to the division of the Church. *Omnia incommoda*, so your own *Christo pherson*, enforced by the circumstances of the place, translates *Dionysius* his words, All *miseries should rather be endured, than we should consent to the Churches division.*

13. *Ad §. 9.* In the next Paragraph you affirm two things, but prove neither, unless a vehement Asseveration, may pass for a weak proof. You tell us first, *That the Doctrin of the total deficiency of the visible Church, which is maintained by divers chief Protestants, implies in it vast Absurdity, or rather sacrilegious Blasphemy.* But neither do the Protestants, alledged 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 do 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 than they could justifie; but yet they do 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 Doctrin, was a desperate voluntary necessity, because they were resolved not to acknowledg the Roman to be the true Church, and were convinced by all manner of evidence, that for divers 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 above all the Roman, had degenerated from the purity of the Gospel of Christ, and thereupon did conclude there was



was no visible Church, meaning by *no Church, none free from corruption*, and conformable in all things to the doctrin 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 Courtesie you intitle, in your 10. *§. more moderate Protestants.* For these affirming the Perpetual 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 affirm, that they conceive very good hope of the Salvation of many of their ignorant and honest Forefathers. 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 perpetual purity and incorruption of the Visible Church.

15. *Ad §. 11.* Let us proceed therefore to your 11. Section, where though D. *Potter* and other Protestants granting the Churches perpetual Visibility, make it needless for you to prove it, yet you will needs be doing that which is needless. But you do 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, than of the Church? What if they had fore-seen, that greater contentions would arise about the Church than Christ?* Which yet, he that is not a meer stranger in the story of the Church must needs know to be untrue, and therefore not to be fore-seen 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 always visible?

17. Besides, What Protestant ever granted (that which you presume upon so confidently,) that *every man for all the affairs of his soul must have recourse to some Congregation?* If some one Christian lived alone among Pagans in some Countrey, remote from Christendom, shall we conceive it impossible for this man to be saved, because he cannot have recourse to any Congregation, for the affairs of his soul? will it not be sufficient, for such an ones salvation, to know the doctrin of Christ, and live according to it? Such fancies as these, you do very wisely to take for granted, because you know well, 'tis hard to prove them.

18. Let it *be as unlawful as you please, to deny and dissemble matters of faith. Let them that do 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 profess 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 while they live, much less 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 and drawn to repair to her, for the affairs of their souls: Neither is it the Visibility of the Church absolutely, but this degree of it, which the most rigid Protestants deny: which is plain enough out of the places of *Napper*, cited by you in your 9. Part of this Chapter. Where his words are, *God hath withdrawn 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 farr Latent and Invisible, as not to profess their faith in open Assemblies, nor to proclaim it to the world, and 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 whersoever they are, there a Church is: But not so, but that in some cases there may be a Church, where these notes are not. Again, these notes will make the Church visible: But to whom? Certainly not to all men, nor to most men: 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 Doctrin preached, it is visible, that there is a Popeish 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 been performed.

20. But *S.* Austin *saith, It is an impudent, abominable, detestable speech,* &c. *to say, the Church hath perished.* I answer; 1. All that S. *Austin* says, is not true. 2. Though this were true, it were nothing to your purpose, unless you will conceive it all one, not to be, and 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 years, may perish in 1600. But *S.* Austin *denyed not only the actual perishing*, but *the possibility of it: and not only of its falling* to nothing, *but of its falling into corruption.* I answer: though no such thing appears out of those places, yet, I believe, heat of disputation against the *Donatists*, and a desire to over-confute them transported him so far, as to urge against them more than was necessary, and perhaps more than was true. But were he now revived, and did but confront the doctrin of after ages, with that; his own experience would enforce him to change his opinion. As concerning the last speech of S. *Austin*, I cannot but wonder very much, why he should think it absurd for any man to say, *There are sheep which he knows not, but God knows*: and no less at you, for obtruding this sentence upon us as pertinent proof of the Church's visibility.

21. Neither do I see, *how the Truth of any present Church depends upon the Perpetual Visibility, nay nor upon 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 repair that which is ruined; to reform that which was corrupted, or to revive that which was dead? Nay, what reason is there, but that by ordinary means 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 far collapsed and over-run with disorders, is yet in possibility of being reduc'd unto its Original state, so long as the Ancient Laws, and Fundamental Constitutions are extant, and remain inviolate, from whence men may be directed how rt make such a Reformation. *But S.* Austin *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 General Councils (and therefore much more particular Doctors) though infallible in their determinations, are yet in their Reasons and Arguments, whereupon they ground them, subject to like Passions and Errors with other men.

22. Lastly, whereas you say, *That all Divines define Schism, 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 Schism 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 Schisms, which have hapned in the Church of *Rome*, which of the parts was the Church, and which was divided from it. But to let this pass, certainly your consequence is most unreasonable. For though whensoever there is a Schism, it must necessarily suppose a Church existent there, yet sure we may define a Schism, that is, declare what the word signifies (for Defining is no more) though at this present there were neither Schism nor Church



Church in the world. Unless you will say, that we cannot tell what a Rose *is*, or what the word Rose signifies, but only in the Summer when we have 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, unless there be Adulterers: or that before *Adam* had a Child, he knew not, and God could not have told him, what it was to be a Father. Certainly Sir, you have forgot your Metaphysicks, which you so much glory in, if you know not, that the connexions of essential predicates with their subjects are eternal, and depend not at all upon the actual existence of the thing defined. This definition therefore of Schism, concludes not the existence of a Church, even when it is defined: much less the perpetual continuance of it, and least of all the continuance of it in perpetual visibility and purity, which is the only thing that we deny, and you are to prove. By this time, you perceive I hope, that I had reason to say, that it was well for you, that D. *Potter* granted the Churches perpetual 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 and acknowledgements. So that the former if they be good, must be good against all Protestants: the later only against D. *Potter*. I will examin them all, and doubt not to make it appear even to your self, if you have any indifference, that there is not any sound and concluding reason amongst them, but that they are all poor and miserable Sophisms.

24. First then to prove us Schismatiques, you urge from the nature of Schism this only Argument.

*Whosoever leave the external Communion of the visible Church, are Schismatiques: But* Luther *and his followers left the external Communion of the visible Church of Christ. Therefore they are Schismatiques.*

The Major of this Syllogism you leave naked without proof; and conceive it, as it should seem, able enough to shift for it self. The Minor or second Proposition of this Argument, you prove by two other. The first is this.

*They which forsook the external Communion of all visible Churches, must needs forsake the external Communion of the true visible Church of Christ: But* Luther *and his followers forsook the external Communion of all visible Churches: Therefore they forsook the external Communion of the true visible Church.*

The *Major* of this Syllogism you take for granted (as you have reason:) The *Minor* you prosecute with great pomp of words, and prove with plenty of Reasons, built upon the confessions of D. *Potter*, *Luther*, *Calvin*, and other Protestants; and this you do in the 12 § of this Chapter.

The second Argument to prove the Assumption of your Syllogism, 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 external Communion of the* Roman *Church: Therefore they forsook the external Communion of the true visible Church of Christ.*

The Assumption of this Syllogism needs no proof: the Proposition which needs it very much, you endeavour to confirm by these Reasons.

1. *The* Roman *Church had the notes of the Church assigned by Protestants.* i. e. *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 she wanted nothing Fundamental 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 prove ſome other, diſagreeing from the* Roman, *and agreeing with Proteſtants, in their particular Doctrins; or elſe they muſt ſay, There was no viſible Church: But they will not ſay, There was no Church: They cannot name and prove 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 confirm by ſeveral Arguments: Therefore they muſt grant, that the* Roman *Church was the true viſible Church.*

And this is the buſineſs 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 external communion of the viſible Church, are Schiſmatical.* 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 external 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 be corrupted, you beg the Queſtion in your Propoſition. If the later, you beg the Queſtion in your ſuppoſition, for Proteſtants, you know, are Peremptory and Unanimous in the Denial 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 *Luther*'s was ſo) that they muſt either leave her Communion, or of neceſſity 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 external Communion of the viſible Church, becauſe ſhe cannot be corrupted. And that *hereafter you will prove, that corruption in the Churches Communion, though the belief & profeſſion of them be made the condition of her Communion, cannot juſtifie a ſeparation from it:* And therefore that they are ſchiſmaticks, who leave the Churches communion though corrupted. I anſwer, that I have examined your proofs of the former, and found that a vein of Sophiſtry runs clean through them: And for the later it is ſo plain and palpable a falſehood, that I cannot but be confident, whatſoever you bring in proof 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 of a very great and horrible crime, you have proved your accuſation only with a Fallacy.

26. Another is, that although it were granted Schiſm, to leave the external Communion of the viſible Church in what ſtate or caſe ſo ever it be, and that *Luther* and his followers were Schiſmatiques, for leaving the external Communion of all viſible Churches: yet you fail exceedingly of clearing the other neceſſary point undertaken by you, *That the Roman Church was then the Viſible Church.* For neither do *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 later a *Particular Church*, or a part of the Catholique. And therefore, ſuppoſe out of curteſie we ſhould grant, what by argument you can never evince, that your Church had theſe notes, yet would it by no means follow, that your Church were



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 Fundamental, or neceſſary to Salvation*? He ſays 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 ſouls ſaved*: And this is all he ſays, and this you confeſs to be all he ſays, in divers places of your Book: which is no more than you your ſelf do, and muſt affirm of Proteſtants: And yet I believe, you will not ſuffer us to infer 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 fundamental or neceſſary to ſalvation. And if we ſhould draw this conſequence from your conceſſion, certainly we ſhould do you injury, in regard many things may in themſelves, and in ordinary courſe be neceſſary to ſalvation, to thoſe that have means to attain them, as your Church generally hath: which yet, by accident, to theſe which were, by ſome impregnable impediment, debarred of theſe means, may by Gods mercy be made unneceſſary.

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 and agreeing with Proteſtants in their particular doctrin, or acknowledge there was no viſible Church.* It is all one, as if (to uſe S. *Paul*'s 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 confeſs that there is no body. To which the foot may 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; but yet ſuch a one as we hope by Gods gracious 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 confeſs 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 ſelf in proving, that we *cannot pretend, that either the Greeks, Waldenſes, Wickliffites, Huſſites, Muſcovites, Armenians, Georgians, Abyſſines, were then the viſible Church.* For all this diſcourſe proceeds upon a falſe and vain ſuppoſition, and begs another point in Queſtion between us, which is, that *ſome Church of one denomination and one Communion* (as the *Roman*, the *Greek*, &c.) *muſt be always* exclufively to all other Communions, *the whole viſible Church.* And though, perhaps ſome weak Proteſtant having the falſe principle ſetled in him, that there was to be always ſome Viſible Church of one denomination, pure from all error in doctrin, might be wrought upon, and prevailed with by it, to forſake the *Church* of Proteſtants: yet why it ſhould induce him to go to yours, rather than the *Greek* Church, or any other, which pretends to perpetual ſucceſſion as well as yours, that I do not underſtand; unleſs it be for the reaſon which *Æneus Sylvius* gave, why more held the Pope above a Council, than a Council above the Pope: which was becauſe *Popes did give Biſhopricks and Archbiſhopricks, but Councils 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 meer favour, that there muſt be always ſome Church of one Denomination and Communion, free from all errours in doctrin, and that Proteſtants had not always 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 than this; If you will leave *England*, you muſt of neceſſity go to *Rome*. And yet with this wretched Fallacy, have

have I been sometimes abused my self, and known many other poor souls 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 always be held captive, under such miserable delusions.

28. We see then, how unsuccessful 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 kind, which you builded upon D. *Potter*'s own words, out of which you promise unanswerable reasons to convince Protestants of Schism.

29. But let the understanding Reader, take with him but three or four 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. 1. That not every separation, but only a causeless separation from the external Communion of any Church, is the Sin of Schism.

31. 2. 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. 3. That to leave the Church, and to leave the external 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 have 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 publicke worship of God. This little Armour if it be rightly placed, I am perswaded, will repel 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*, applyed to *Luther* thus. *If the Church perished, what Church brought forth Donatus* (you say Luther)? *If she could not perish, what madness moved the sect of Donatus, to separate, upon pretence to avoyd the Communion of bad men*? Whereunto, one fair answer (to let pass many others) is obvious out of the second observation: That this sentence though it were Gospel, as it is not, is impertinently applyed 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* instead of *Donatus* in the later part of the Dilemma as well as in the former, would make a suspicious man conjecture that you your self took notice of this exception of disparity 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 Doctrin (if by the *true Church* be understood, *the pure Church*, as you do understand it) is a certain truth, and it is easier for you to declaim (as you do) than to dispute against it. But *these men you say must be 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. *Answ.* I might very justly desire some proof of that which so confidently you take for granted: That, there were no persecuted and oppressed maintainers of the Truth in the days of our Fore-fathers, but only such as dissembled their opinions, and 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, than you can make your Negative. We read in Scripture, that *Elias* conceived *There was none left beside himself in the whole Kingdom of Israel*, who had not revolted from God: and yet God himself assures us, that he was deceived.



deceived. And if such a man, a Prophet, and one of the greatest, erred in his judgment 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 country or other, there were not always 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 think it sufficient to tell you, that if it be true that this supposed invisible Church did hypochritically communicate with the visible Church, in her corruptions, then Protestants had cause, nay, necessity, to forsake their Communion also; for otherwise they must have joyn'd with them in the practise of impieties: and seeing they had such cause to separate, they presume their separation cannot be schismatical.

36. Yes, you reply, *To forsake the external Communion of them with whom they agree in faith, is the most formal and proper sin of Schism.* Answ. Very true, but I would fain know *wherein*. I would gladly be informed, whether I be bound, for fear of Schism, to communicate with those that believe as I do, only in lawful things, or absolutely in every thing: whether I am to join 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 have them do, or else, forsooth, they must be Schismatiques. But hereafter, I pray you remember, that there is no necessity of communicating even with true Believers 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 reasonableness of their cause to separate shall, according to my first observation, justifie their separation from being schismatical.

37. Arg. *But the property of Schism, according to* D. Potter, *is to cut off from the hope of salvation, the Church from which it separates: And these Protestants have this property, therefore they are Schismatiques.*

38. Ans. I deny the Syllogism, it is no better than this:

One Symptom of the Plague is a Feaver;
But such a man hath a Feaver:
Therefore he hath the Plague.

The true Conclusion which issues out of these Premisses, should be this, Therefore he hath one Symptom of the Plague. And so likewise in the former, Therefore they have one property or one quality of Schismatiques. And as in the former instance, The man that hath one sign of the Plague, may by reason of the absence of other requisits, not have the plague: So these Protestants may have something of Schismatiques, and yet not be Schismatiques. A Tyrant sentencing a man to death for his pleasure, and a just judge that condemns a malefactor, do both sentence a man to death, and so for the matter do 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 always or generally denounce damnation to them from whom they separate. The same do these Protestants, and yet are not Schismatiques. The reason: because Schismatiques do it, and do it without cause, and Protestants have cause for what they do. The impieties of your Church, being, generally speaking, damnable; unless where they are excus'd by ignorance, and expiated at least by a general repentance. In fine, though perhaps it may be true, that all Schismatiques do so: yet universal affirmatives are not converted, and therefore it follows not by any good Logick that all that do 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 have just 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.

nothing. For your Church may be conſidered either in regard of thoſe, in whom, either negligence, or pride, or worldly fear, or hopes, or ſome other voluntary ſin, is the cauſe of their ignorance, which I fear 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 have 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 cenſures ſeem eſpecially to reflect upon,) and the heavieſt ſentence will not be too heavy. Conſider the later, and the mildeſt will not be too mild. So that here is no difference but in words only, neither are you flatter'd 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 ſin of Schiſm by communicating with thoſe (as you call them) exterminating Spirits, whom you conceive your ſelf to have 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 confeſs were not fundamental: ſhall it not be much more damnable, to live in confraternity with theſe, who defend an Errour of the failing of the Church, which in the* Donatiſts *you confeſs to have been properly Heretical?*

40. *Anſw.* You miſtake, in thinking that Proteſtants hold themſelves obliged not to communicate with you, only or principally by reaſon of your Errours and Corruption. For the true reaſon according to my third Obſervation, is not ſo much becauſe you *maintain* Errours and Corruption, as becauſe you *impoſe* them: and will allow your Communion to none but to thoſe that will hold them with you; and have 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 Doctrin 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 parity between you and them, might make it more lawful for us to communicate with them than you: becauſe what they hold, they hold to themſelves, and refuſe not (as you do) 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 do theſe Proteſtants hold the failing of the Church from its being, but only from its viſibilty: which if you conceive all one, then muſt you conceive that the Stars fail every day, and the Sun every night. Neither is it certain that the doctrin of the Churches failing is repugnant to the Creed. For as the truth of the Article of the remiſſion of ſins, depends not upon the actual remiſſion of any mans ſins, but upon Gods readineſs and reſolution to forgive the ſins of all that believe and repent; ſo that although unbelief or impenitence ſhould be univerſal, and *the Faithful ſhould* abſolutely *fail from the children of men,* and *the Son of Man ſhould find no faith on the earth*; yet ſhould the Article ſtill continue true, that God would forgive the ſins of all that repent: In like manner, It is not certain that the truth of the Article of the Catholique Church, depends upon the actual exiſtence of a Catholique Church; but rather upon the right, that the Church of Chriſt, or rather (to ſpeak properly) the Goſpel of Chriſt hath to be univerſally believed. And therefore the Article may be true, though there were no Church in the world. In regard, this notwithſtanding, it remains ſtill true, that there ought to be a Church, and this Church ought to be Catholique. For as, of theſe two Propoſitions, There is a Church in *America*, and There ſhould be a Church in *America*, the truth of the later depends not upon the truth of the former, ſo neither does it in theſe



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 errors *not fundamental*, ſuch as are *not damnable*, it is not true, as I have often told you, that we confeſs your errors not fundamental.

43. Laſtly, for your deſire that I ſhould here apply an authority of Saint *Cyprian* alledged in your next number I would have done ſo very willingly; but indeed I know not how to do it: for in my apprehenſion it hath no more to do with your preſent buſineſs of proving it unlawful, to communicate with theſe men, who hold the Church was not always viſible, than *In novâ fert animus*. Beſides, I am here again to remember you, that St. *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 only to make Books great, and Controverſies endleſs.

44. *Ad* § 17. The next Section in three long leaves, delivers us this ſhort ſenſe, *That thoſe Proteſtants which ſay they have not left the Churches external Communion, but only her corruptions, pretend to do that which is impoſſible; becauſe theſe corruptions were inherent in the Churches external Communion; and therefore he that forſakes them, cannot but forſake this.*

45. Anſw. But, Who are they that pretend, they forſook the Churches corruptions, and not her external 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 internal 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 kind of communion with it: and he that is not in this internal communion, is not in the Church. Some perhaps, that they left not your external communion in all things; meaning, that they left it not voluntarily being not *fugitivi*, but *fugati*, as being willing to joyn with you in any act of piety; but were by you neceſſited and conſtrained to do ſo, becauſe you would not ſuffer them to do well with you, unleſs they would do ill with you. Now to do ill that you may do 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 external communion*, that is, ſuch as pretend to communicate with you in your Confeſſions and Liturgies, and participations 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 external communion of it, was all one in ſenſe and ſignification, I hope by this time you are diſabus'd and begin to underſtand, that as a man may leave any faſhion or cuſtom of a College, and yet remain ſtill a member of the College; ſo a man may poſſibly leave ſome opinion or practice of a Church, formerly common to himſelf and 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 external communion of this Church, that it may be ſimply impoſſible for him to leave this practiſe, and not to leave the Churches external 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, and not the Church, as againſt thoſe who ſay, they forſook the Churches corruptions and not her external 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. Anſw. A pretty ſophiſm, 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 can-

not forſake Themſelves; and Vices and Errors are things inherent in themſelves. The deceit lies, in not diſtinguiſhing between a Local and a Moral 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 ſelf: So is it alſo againſt reaſon to deny, that a man may (by an uſual phraſe of ſpeech) forſake any cuſtom or quality, good or bad, either proper to himſelf, or common to himſelf with any company, and yet never truly or properly forſake either his company or himſelf. Thus if all the Jeſuits in the Society, were given to write Sophiſtically, yet you might leave this ill cuſtom, 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 cleanſe themſelves, and yet continue parts of the body. And what reaſon then in the world is there, if the whole Viſible Church were over-run with tares and weeds of ſuperſtitions, and corruptions, but that ſome members of it might reform themſeves, 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 and 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 Qu. 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 himſelf from the Churches external Communion as ſhe is corrupted, and yet continue in that Churches external Communion, which in this external Communion is corrupted. But we, that ſay only the whole Church being corrupted, ſome parts of it might and did reform themſelves, and yet might and did continue parts of the Church, though ſeparated from the external communion of the other parts, which would not reform, 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*; and 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 Queens Colledge*, without ceaſing to be himſelf: or, that a ſinner cannot leave his ſin, 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 ſhall find us apt enough to believe, that the particular parts of the viſible Church could not reform themſelves, but they muſt of neceſſity become no parts of it. But until we ſee this done, you muſt pardon us, if we chuſe to believe ſenſe rather than Sophiſtry.

48. In this Paragraph you bring in the ſentence of St. *Cyprian*, whereto you refer'd us in the former: but, Why, in a Controverſie of Faith, do you cite any thing, which is confeſſed on all hands, not to be a rule of Faith? Beſides, in my apprehenſion, this ſentence of St. *Cyprian*, is, in this place, and to this purpoſe, meerly impertinent. St. *Cyprians* words are, *The Church* (he ſpeaks of the particular Church, or Dioceſs 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 lawful Ordination*, Novatianus *is not in the Church*. And now, having related the words, I am only to remember the Reader, that your buſineſs was to prove it *impoſſible, For a man to forſake the Churches corruptions, and not the Church*, and 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*



*and tell us, That out of your diſcourſe it remaineth cleer, that this our chiefeſt Anſwer changeth the very ſtate of the Queſtion: confoundeth internal Acts of the underſtanding, with external deeds: doth not diſtinguiſh between Schiſm and Hereſie, 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 needful, then briefly thus: We do 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 external communion, which we confeſs 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 *do not confound internal Acts of underſtanding with external 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 External 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 external Communion with all the other parts of it: taking for granted, that which is certainly falſe, that no two Men or Churches, divided in external communion, can be both true parts of the Catholique Church.

51. We are not *to learn the difference between Schiſm and Hereſie*, for Hereſie we conceive, An obſtinate defence of any error againſt any neceſſary Article of the Chriſtian faith: and Schiſm, A cauſleſs 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 Schiſmaticks, for refuſing to joyn with you in the profeſſion of theſe Errors, and the practiſe of theſe corruptions. And therefore you muſt free either us from Schiſm, or your ſelves from error: at leaſt from requiring the profeſſion of it as a condition of your communion.

52. Laſtly, whereas you ſay, *That you have demonſtrated againſt us, that Proteſtants divided themſelves from the external communion of the Viſible Church*, add, *which external communion was corrupted*, and we ſhall confeſs 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-laws from it, and no members of it. And moreover, in the Reaſon of our ſeparation from the external communion of your Church you are miſtaken: for it was not ſo much becauſe ſhe, your Church, as becauſe your Churches external communion, was corrupted, and needed Reformation.

53. *That a pretence of Reformation will acquit no man from Schiſm*, we grant very willingly, and therefore ſay, that it concerns every man who ſeparates from any Churches communion, even as much as his Salvation is worth, to look moſt carefully to it, that the cauſe of his ſeparation be juſt and neceſſary: For unleſs it be neceſſary, it can very hardly be ſufficient. But whether a true Reformation of our ſelves from errors, ſuperſtition, and impieties, will not juſtifie our ſeparation in theſe things; our ſeparation, I ſay, from them who will not reform 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 refer us, for the determination of this Queſtion, I ſuppoſe by what I have ſaid above, the Reader underſtands, by alleadging them you have gain'd little credit to your cauſe or perſon. And that, if they were competent Judges of this controverſie, their ſentence is againſt you much rather than 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 than*

*from Chriſt himſelf, 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 do 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 external communion; and then he is perſwaded it will appear to you, that againſt *Luther* and his followers you have ſaid many things, but ſhewed nothing.

55. But *the Church Univerſal, remaining the Church Univerſal, according to D.* Potter *may fall into error*: *And from hence it cleerly followes, that it is impoſſible to leave the external communion of the Church ſo corrupted, and retain external communion with the Catholique Church.* Anſ. The reaſon of this conſequence which you ſay is ſo clear, truly I cannot poſſibly diſcern; But the concluſion infer'd, me-thinks, is evident of it ſelf, and therefore without proof I grant it. I mean, that it is impoſſible to leave the external communion of the Catholique Church corrupted, and to retain external communion with the Catholique Church. But what uſe you can make of it, I do not underſtand: Unleſs 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 external communion and not forſake it. If you mean ſo, ſure you miſtake the meaning of Proteſtants when they ſay, They forſook not the Church but her corruptions. For in ſaying ſo, they neither affirm, nor deny that they forſook the external communion of the Church, nor ſpeak 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 external Communion of the Viſible Church, we have without ſcruple formerly granted, that Proteſtants did forſake it, that is, renounce the practice of ſome obſervances, in which the whole Viſible Church before them did communicate. But this we ſay they did without Schiſm, becauſe they had cauſe to do ſo, and no man can have cauſe to be a Schiſmatique.

56. But your Argument you conceive, will be 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 theſe matters; nor that all ſhould be extant that were written, much leſs extant uncorrupted: eſpecially, conſidering your Church, which had lately all the 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 err, is it to contradict this ground of D. *Potters*, that the Church may err. Unleſs 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, unleſs 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 brag 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 brag be evacuated, (as you call it) let it be ſo, I ſee no harm will come of it.

Laſtly



Laſtly whereas you ſay, that ſuppoſing a viſible pure Church, *Luther* muſt be a Schiſmatick 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 doctrin, neceſſary and profitable, then *Luther* ſeparated not from this Church, but adjoyned himſelf to it: Not indeed in place, which was not neceſſary, not in external communion which was impoſſible, but by the Union of faith and charity. Upon theſe grounds, I ſay, that the ground of this Argument is no way made certain; yet becauſe it is not manifeſtly falſe, I am content to let it paſs. And, for ought I ſee, it is very ſafe for me to do ſo: for you build nothing upon it which I may not fairly grant. For what do you conclude from hence, but that, ſeeing there was no viſible Church but corrupted, *Luther* forſaking the external communion of the corrupted Church, could not but forſake the external 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 means: For not every ſeparation, but only a cauſleſs ſeparation from the communion of the Church we maintain to be Schiſmatical. Hereunto may be added, that though the whole Church were corrupted, yet properly ſpeaking, it is not true, that *Luther* and his Followers forſook the whole corrupted Church, or the external 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 go about to perſuade 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 follows not, in as much as themſelves were a part of it, and ſtill continued ſo: and therefore could no more ſeparate from the whole than 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 yields 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 go 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 ſcandal to the Church. *Our bleſſed Saviour foretold*, you ſay, *that there ſhould be in the Church tares with choiſe corn.* Look again, I pray, and you ſhall ſee, that the field he ſpeaks of, is not the Church, but *the world*: and therefore neither do you obey our Saviour's command, *Let both grow up till the harveſt*, who teach it to be lawfull to root theſe tares (ſuch are Heretiques) out of the world: neither do Proteſtants diſobey it, if they eject manifeſt Heretiques and notorious ſinners out of the Church.

58. *ad §.* 19. In the 19. you are ſo courteous as to ſuppoſe *corruptions in your doctrin*: and yet undertake to prove that, *neither could they afford us any ſufficient cauſe, or colourable neceſſity to depart from 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 error, 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 damn all that held them*: ſuch he means and ſaies, as were excuſably ignorant of the Truth, and amongſt the number of their unknown ſins, repented daily of their unknown errors. The truth is, he thinks as ill of your errors and their deſert, as you do of ours: only

he

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 merciful, and therefore will not damn them for meer errors, who deſire to find the truth and cannot: and withal infinitely juſt, and therefore (it is to be feared) will not pardon them, who might eaſily have come to the knowledge of the truth, and either through Pride, or Obſtinacie, 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 courteous* Suppoſal, that your Church may erre, and *in recompence thereof, will do you a charity, by putting you in mind, into what Labyrinths you caſt your ſelf*, by ſuppoſing that the Church may erre in ſome of her Propoſals, and yet denying it lawful 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 knows true*? No, that you will not for them that do ſo, you your ſelf have pronounced a damned crew of diſſembling Sycophants. Or would you have him continue in your Communion, and yet profeſs your Church to erre? This you your ſelves have made to him impoſſible. Or would you have him believe thoſe things true, which together with him you have ſuppoſed to be Errors? This is ſuch an 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 Schoolmen ſpeak*, Implicatio in terminis, *a contradiction ſo plain, that one word deſtroyeth another; as if one ſhould ſay, a living dead man*. For it is to require that they which believe ſome part of your Doctrin falſe, ſhould withall believe it all true. Seeing therefore, for any man to believe your Church in error, and profeſs the contrary, is damnable Hypocriſie; to believe it and not believe it, a manifeſt repugnancy; and thirdly, to profeſs it and to continue in your Communion (as matters now ſtand) a plain impoſſibility; what remians, but that whoſoever is ſuppoſed to have juſt reaſon to disbelieve any doctrin of your Church, muſt of neceſſity forſake her Communion; Unleſs you would remit ſo far from your preſent rigour, as to allow them your Churches communion, who publikely profeſs that they do not believe every article of her eſtabliſhed doctrin. Indeed, if you would do ſo, you might with ſome coherence ſuppoſe your Church in error, and yet find 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 doctrin, in themſelves (which yet is falſe) did not, yet your obliging us to profeſs your doctrin 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 do ſo without profeſſing my ſelf of their belief in this matter, then I ſuppoſe I ſhould be excus'd from Schiſm, if I ſhould forſake their communion, rather than profeſs my ſelf to believe that which I do 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 Doctrins and Practiſes, 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*



*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 proof enough to ask, How it can be otherwiſe? Methinks if you would convince D. *Potters* words of manifeſt contradiction, you ſhould ſhew, that he affirms and denies the ſame of the ſame. From which fault methinks he ſhould be very innocent, who ſays 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* ſays here; *viz.* That the profeſſion of a falſhood to him that believes it, may not be damnable: and yet damnable to him that believes the contrary. Or that, not to profeſs a falſhood in him that knows 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 75th. page. But in the progreſs 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 courteſie for him, if your will had been anſwerable to your ability. I will ſet down the words, and leave the Reader to condemn or abſolve them. *To forſake the errors of that Church, and not to joyn with her in thoſe practices which we account erroneous, we are inforced by neceſſity. For though in the iſſue they are not damnable to them which believe as they profeſs, yet for us to profeſs a Vow by Oath* (*as the Church of* Rome *enjoyns*) *what we believe not, were without queſtion damnable. And they with their errors, by the grace of God might go to Heaven, when we for our hypocriſie and diſſimulation* (he might have added, *and perjury*) *ſhould certainly be condemned to Hell.*

61. *Ad §.* 20. *But a Church not erring in Fundamentals, though erring in other matters, doth what our Saviour exacts at her hands, doth as much as lies in her power to do: Therefore the communion of ſuch a Church is not upon pretence of Error 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 do more than God doth aſſiſt her to do.* Anſw. The promiſe of Divine Aſſiſtance is two-fold: Abſolute, or Conditional. That there ſhall be by Divine providence preſerv'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 affirms 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 hurtful Errors. This, I ſay, he neither denies nor queſtions. And ſhould he have done ſo, he might have been confuted by evident and expreſs Text of Scripture. When therefore you ſay, That *a Church not erring in Fundamentals, doth as much as by Gods aſſiſtance lies in her power to do*: This is manifeſtly untrue. For Gods aſſiſtance is always 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 ſo preciſely neceſſary, errs ſhamefully and dangerouſly in other things very profitable: This by no means 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 ſelf too much for retaining Fundamental Truths, while ſhe remains ſo regardleſs of others. For though the ſimple defect of ſome truths profitable only and not ſimply

ply neceſſary, may conſiſt with ſalvation; yet, Who is there that can give 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 Errors about profitable matters may not, according to the uſual fecundity of error, bring forth others of a higher quality, 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 Fundamental Hereſies, if in the mean time ſhe be negligent of others, which though they do not plainly deſtroy Salvation, yet obſcure and hinder, and only not block up the way to it? Which though of themſelves and immediately they damn no man, yet are cauſes and occaſions that many men run the race of Chriſtian piety more remiſſly than they ſhould, many defer their repentance, many go on ſecurely in their ſins, and ſo at length are damn'd by means and occaſion of theſe Errors, though not for them. Such Errors as theſe, (though thoſe of the *Roman* Church be much worſe, even *in themſelves damnable, and by accident only pardonable*) yet, I ſay, ſuch Errors as theſe, if any Church ſhould tolerate, diſſemble, and ſuffer them to reign, and neglect to reform 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 ſhe hath with due fidelity diſpenſed the Goſpel of Chriſt? that ſhe hath done what ſhe could, and what ſhe ought? What ſhall we ſay then, if theſe errors 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 and ſword, and all kinds of moſt exquiſite torments? Truly I do much fear, that from ſuch a Church (though it hold no error 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 ſhe ſhall be led into none. And although this ſhould not happen, yet what mortal man can ſecure us, that not only a probable unaffected ignorance, not only a meer neglect of profitable truths, but alſo a retchleſs 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, find that which is neceſſary; who endeavouring to free themſelves from all Errors, any way contrary to the purity of Chriſtianity, yet fail of performance and remain in ſome: yet if I did not find in my ſelf a love and deſire of all profitable truth; If I did not put away idleneſs, and prejudice, and worldly affections, and ſo examine to the bottom all my opinions of divine matters, being prepar'd in mind to follow God, and God only, which way ſoever he ſhall lead me: If I did not hope, that I either do, or endeavour to do theſe things, certainly I ſhould have little hope of obtaining ſalvation.

62. *But to oblige any man under pain of damnation to forſake a Church by reaſon of ſuch errors, 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 than Chriſt left it? Anſw.* It is not: for Chriſt himſelf hath obliged us hereunto. He hath forbad us under pain of damnation to profeſs what we believe not, and conſequently under the ſame penalty, to leave that Communion, in which we cannot remain without this hypocritical profeſſion of thoſe things, which we are convinc'd to be erroneous. But then beſides, it is here falſly ſuppoſed, (as hath been ſhewed already) that Chriſt hath not promiſed aſſiſtance to thoſe that ſeek it, but only in matters ſimply neceſſary. Neither is there any reaſon, why any Church, even in this world, ſhould deſpair of victory over all errors pernicious or noxious; provided ſhe humbly and earneſtly implore divine aſſiſtance, depend wholly upon



on it, and be not wanting to it. Though a *Triumph over all ſin and error*, that is, ſecurity that ſhe neither doth nor can err, be rather to be deſired than 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 ſlit from one erring Society to another. Anſw.* The inconſequence of this Argument is too apparent: Proteſtants may err as well as the Church of *Rome*, therefore they did ſo! Boys in the Schools know, that *à Poſſe ad Eſſe*, the Argument follows not. He is equally fallible who believes twice two to be four, 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 than another, and yet he is more ſecure that his work is right and ſtreight who hath made it by the level, than he which hath made it by gueſs & 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 knows himſelf fallible, as well as thoſe whom he hath forſaken, yet he may be certain (as certain as the nature of the thing will bear) 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 ſeems true, and the contrary which he hath forſaken, ſeems falſe: And therefore without remorſe of conſcience, he may profeſs that, but this he cannot.

64. But *we are to remember, that, according to* D. Potter, *the viſible Church hath a bleſſing not to err in Fundamentals, in which any private Reformer may fail, 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. Anſw.* The viſible Church is free indeed from all errors abſolutely deſtructive and unpardonable, but not from all error which in it ſelf 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 ſelf teach, that he plainly teacheth the contrary, and thereupon will allow him to be no more charitable to Papiſts, than 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 do it, is as ſecure as the viſible Church, more ſecure than your Church, from the danger of erring in fundamentals: 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 far 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: profeſs this I cannot, but I muſt lie 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 falſhood, is certainly a capital ſin, and of great affinity with the ſin which ſhall never be forgiven.

65. 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 fundamental, as likewiſe thoſe in the Roman Church, are confeſſed not to be fundamental. And what man of judgment will be a Proteſtant, ſince that Church is confeſſedly a corrupted one? Anſw.* And yet you your ſelf 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 judgment continue in this Communion of a Church confessedly corrupted, as well as a Church supposed to be corrupted, requires the belief and profession of her supposed corruptions, as the condition of her Communion: which this Church, confessedly corrupted, doth not. What man of judgment will think it any disparagement to his judgment, to prefer the better, though not simply the best, before that which is stark nought? To prefer indifferent good health, before a diseased and corrupted state of body? To prefer a field not perfectly weeded, before a field that is quite over-run with weeds and thorns? 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 judgment, to change your Communion for theirs, though confessed to have some corruptions, it may well be presum'd that he hath but little judgment. For as for your pretence that yours are confessed not to be Fundamental, it is an affected mistake, as already I have often told you.

66. *Ad* § 22. *But D.* Potter says, *It is comfort enough for the Church, that the Lord in mercy will secure her from all her capital dangers: but she may not hope to triumph over all sin and error, till she be in heaven. Now if it be comfort enough to be secur'd from all capital dangers, which can arise only from error in fundamental points, Why were not our first Reformers content with enough, but would needs dismember the Church, out of a pernicious greediness of more than enough?* *Answ.* I have already shewed sufficiently, how capital danger may arise from errors, though not fundamental. I add now, that what may be enough for men in ignorance, may be to knowing men not enough: according to that of the Gospel, *to whom much is given, of him much shall be required*: That the same error may be not capital to those who want means of finding the truth, and capital to others who have means, 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*) Brittish *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, *Siquis de antecessoribus nostris, vel ignoranter 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* alledging that he followeth the example of his Predecessors famous for holiness, and famous for miracles in these words, *De Patre vestro Columba & sequacibus ejus, quorum sanctitatem vos imitari & regulam ac praecepta, coelestibus signis confirmata sequi perhibetis, possum respondere: Quia multis in judicio dicintibus Domino quòd in nomine ejus prophetaverint & demonia ejecerint, & virtutes multas fecerint, responsurus sit Dominus, quia nunquam eos noverit. Sed absit ut de patribus vestris hoc dicam, quia justius multo est de incognitis bonum credere quam malum. Unde & illos Dei famulos & Deo dilectos esse non nego, qui simplicitate rusticâ, sed intentione piâ Deum dilexerunt: Neque illis multum obesse Paschae talem reor observantiam, quam diù nullus advenerat qui eis instituti perfectioris decreta qua sequerentur ostenderet. Quos utique credo, siquis tunc ad eos Catholicus circulator adveniret, sic ejus monita fuisse secuturos, quomodo ea quae noverant ac didicerunt Dei mandata, probantur fuisse secuti. Tu autem & socii tui si audita decreta sedis Apostolicae, imo universalis Ecclesiae, & hac literis sacris confirmata contemnitis, absque ulla dubietate peccatis.* (c) Beda, *lib.* 3. *Eccl. Hist. c.* 25.

67. But *if* (as the Doctor says) *no Church may hope to triumph over all error till she be in Heaven, then we must either grant, that errors not fundamental cannot yield sufficient cause to forsake the Church, or you must affirm, 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 pernicious, 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 unfundamental, unless it exact withal either a dissimulation of them being noxious; or a Profession of them against the dictate of Con-



science; if they be meer errors. This, if the Church does (as certainly yours doth) then her Communion is to be forsaken, rather than the sin of Hypocrisie to be committed. Whereas to forsake the Churches of Protestants for such errors, there is no necessity, because they err to themselves, and do not under pain of Excommunication exact the profession of their errors.

68. But *the Church may not be left by reason of sin, therefore neither by reason of errors not fundamental: in as much as both sin and error are impossible to be avoided till she be in heaven.* *Answ.* The reason of the consequence does not appear to me: But I answer to the Antecedent: Neither for sin nor errors, ought a Church to be forsaken, if she does not impose and enjoyn them: but if she do, (as the *Roman* does) then we must forsake men rather than God; leave the Churches Communion rather than commit sin, or profess known errors to be divine truths. For the Prophet *Ezekiel* hath assured us, that to say, *The Lord hath said so, when the Lord hath not said so*, is a great sin, 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 fundamental. Not the number, because the foundation is strong enough to support them.* *Answ.* Here again you vainly 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 lays necessity on us, either to forsake your company, or to profess 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 trespasses; and then, how dare we alledge his command, that we must not pardon his Church for errors acknowledged to be not fundamental?* *Answ.* He that commands us to pardon our brother sinning against us so often, will not allow us for his sake to sin with him, so much as once. He will have us to do any thing but sin, rather than offend any man. But his will is also, that we offend all the world, rather than sin 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 err with the Church, or if we do not, that we should against conscience profess 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 Schism.* *Answ.* True, they may make the same answer, and the same defence as we do; 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 be proved by Schismatiques. They may object errors to other Churches, as well as we do to yours; but that they prove their accusation so strongly as we can, that appears not. To the Priests and Elders of the Jews, imposing that sacred silence mentioned in the *Acts of the Apostles*, Saint *Peter* and Saint *John* answered, *They must obey God rather than 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 cloak of his Rebellion, and, Who sees not that such an one may answer for himself, in those very formal 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 Traytors and Rebels. Certainly therefore it is no good consequence to say, Schismatiques may make use of this answer, therefore all that do make use of it are Schismatiques. But moreover, it is to be observed, that the chief 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 Schiſms, and therefore it muſt not be forſaken. Anſw.* We muſt not do evil to avoid evil: neither are all courſes preſently lawful, by which inconveniences may be avoided. If all men would ſubmit themſelves to the chief Muſty of the Turks, it is apparent there would be no diviſions; yet unity is not to be purchaſed at ſo dear 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 than unanimous concord in damned errors. As it is better for men to go to heaven by divers ways, or rather by divers paths of the ſame way, than in the ſame path to go on peaceably to hell. *Amica Pax, magis amica Veritas!*

73. But there *can be no juſt cauſe to forſake the Church, ſo the Doctor grants: who notwithſtanding teacheth that the Church may err in points not fundamental; therefore neither is the Roman Church to be forſaken for ſuch errors. Anſw.* 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 do 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 retains and defends; this I deny, and you miſtake the Doctor, if you think he affirms 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 Schiſm: But others*, &c. Prodigious doctrines indeed! But who, I pray, are they that teach them? Where does D. *Potter* accuſe thoſe Proteſtants of *damnable Schiſm*, 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 plain precepts of Chriſt; both Ceremonial, in mutilating the Communion; and Moral in points of Superſtition and Idolatry, and moſt bloody tyranny? which is without queſtion to err in neceſſary matters. Neither does D. *Potter* accuſe any man of Schiſm for holding ſo: if he ſhould, he ſhould call himſelf a Schiſmatique. Only he ſays, ſuch (if there be any ſuch) as affirm, that ignorant ſouls among you, who had no means to know the truth, cannot poſſibly be ſaved, that their wiſdom and charity cannot be juſtified. Now you your ſelf have plainly affirmed, That *Ignorant Proteſtants dying with contrition may be ſaved*; and yet would be unwilling to be thought to ſay, that Proteſtants err in no points neceſſary to ſalvation. For that may be in it ſelf, and in ordinary courſe, where there are means of knowledge, neceſſary, which to a man invincibly ignorant, will prove not neceſſary. Again, where doth D. *Potter* ſuppoſe (as you make him) that there were other Proteſtants, who believed that your Church had no errors: Or, where does he ſay, they did well to forſake her, upon this ridiculous reaſon, becauſe they judged that ſhe retained all means neceſſary to ſalvation? Do you think us ſo ſtupid, as that we cannot diſtinguiſh between that which D. *Potter* ſays, and that which you make him ſay? He vindicates Proteſtants from Schiſm two ways: The one is, becauſe they had juſt and great and neceſſary cauſe to ſeparate, which Schiſmatiques never have; becauſe they that have it, are no Schiſmatiques: For Schiſm is always a cauſleſs 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 motive to it. And whereas he ſays, *Though we ſeparate from you in ſome things, yet we acknowledge your Church a member of the Body of Chriſt, and therefore are not*



*not Schiſmatiques*: You make him ſay moſt abſurdly, *we did well to forſake you, becauſe we judged you a member of the body of Chriſt.* Juſt as if a brother ſhould leave 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 leave your company in theſe ill courſes, and I do well to do ſo, becauſe you are my brother: ſo making that the cauſe of leaving him, which indeed is the cauſe that he left him no farther.

75. But you ſay, *The very reaſon for which he acquitteth himſelf from Schiſm, is, becauſe he holds that the Church which they forſook, is not cut off from the Body of Chriſt.* Anſw. This is true: But can you not perceive a difference between juſtifying his ſeparation from Schiſm by this reaſon, and making this the reaſon of his ſeparation? If a man denying obedience in ſome unlawful matter to his lawful Sovereign, ſhould ſay to him, Herein I diſobey you, but yet I am no Rebel, becauſe I acknowledge you my Sovereign Lord, and am ready to obey you in all things lawful; ſhould not he be an egregious Sycophant, that ſhould accuſe him, as if he had ſaid, I do well to diſobey you; becauſe I acknowledge you my lawful Sovereign? Certainly, he that joyns this acknowledgment with his neceſſitated obedience, does well; but he that makes this conſideration the reaſon of diſobedience doth ill. Urge therefore this (as you call it) moſt ſolemn foppery as far as you pleaſe: For every underſtanding Reader will eaſily perceive 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 be the true Church: whereas it is a ſign of a great deal of Charity in him, that he allows you to be a Part of it.

76. And *whereas you pretend to find ſuch unſpeakable comfort herein, that we cannot clear our ſelves from Schiſm, otherwiſe than by acknowledging that they do not, nor cannot, cut off your Church from the hope of ſalvation.* I beſeech you to take care that this falſe comfort coſt you not too dear. For why this good opinion of God Almighty, that he will not damn men for error, who were without their own 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 have eyes to ſee and will not ſee, who have ears to hear and will not hear, 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 deſperately inconſiſtent, nor to ſay, we *muſt be damn'd, unleſs you may be ſaved*; but that we aſſure our ſelves, if our lives be anſwerable, we ſhall be ſaved by our knowledge. And that we hope, (and I tell you again, *Spes eſt rei incertæ nomen*) that ſome of you may poſſibly be 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 do ſo: unleſs you conceive a corrupted Church to be none at all; and, if you do, 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 Schiſm conſiſts in being divided from that true Church, with which a man agreeth in all points of Faith: Now we muſt profeſs, you ſay, that we agree with the Church of* Rome *in all Fundamental Articles; Therefore we are Schiſmatiques. Anſw.* Either in your Major, *by all points of Faith*, you mean *all fundamental points only*, or *all ſimply and abſolutely*. If the former, I deny your Major: for I may without all Schiſm divide from that Church which errs in any point of Faith Fundamental, or otherwiſe, if ſhe require the profeſſion of this Error among the conditions of her Communion. Now this is our caſe. If the later, I deny the ſyllogiſm, as having manifeſtly four tearms, and being coſen-german to this,

He

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 juſt and neceſſary cauſe to depart from it, and that they of that Church which have underſtanding and means to diſcover their Error, and neglect to uſe them, are not to be flattered with hope of ſalvation; they do 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 he 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 means to diſcover their error, neglect to uſe them. Now theſe are not the whole Church; and 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* ſays, *There is a great difference between a Schiſm from them, and a Reformation of our ſelves: this*, you ſay, *is a quaint ſubtilty, by which all Schiſm and Sin may be as well excuſed.* It ſeems then in your judgment, that thieves and adulterers, and murtherers, and traytors may ſay with as much probability as Proteſtants, that they did no hurt to others, but only reform themſelves. But then methinks it is very ſtrange, that all Proteſtants ſhould agree with one conſent in this defence of themſelves from the imputation of Schiſm: and that to this day, never any thief or murtherer ſhould have been heard of, to make uſe of this Apology! 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 himſelf 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 perſecution, they might not be reſtored to the peace of the Church preſently, upon the interceſſion of the Confeſſors; whether the *Donatiſts*, who divided from, and damned all the world, becauſe all the world would not excommunicate them who were accuſed only, and not convicted, to have been Traditors of the ſacred Books; whether they which for the ſlips and infirmities of others, which they might and ought to tolerate, or upon ſome difference in matters of Order and Ceremony, or for ſome error in Doctrine, neither pernicious nor hurtful 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 extream impudency, put in this plea of Proteſtants, and pretend with as much likelihood as they, that they did not ſeparate from others, but only reform themſelves? But ſuppoſe they were ſo impudent as to ſay ſo in their own defence falſly, 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 Schiſm 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 Rebel that makes Conſcience the cloak of his impious diſobedience, may ſay with S. *Peter*, and S. *John*, *We muſt obey God rather than 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 have ſaid, St. *Peter* and St. *John* did ill to make ſuch an anſwer as they made, becauſe impious Hypocrites might make uſe of the ſame to palliate



liate their Diſobedience and Rebellion againſt the lawful commands of lawful Authority.

81. *But ſeeing their pretended Reformation conſiſted in forſaking the Churches corruptions, their Reformation of themſelves, and their diviſion from you, falls out to be one and the ſame thing.* Juſt as if two men having been a long while companions in drunkenneſs, one of them ſhould turn ſober; this Reformation of himſelf, and deſertion of his companion, in this ill cuſtom, 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 withal 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 lawful. 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 far ſhort of infinite) nor *their ſymbolizing in the general of forſaking your corruptions*, prove any thing to the contrary, or any way advantage your deſign or make for your purpoſe. For it is not any ſign at all, much leſs an evident ſign, that they had no ſetled deſign, 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 original purity from which it was fallen. The declination from which, ſome conceiving to have begun (though ſecretly) in the Apoſtles times, *(the myſtery of iniquity being then in work*;) and after their departure to have ſhewed it ſelf more openly: Others again believing, that the Church continued pure for ſome Ages after the Apoſtles, and then declined: And conſequently ſome aiming at an exact conformity with the Apoſtolique times: Others thinking they ſhould do God and Men good ſervice, could they reduce the Church to the condition of the fourth and fifth Ages: Some taking their direction in this work of Reformation, only from Scripture; others, from the Writings of Fathers, and the Decrees of Councils of the firſt five Ages, certainly, it is no great marvail, 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 reform it ſelf, and ſhould reduce into practice ancient good diſcipline, when others would not: In this caſe could it be charged with Schiſm 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 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 Schiſm, (that is, ſeparating from the Church, and making themſelves no members of it) if all they did was (as indeed it was) to reform 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 unanſwerable. 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 anſwer that.

84. This

84. This you do, § 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 ways how to forſake his vocation, and to maintain the lawfulneſs of Schiſm from the Church, and Apoſtacy from a Religious Order.* Certainly the innocent caſe put by the Doctor of a Monaſtery reforming it ſelf, hath not deſerved ſuch grievous accuſations. Unleſs Reformation with you be all one with Apoſtacy: and to forſake ſin and diſorder, be to forſake ones Vocation; and ſurely, if it be ſo, your Vocations are not very lawful, and your Religious Orders not very Religious. Secondly, that you quite pervert and change D. *Potters* caſes, and inſtead of the caſe, of a *whole Monaſtery reforming it ſelf, 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 think you can better deal with; of *ſome particular Monks, upon pretence of the neglect of leſſer Monaſtical Obſervances going out of their Monaſtery, which Monaſtery yet did confeſſedly obſerve their ſubſtantial Vows, and all principal 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 mortal: and out of it, no hope of eſcaping others like that for which he forſook the firſt infected Company.* I appeal now to any indifferent judge, whether theſe caſes be the ſame or near the ſame with D. *Potter's?* Whether this be fair and ingenuous dealing, inſtead 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 croſs 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. *Potter's* 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 deal 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 to you, as in reaſon you can expect, That a Monaſtery did obſerve her ſubſtantial vows, and all principal Statutes; but yet did generally practiſe, and alſo enjoyn the violation of ſome leſſer, yet obliging obſervances, and had done ſo time out of mind: And that ſome inferiour Monks more conſcientious than the reſt, diſcovering this abuſe, ſhould firſt with all earneſtneſs ſolicite their Superiours for a general and orderly reformation of theſe, though ſmall and venial corruptions, yet corruptions: But finding they hop'd and labour'd in vain to effect this, ſhould reform theſe faults in themſelves, and refuſe to joyn in the practiſe of them, with the reſt of their Confraternity, and perſiſting reſolutely in ſuch a refuſal, ſhould by their Superiours be caſt out of their Monaſtery, and being not to be re-admitted without a promiſe of remitting from their ſtiffneſs in theſe things, and of condeſcending to others in the practiſe of theſe ſmall faults, ſhould chooſe rather to continue exiles, than to re-enter upon ſuch conditions: I would know whether you would condemn ſuch men of Apoſtacy from the Order? Without doubt, if you ſhould, you would find the ſtream of your Caſuiſts againſt you; and beſides, involve S. *Paul* in the ſame condemnation, who plainly tells us, that *we may not do the leaſt evil, that we may do the greateſt good.* Put caſe again, you ſhould be a 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 find the greateſt part of them ſo far in love with their diſeaſe, that they were reſolved to keep it; nay, ſo fond of it, that they ſhould make a decree, that whoſoever would leave it, ſhould leave their company. Suppoſe now, that your ſelf and ſome few others, ſhould notwithſtanding their injunction to the contrary, free your ſelves from this diſeaſe, and



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 tyrannical peeviſhneſs? And if in theſe caſes you will (as I verily believe you will) acquit the Inferiours and condemn the Superiours, abſolve the Minor part and condemn the Major, then can you with no reaſon condemn Proteſtants, for chooſing rather to be ejected from the communion of the *Roman* Church, than with her to perſiſt (as of neceſſity they were to do, if they would continue in her communion) in the profeſſion of errors, though not deſtructive of ſalvation, yet hindring edification; and in the Practice, or at leaſt approbation of many (ſuppoſe not mortal but venial) corruptions.

86. Thirdly, the Reader may be pleaſed to be advertiſed that you cenſure too partially the corrupt eſtate of your *Church in comparing it to a Monaſtery, which did confeſſedly obſerve their ſubſtantial vows, and all principal Statutes of their Order, and moreover was ſecured by an infallible aſſiſtance, for the avoiding of all ſubſtantial corruptions*: for of your Church we confeſs no ſuch matter, but ſay plainly, That ſhe not only might fall into ſubſtantial corruptions, but did ſo; that ſhe did not only generally violate, but of all the members of her communion, either in act or approbation, require and exact the violation of many ſubſtantial Laws of Chriſt, both Ceremonial and Moral, which though we hope it was pardonable in them, who had not means to know their error, yet, of its own nature, and to them who did or might have known their error, was certainly damnable. And that it was not the *tything of Mint, and Aniſe, and Cummin*, the neglect whereof we impute unto you, but *the neglect of judgment, 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 ſoon as they were gone out from the Monaſtery that refuſed to reform, 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 far as it concerns the ſame errors, plainly deſtroys it ſelf. For how can they poſſibly fall into the ſame errors by forſaking your Communion, which that they may forſake they do forſake your Communion? And then for other errors of the like nature and quality, or more enormous than yours, though they deny it not poſſible, but by their negligence and wickedneſs they may fall into them, yet they are ſo far from acknowledging that they have no hope to avoid this miſchief, that they proclaim to all the world, that it is moſt prone and eaſie to do ſo, to all thoſe that fear God and love the Truth; and hardly poſſible for them to do otherwiſe, without ſupine negligence and extreme impiety.

88. To fit the Reddition of your perverted Simile, to the Propoſition of it, you tell us *that we teach, that for all fundamental points, the Church is ſecured from error.* I anſwer, Fundamental errors may ſignifie, either ſuch as are repugnant to Gods command, and ſo in their own nature damnable, though to thoſe which out of invincible ignorance practice them, not unpardonable: or ſuch as are not only meritoriouſly, but remedileſly pernicious and deſtructive of Salvation. We hope that yours, and the *Greek*, and other Churches before the Reformation, had not ſo far apoſtated from Chriſt, as to be guilty of errors of the later ſort. We ſay, that not only the Catholick Church, but every particular true Church, ſo long as it continues a Church, is ſecured from Fundamental errors of this kind, but ſecur'd not abſolutely by any promiſe of divine aſſiſtance, which being not ordinarily irreſiſtible, but tempered to the nature of the Receivers, may be neglected, and therefore withdrawn; but by the Repugnance of any error in this ſenſe fun-

damental to the eſſence and nature of a Church. So that to ſpeak properly, not any ſet known company of men is ſecured, that, though they neglect the means of avoiding error, yet certainly, they ſhall not err in fundamentals, which were neceſſary for the conſtitution of an infallible guide of faith: But rather they which know what is meant by a Church, are ſecured or rather certain that a Church remaining a Church cannot fall into fundamental errors; becauſe, when it does ſo, it is no longer a Church. As they are certain, that men cannot become unreaſonable creatures, becauſe when they do ſo, they are no longer men. But for fundamental 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 fundamental errors, we do not teach ſo much as that the Church Catholick, much leſs, (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 and 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 add another manifeſt falſhood, *viz.* that we ſay, *That no particular perſon, or Church, hath any promiſe of aſſiſtance in points fundamental.* Whereas, croſs 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 ſeek it as they ſhould, by the means 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 evil, can give good gifts to our children, much more ſhall our heavenly Father give his Spirit to them that ask it*: and that, *if any man want wiſdom* (eſpecially ſpiritual wiſdom) *he is to ask 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 himſelf to all, as well Subjects as Superiours. Anſw.* 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 far lie in wickedneſs*, (as St. *John* ſpeaks) that it may be lawful and noble for one man to oppoſe the world. But yet were we put to our oaths, we ſhould ſurely not teſtifie any ſuch thing for you; for how can we ſay properly and without ſtreining, that *he oppoſed himſelf to All*, unleſs we could ſay alſo, that All oppoſed themſelves to him? And how can we ſay ſo, ſeeing the world can witneſs, that ſo many thouſands, nay, millions, followed his ſtandard as ſoon as it was advanced?

90. But *none that lived immediately 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 begin the Reformation. In the Chriſtian warfare, every man ought to ſtrive to be foremoſt. Secondly, it is more than you can juſtifie. 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 the lower voice of petitions and remonſtrances, in many points, as he did.

91. Fourthly and laſtly, whereas you ſay, that *many chief learned Proteſtants are forced to confeſs the Antiquity of your Doctrine and Practice*: I anſwer, Of many Doctrines and Practices of yours, this is not true, nor pretended to be true by thoſe that have dealt in this Argument. Search your Store-houſe, Mr. *Brerely*, who hath travelled as far in this Northweſt diſcovery, as it was poſſible for humane induſtry, and when you have done ſo, I pray inform me, what confeſſions of Proteſtants have you, for the Antiquity of the Doctrine of the Communion in one kind: the lawfulneſs and expedience of the *Latine*-Service: For the preſent uſe of Indulgences: For the Popes power in Temporalities over Princes:



Princes: For the picturing of the Trinity: For the lawfulneſs of the worſhip of Pictures: For your Beads, and Roſary, and Ladies Pſalter; and in a word, for your whole worſhip of the Bleſſed Virgin: For your Oblations by way of Conſumption, and therefore in the quality of Sacrifices to the Virgin *Mary*, and other Saints: For your ſaying of *Pater-noſters*, and Creeds to the honour of Saints, and of *Ave Maries* to the honour of other Saints beſides the Bleſſed Virgin: For the infallibility of the Biſhop or Church of *Rome*: For your prohibiting the Scripture to be read publickly in the Church, in ſuch Languages as all may underſtand: For your Doctrine of the bleſſed Virgin's immunity from actual ſin; 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 ſelf with finding out more) for this very doctrine of Licentiouſneſs, That though a man live and die without the Practice of Chriſtian vertues, and with the habits of many damnable ſins unmortified; yet if in the laſt moment of life, he have any ſorrow for his ſins, and joyn confeſſion with it, certainly he ſhall be ſaved? Secondly, they that confeſs 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 far from the ſenſe. Some of them I am ſure are ſo, I will name *Gonlartius*, who in his Commentaries on S. *Cyprian*'s 35 *Ep.* grants that the ſentence [*Hereſies have ſprung*, &c.] quoted by you §. 36. of this Chapter, was meant of *Cornelius*: whereas it will be very plain to any attentive Reader, that St. *Cyprian* ſpeaks there of himſelf. Thirdly, though ſome Proteſtants confeſs ſome of your Doctrins 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, unleſs it be abſolute and primitive, is a certain ſign 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 prevail in the 5. or 4. or 3. or 2. age? Eſpecially ſeeing the Apoſtles aſſure us, that the *myſtery of iniquity was working*, though more ſecretly even in their times. If any man ask, How could it become univerſal in ſo ſhort a time? Let him tell me how the Error of the Millenaries, and the communicating of Infants, became ſo ſoon univerſal; 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 confeſs the antiquity, but always poſt-nate to Apoſtolick, 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 teſtimonies, we have (without thanks to you) in your *Indices expurgatorii*: 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: only one general ingenuous confeſſion of that great *Eraſmus*, may not be paſſed 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 affirm, 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 do not condemn your Progenitors of Schiſm from God's viſible Church*: I aſſure you, I have well conſidered them, and do plainly ſee that this is not D. *Potter*'s ſimilitude, but your own; and beſides, that it is wholly made up of miſtakes and falſhoods, and is at no hand, a ſufficient proof 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 Hoſpital of perſons Univerſally infected with ſome diſeaſe, where he finds to be true, what you ſuppoſed, that, after his departure from his Brethren, he might fall into greater incon-*

*veniences, and more infectious diſeaſes than thoſe for which he left them.* Thus you. But, to deal truly with you, I find nothing of all this, nor how it is conſequent from any thing ſaid by you, or done by D. *Potter*. But this I find, that you have compoſed this your ſimilitude as you did the former, of a heap of vain Suſpitions, pretended to be grounded on our confeſſions. As firſt, that your *diſeaſes which we forſook, neither were nor could be mortal*: Whereas we aſſure our ſelves, and are ready to juſtifie, that they are and were mortal in themſelves, and would have been ſo to us, if, when *light came to us, we had loved darkneſs more than light.* And D. *Potter*, though he hope your Church wanted no neceſſary vital part, that is, that ſome in your Church by ignorance might be ſaved; yet he nothing doubts but that it is full of ulcers without, and diſeaſes within, and is far from ſo extenuating your errors as to make them only like the ſuperfluous fingers of the Giant of *Gath*. Secondly, *that we had no hope to avoid other diſeaſes like thoſe for which we 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 means to be ſecured from damnable error, 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 fail to give a bleſſing. Thirdly, that *thoſe innumerable miſchiefs 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, than the Goſpel of Chriſt of the diviſion of the world. The only fountain of all theſe miſchiefs, being indeed no other than your pouring out a floud of perſecutions againſt Proteſtants, only becauſe they would not ſin and be damn'd with you for company. Unleſs we may add the impatience of ſome Proteſtants, who not enduring to be torn in pieces like ſheep by a company of wolves without reſiſtance, chooſe rather to die like Souldiers than Martyrs.

93. But you proceed; and falling into a fit of admiration, cry out and ſay thus, *To what paſs hath Hereſie brought men, who bluſh not to compare the beloved Spouſe of the Lord, the only Dove,* &c. *to a Monaſtery that muſt be forſaken; to the Giant in Gath with ſuperfluous fingers!* But this *Spouſe of Chriſt*, this only *Dove*, this *purchaſe of our Saviours bloud*, this *Catholick 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 ſins daily committed againſt knowledge and conſcience? Now I would fain underſtand why one error in faith, eſpecially if not fundamental, ſhould not conſiſt with the holineſs of this Spouſe, this Dove, this Church, as well as many and great ſins 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 do not wipe out all that you have ſaid, to prove Proteſtants Schiſmaticks for ſeparating from your Church, though ſuppoſed to be in ſome errors not fundamental! *For if any ſuch error may make her deſerve to be compared to a Monaſtery ſo diſordered that it muſt be forſaken*; then if you ſuppoſe (as here you do) your Church in ſuch errors, 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 have 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 have left the viſible Church. And that* D. Potter *ſpeaks very ſtrangely when he ſays, 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 do not ſeparate themſelves from the ſociety of the infected perſons, how do 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 Deſertors of the diſeaſed company, as you put the caſes, that is,



is, of thoſe which left theſe communities, then is it as true as Goſpel, that they cannot deny but that they left the ſaid communities. But it appears not to me, how it will enſue hereupon, That *Luther* and the reſt cannot pretend not to have 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, methinks, 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 acknowledged above that they forſook the external 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 proof of it than your former ſimilitude. And my reaſon is this, becauſe he and his Followers were a part of this Church, and ceaſed not to be ſo by the 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. *Potter*'s caſes, according as he put them, and anſwer not your own Arguments, when you make ſhew of anſwering his: methinks, 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 Monks of St. *Benets* Order make one Body, whereof their ſeveral Monaſteries are ſeveral members, I preſume it will be eaſily granted. Suppoſe now, that all theſe Monaſteries being quite out of Order, ſome twenty or thirty of them ſhould reform 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 the Community whereof they were parts? In my Opinion it is no ſuch matter. Let the world judge. Again, whereas the Doctor ſays, *that in a Society of men Univerſally 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, Sir, I am extremely deceived if his words be not plain Engliſh, and plain ſenſe, and contain ſuch a manifeſt Truth as cannot be denied 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 than this; That if ſome whole Family were taken with Agues, if the Father of this Family ſhould free himſelf from his, that he ſhould not therefore deſervedly be thought to abandon and diſert his Family? But (ſay you) if they do not ſeparate themſelves from the Society of the wicked perſons, how do they free themſelves from the common diſeaſe? Do they at the ſame time remain in the company and yet depart from thoſe infected creatures? Methinks, a Writer of Controverſies ſhould not be ignorant how this may be done without any ſuch difficulty! But if you do not know, I'le tell you, There is no neceſſity they ſhould leave the company of theſe infected perſons at all, much leſs, that they ſhould at once depart from it and remain with it, which I confeſs were very difficult. But if they will free themſelves 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, learn from your ſelf, *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

Which are your own words within four or five lines after this: plainly ſhewing that your miſtaking D. *Potter's* meaning, and your wondring at his words as at ſome ſtrange monſters, was all this while affected, and that you are conſcious to your ſelf of perverting his Argument that you may ſeem to ſay ſomething, when indeed you ſay nothing. Whereas therefore you add, *We muſt then ſay that they ſeparate themſelves from the perſons, though it be by occaſion of the diſeaſe;* I aſſure you, good Sir, you muſt not do ſo at any hand; for then you alter and ſpoil D. *Potter's* caſe quite, and fight not with his reaſon but your own ſhadow. For the Inſtance of *a man freeing himſelf from the diſeaſe of his company, and not leaving his company*, is very fit to prove, by the parity of reaſon, that it is very poſſible, a man may leave the corruptions of a Church, and not leave 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 buſineſs.

95. But *Luther and his followers, did not continue in the company 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 himſelf from the common diſeaſe of a ſociety, and yet continuing a part of it, is here compared to *Luther* and his followers, freeing themſelves from the corruptions of the viſible Church, and 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 do not joyn with other parts of it in all obſervances. Nor poſſible, for had he accompanied them in all things, he had not freed himſelf from the common corruptions.

96. But *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 power, drive them away even their Superiours both Spiritual and Temporal, as is notorious.* The proofs hereof are wanting, and therefore I might defer my anſwer until they were produced; yet take this before hand: If they did ſo, then herein, in my opinion, they did amiſs; for I have learnt from the ancient Fathers of the Church, that *nothing is more againſt Religion than to force Religion*, and of S. *Paul*, *The weapons of the Chriſtian Warfare are not carnal.* And great reaſon: For, humane violence may make men counterfeit, but cannot make them believe, and is therefore fit for nothing but to breed form without, and Atheiſm within. Beſides, if this means of bringing men to embrace any Religion were generally uſed (as if it may be juſtly uſed in any place by thoſe that have power, and think they have truth, certainly they cannot with reaſon deny but that it may be uſed in every place, by thoſe that have power as well as they, and think they have truth as well as they) what could follow but the maintenance perhaps of truth, but perhaps only of the profeſſion of it in one place, and 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 and Churches; but the immortalizing the greater and more lamentable diviſions of Chriſtendom and the world? And therefore what can follow from it, but perhaps in the judgment of carnal policy, the temporal benefit and tranquillity of temporal States and Kingdoms, but the infinite prejudice, if not the deſolation, of the Kingdom of Chriſt? And therefore it well becomes them who have their portions in this life, who ſerve no higher State than that of *England* or *Spain*, or *France*, nor this neither any further than they may ſerve themſelves by it; who think of no other happineſs but the preſervation of their own fortunes and tranquillity in this world; who think of no other means to preſerve States, but humane power and Machivilian policy, and believe no other Creed but this, *Regi aut Civitati imperium habenti nihil injuſtum quod utile.* Such men as theſe it may become to maintain by worldly power and violence their State-inſtrument, Religion. For if all be vain and falſe, (as in their judgment it is) the preſent whatſoever,



whatſoever, is better than any, becauſe it is already ſetled: an 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 Mankind, 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 Kingdoms 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, than to force weak men by the profeſſion of a Religion which they believe not, to loſe their own eternal happineſs, out of a vain and needleſs fear, leſt they may poſſibly diſturb their temporal quietneſs. There being no danger to any State from any mans opinion; unleſs it be ſuch an opinion by which diſobedience to authority, or impiety, is taught or licenc'd: which ſort, I confeſs, may juſtly be puniſhed as well as other faults; or, unleſs this ſanguinary doctrine be joyn'd with it, That it is lawful for him by humane violence to enforce others to it. Therefore if Proteſtants did offer violence to other mens conſciences and compel them to embrace their Reformation, I excuſe them not: much leſs, if they did ſo to the ſacred Perſons of Kings, and thoſe that were in authority over them, who ought to be ſo ſecured 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 City flie 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 than Murderers, and to die for their Religion rather than to fight for it. But of all the men in the world you are moſt unfit to accuſe them hereof, againſt whom the ſouls of the Martyrs from under the Altar cry much louder than againſt all their other Perſecutors together: Who for theſe many ages together have daily ſacrificed *Hecatombs* of innocent Chriſtians under the name of Hereticks, to blind zeal and furious ſuperſtition. Who teach plainly, that you may propagate your Religion whenſoever you have power, by depoſing of Kings and invaſion of Kingdoms, and think when you kill the adverſaries of it, you *do God good ſervice*. But for their departing corporally from them, whom mentally they had forſaken: For their forſaking the external Communion and company of the unreformed part of the Church, in their ſuperſtitions and impieties: thus much of your accuſation we embrace and glory in it; And ſay, though ſome Proteſtants might offend in the manner or degree of their ſeparation, yet certainly their ſeparation it ſelf was not Schiſmatical, but innocent; and not only ſo, but juſt and neceſſary. And as for your obtruding upon D. *Potter* that he ſhould ſay, *Their neither was nor could be juſt cauſe to do ſo, no more than to depart from Chriſt himſelf.* I have ſhewed divers times already, that you deal very injuriouſly with him, confounding together, *Departing from the Church*, and *Departing from ſome general opinions and practices*, which did not conſtitute but vitiate, not make the Church but mar it. For though he ſays, that which is moſt true, that *there can be no juſt cauſe to depart from the Church*, that is, to ceaſe being a member of the Church, *no more than 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 juſt and neceſſary cauſe to depart from ſome opinions and practices of your Church, nay, of the Catholick Church. And therefore you do vainly to infer, that, *Luther and his followers for ſo doing, were Schiſmaticks.*

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 Schiſmatick for departing from *Cæcilianus*, and the Chair of *Cyprian* and *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 Dioceſs be none, becauſe they had juſt and neceſſary cauſe of their departure. For otherwiſe they muſt have continued in the profeſſion of known errors and the practice of manifeſt Corruptions.

98. *Ad*

98. *Ad §.36.* In the next Section you tell us, that *Christ our Lord gave S.* Peter *and his Successors authority over his whole Militant Church.* And for proof hereof *you first refer us to* Brerely, *citing exactly the places of such chief Protestants as have 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 prove this point true, you only 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 than any of those who are pretended to be confessed by Protestants to have held with you in this matter: and when those whom you have to do 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 less than Apostolical, is a certain note of truth? Yet this I say, not as if I did acknowledge what you pretend, that Protestants did confess 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 Catholick Church? Now, having perused *Brerely*, I cannot find any one Protestant confessing any one Father to have 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 find 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 *Ep.* of S. *Cyprian*, with any ordinary attention, out of which you take your first place, and I am confident he shall find that he means nothing else by the words quoted by you, But that in one particular Church at one time there ought to be but one Bishop, and that he should be obeyed in all things lawful: The non-performance whereof, was one of the most ordinary causes of Heresies against the Faith, ane Schism from the Communion of the Church Universal. He shall find, secondly, and that by many convincing Arguments, that though he write to *Cornelius* Bishop of *Rome*, yet he speaks not of him, but of himself then Bishop of *Carthage*, against whom a faction of Schismaticks had then set up another. And therefore here your ingenuity is to be commended above many of your side: For whereas they ordinarily abuse this place to prove, that in the whole Church there ought to be but one Priest and one Judge; you seem somewhat diffident hereof, and thereupon say, *That these words plainly condemn* Luther, *whether he will understand them as spoken of the universal, or of every particular Church.* But whether they condemn *Luther*, is another question. The question here is, Whether they plainly prove the Pope's Supremacy over all 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 Catholick Church, but of one Bishop in one particular Church.

99. And no less impertinent is your saying out of *Optatus*, if it be well look'd into, though at the first sight it may seem otherwise; because *Optatus* his scene hapned 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* above-mentioned ground of *one Bishop in one Church*, proves them Schismaticks 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 Chair, (understand *in that City*; for in other places others, I hope, had Chairs beside S. *Peter*) and therefore he is a Schismatick, who against that one single Chair erects another (understand as before, *in that place*) making another Bishop of that Diocess besides him who was lawfully elected to it.

100. But *yet by the way he stiles St.* Peter *head of the Apostles, and says, that from thence he was called* Cephas. *Answ.* Perhaps he was abused into this opinion, by thinking *Cephas* derived from the *Greek* word Κεφαλὴ, *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 sign of subjection, methinks is as strange, as that a King of *England* for twenty five years together should do no Act of Regality, nor receive any one acknowledgment of it. As strange methinks it is, that you, so many Ages after, should know this so certainly, as you pretend to do, 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 confirm it by saying, *the Kings of the Gentiles exercise authority over them, but it should not be so among them.* No less a wonder was it that S. *Paul* should so far forget S. *Peter* and himself, as that, first mentioning of him often, he should do it without any title of Honour. Secondly, speaking of the several 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 himself in particular, and perhaps comparing himself with S. *Peter* in particular, rather than any other, he should say in plain terms; *I am in nothing inferiour 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 far from shewing, that in the judgment of *Optatus*, the Bishop of *Rome*, was to be at all, much less by divine right, Successor to S. *Peter* in this his Headship and Authority. For what incongruity 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, Universal? 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 Apostles should succeed the first.

101. *Ad §.37.* The next Paragraph I might well pass over, as having no Argument in it. For there is nothing in it but two sayings of S. *Austin*, which I have great reason to esteem no Argument, untill you will promise me to grant whatsoever I shall prove by two sayings of S. *Austin*. But moreover, the second of these sentences seems to me, to imply the contradiction of the first. For to say, *That the Sacriledge of Schism, is eminent, when there is no cause of separation*, implies, to my understanding, that there may be a cause of Separation. Now in the first, he says plainly, *That this is impossible*. Neither doth any reconciliation of his words occur to me, but only this, that in the former he speaks upon supposition, that the Publick Service of God, wherein men are to communicate is unpolluted, and no unlawful 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. *Austin* and *Optatus*,

that though the Donatists, at the beginning of their Separation, pretended no cause of 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 Catholicks, that they set pictures upon their altars: which when St. *Austin* comes to Answer, he does not deny the possibility of the thing, for that had been to deny the Catholick Church to be made up of men, all which had free-will to evil, and therefore might possibly agree in doing it, and, had he denied this, the Action of after-Ages had been his resutation; 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 do 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 abhor the thing, and deny the imputation: Which way of answering, does not, I confess, plainly shew, but yet it somewhat intimates, that he had nothing else to answer; and that if he could not have denied this, he could not have denied the Donatists separation from them to have been just. If this Answer to this little Argument seem not sufficient, I add moreover, that if it be applied to *Luther*'s 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 divide 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 Catholicks, was divided and subdivided long before he divided from it; and by their divisions had much weakned their own authority, and taken away from you this plea of St. *Austin*, which stands upon no other Foundation, but the Unity 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 Schismaticks, it follows not. Or if it does, then either the Jesuits are Schismaticks from the Dominicans, or they from the Jesuits; The Canonists from the Jesuits, or the Jesuits 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 knows that, in point of Doctrine, there is a plain and irreconcilable contradiction; and therefore one Part must be in error, at least not Fundamental. Thus your Argument returns upon your self, and, if it be good, proves the *Roman* Church in a manner to be made up of Schismaticks. But the answer to it, is, that it begs this very false and vain Supposition; That whosoever in any point of doctrine is a Schismatick.

103. *Ad §.* 39. In the next place you number up your victories, and tell us, *that out of these premises, this conclusion follows, That Luther and his followers were Schismaticks from the Visible Church, the Pope, the Diocess wherein they were baptized; from the Bishop under 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 self: Because the self-same protestant is convicted to day, that his yester-days 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 Schismaticks, that was the only thing you should have proved, and to that you have not urged one reason of any moment. All of them for weight and strength were cosen-

germans



germans to this pretty device, wherewith you will prove them Schismaticks from themselves, *because the self-same Protestant to day is convicted in conscience, that his yesterdays opinion was an error.* It seems then, that they that hold errors, must hold them fast, and take special care of being convicted in conscience that they are in error, for fear of being Schismaticks! Protestants must continue Protestants, and Puritans Puritans, and Papists Papists; nay, Jews, and Turks, and Pagans, must remain Jews, and Turks, and Pagans, and go on constantly to the Devil, or else, forsooth, they must be *Schismaticks*, 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 fancies of their several Sects: so that it is a miracle to hear of any Jesuit that hath forsaken the opinion of the Jesuits, or any Dominican that hath chang'd his for the Jesuits. Without question, this Gentleman my adversary knows none such, or else methinks 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 be true. But sure, if this be all his fault, he 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 sin, unless to be in error be a vertue. And therefore to do as you do, to damn men for false opinions, to call them Schismaticks for leaving them; to make pertinacy in error, that is, an unwillingness to be convicted, or a resolution not to be convicted, the form of Heresie, 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 turned 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 yesterdays opinion was an error, and yet thinks he was no Schismatick for doing so, and desires to be informed by you, whether or no he was mistaken? The same man afterwards, upon better consideration, became a doubting Papist, and of a doubting Papist a confirmed Protestant. And yet this man thinks himself no more to blame for all these changes, than a Traveller, who using all diligence to find the right way to some remote City, where he had never been, (as the party I speak of had never been in Heaven) did yet mistake it, and after find his error, and amend it. Nay, he stands upon his justification so far as to maintain that his alterations, not only to you, but also from you by Gods mercy, were the most satisfactory actions to himself, that ever he did, and the greatest victories that ever he obtained over himself, 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 inconveniences, which to ingenuous natures are of all most terrible. So that though there were much weakness in some of these alterations, yet certainly there was no wickedness. Neither does he yield his weakness altogether without Apology, seeing his deductions were rational, and out of some 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 Book, to prove our Separation from you, not only lawful but necessary, hath these words, *Although we confess the Church of* Rome, (in some sense) *to be a true Church, and her errors* (to some men) *not damnable; yet for us who are convinced in conscience, that she errs in many things, a necessity lies upon us, even under pain of damnation, to forsake her in those errors.* He means not, in the belief of those errors; for that is presupposed to be done already: for whosoever is convinced in Conscience that she errs, hath for matter of belief forsaken, that is, ceased to believe those errors. This therefore he meant not, nor could not mean: but that, whosoever is convinced in Conscience that the Church of *Rome* errs, 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 profeſs what he believes not, and practiſe what he approves not. Which is no more than your ſelf in *theſe* have divers times affirmed. For in one place, you ſay, *It is unlawful to ſpeak any the leaſt untruth*: Now he that profeſſeth your Religion, and believes it not, what elſe doth he but live in a perpetual lie? Again in another, *you have called them that profeſs 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 belief whereof they had already forſaken, what do you but rail at them for not being a *damned crew of diſſembling Sycophants*? And laſtly, §. 42. of this Chapter, within three leaves after this, whereas D. *Potter grants but only a neceſſity of peaceable external 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, diſturb the Churches peace, and caſt off her Communion: Upon this occaſion you come upon him with this bitter Sarcaſm, *I thank you for your ingenuous confeſſion, in recompence whereof I will do a deed of Charity, by putting you in mind into what Labyrinths you are brought, by teaching that the Church may err in ſome points of Faith and yet that it is not lawful for any man to oppoſe his judgment, 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 do ſo: not he who ſays plainly, that *whoſoever is convinc'd in Conſcience that any Church errs, is bound under pain of damnation to forſake her in her profeſſion and practice of theſe errors*: but you, who find fault with him, and make long diſcourſes againſt him, for thus affirming: Not he who can eaſily wind himſelf out of your Imaginary Labyrinth, by telling you, that he no where denyes it lawful 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 ſayes indeed at firſt, *It is not lawful for any man to oppoſe his judgment to the publique*: But he preſently explains himſelf 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 far is he from requiring any ſinful diſſimulation;) *Provided, he do 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 judgment to the publique ſimply, which the Doctor finds 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 far as to caſt off her Communion*, becauſe, forſooth, ſhe errs 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 deal leſs, to quarrel with him, for ſaying (which is all that here he ſays,) 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) *errs 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 *falſhoods* and *impertinencies*. The firſt falſhood is, that he in theſe words avoucheth, *that no learned Catholiques can be ſaved*: Unleſs you will ſuppoſe, that all learned Catholiques are convinc'd in conſcience, that your Church errs in many things. It may well be fear'd that many are ſo convinc'd, and yet profeſs what they



they believed not. Many more have been, and have ſtifled their conſciences, by thinking it an act of humility, to do ſo. Many more would have been, had they with liberty and indifference of judgment, examined the grounds of the Religion which they profeſs. But to think that all the Learned of your ſide, are actually convinced of errors in your Church, and yet will not forſake the profeſſion of them, this is ſo great an uncharitableneſs, that I verily believe D. *Potter* abhors it. Your next falſhood is, *That the Doctor affirms, that you Catholicks want no means of Salvation*: and that he judges *the Roman errors not to be in themſelves fundamental or damnable*. Which calumny I have very often confuted: and in this very place it is confuted by D. *Potter*, and confeſſed by your ſelf. For in the beginning of this Anſwer you tell us, that the *Doctor avouches of all Catholicks whom ignorance cannot excuſe, that they cannot be ſaved*. Certainly then he muſt needs eſteem them to want ſomething neceſſary to Salvation. And then in the Doctor's ſaying, it is remarkable, that he confeſſes, *your errors to ſome men not damnable*: which clearly imports, that according to his judgment, 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 confeſs them, are abſolutely inconſiſtent*; which is falſe; for, be the matter what it will, yet for a man to tell a lie, eſpecially in matter of Religion, cannot but be damnable. How much more then, to go on in a courſe of lying by profeſſing to believe theſe things divine Truths, which he verily believes to be falſhoods and fables? A fourth is, that *if we erred in thinking that your Church holds errors, this error or erroneous conſcience might be rectified and depoſed, by judging thoſe errors not damnable*. For, what repugnance is there between theſe two Suppoſitions, that, you do hold ſome errors, and, that they are not damnable? And if there be no repugnance between them, how can the belief of the later remove or deſtroy, or if it be erroneous, rectifie the belief of the former? Nay, ſeeing there is a manifeſt conſent between them, how can it be avoided, but the belief of the later will maintain and preſerve the belief of the former? For who can conjoyn in one brain not crackt, (pardon me, if I ſpeak 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 eſteem the errors of the *Roman* Church not damnable, therefore I do amiſs to think that ſhe errs at all? If therefore you would have us alter our judgment, 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 errors, becauſe we believe your errors are not damnable, aſſure your ſelf it will never hold.

106. A fifth falſhood is, *That we daily do 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 knows 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 belief 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 ſixth is, that, according to the *Doctrine of all Divines, there is any difference between a Speculative Perſwaſion of conſcience, of the unlawfulneſs of any thing, and a Practical Dictamen that the ſame thing is unlawful*. For theſe are but divers words ſignifying the ſame thing; neither is ſuch perſwaſion wholly ſpeculative, but tending to practice: nor ſuch a dictamen wholly practical, but grounded upon ſpeculation. A ſeventh is, *That Proteſtants did only conceive in ſpeculation that the Church of* Rome *erred in ſome doctrines*, and had not alſo a practical dictamen, that

that it was damnable for them to continue in the profession of these errors. An eighth is, that *it is not lawful to separate from any Churches communion, for errors not appertaining to the substance of Faith*: Which is not universally true, but with this exception, unless 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 says, *That a necessity did lie 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 condemn of horrible impiety, and therefore may not hope to be excused, if you do it to others.

107. The eleventh 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 formal and express terms, contains many of these opinions. And the reason of this assertion is very vain: *for though they had not an absolute infallibility promised unto them*, yet may they be of some things infallibly certain. As *Euclide* sure was not infallible, yet was he certain enough, that *twice two were four*, and *that every whole was greater than a part of that whole*. And so though *Calvin* and *Melanchthon* were not infallible in all things, yet they might and did know well enough, that your Latine Service was condemned by S. *Paul*, and that the Communion in both kinds 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 enjoyed prescription for many ages*. For, besides that Doctrine is not a thing that may be possessed: And the professors of it were the Church itself, and in nature of possessors, (If we speak improperly) rather than 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 Governours of your Church held for some ages, of the party governed, was not peaceable, but got by fraud, and held by violence.

108. These are the *Fallhoods* which in this Answer offer themselves to any attentive Reader, and that which remains is meer *impertinence*. As first, that *a pretence of conscience will not serve to justifie Separation, from being Schismatical*. Which is true, but little to the purpose, seeing it was not an erroneous perswasion, much less an Hypocritical pretence, but a true and well grounded conviction of conscience, which D. *Potter* alleaged to justifie Protestants from being Schismatical. 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 than 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 Apology, *We must obey God rather than men*? It is therefore most apparent that this answer must be meerly impertinent: seeing it will serve against the Martyrs, and Apostles, and Prophets, and even against your selves, as well as against Protestants. Or as little purpose is your rule out of *Lyrinensis* against them that followed *Luther*, seeing they pretend and are ready to justifie, 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 publickly oppose his decrees*. From whence it will follow very evidently, that seeing it is not a matter of faith, but a disputed question amongst you, Whether the Oath of allegeance be lawful: that either you acknowledge not the King your superiour, or do against conscience, in opposing his and the Kingdoms decree, requiring the taking of this Oath. This good use, I say, may very fairly be made of it, and is by men of your Religion. But then it is so far from being a confutation, that it is rather a confirmation of D. *Potter*'s assertion. For he that useth these words, Doth he not plainly import (and such was the case of Protestants) that we are to leave our Superiours, to cast off obedience to them, and publickly 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, alledged. *For, what if* S. Cyprian *holding his opinion true, but not necessary, condemned no man (much less any Church) for holding the contrary?* Yet, methinks, this should lay no obligation upon *Luther* to do so likewise: seeing he held his own opinions not only true, but also necessary, and the doctrine of the *Roman* Church not only false but damnable. And therefore seeing the condition and state of the parties censured by St. *Cyprian* and *Luther* was so different, no marvel 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 Fundamental or necessary*, you have been often told, that it is a Calumny. We hold your errors as damnable in themselves as you do ours, only by accident through invincible ignorance, we hope they are not unpardonable: and you also profess to think the same of ours.



109. *Ad §.* 42. The former part of this discourse, grounded on D. *Potter*'s words *p.* 105. I have already in passing examined and confuted: I add in this place, 1. That though the Doctor say, *It is not fit for any private man to oppose his judgment to the publick*; that is, his own judgment and bare authority: yet he denies not, but occasions may happen wherein it may be warrantable, to oppose his reason or the authority of Scripture against it; and is not then to be esteemed to oppose his own judgment to the publick, but the judgment of God to the judgment 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 have 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 do it with evidence of Scripture. But if he will factiously advance his own conceits* (that is, say I, clean contrary to your gloss) *Such as have not evident nor very probable ground in Scripture*, (for these conceits are properly his own) *he may justly be branded*, &c. Now that this of the two is the better gloss, 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 fastening upon them this absurd construction: They not only bearing, but even requiring another more fair and more sensible. Every man ought to be presumed to speak sense, rather than non-sense; coherently, rather than contradictiously, if his words be fairly 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 do you any service. For though he says, that *men are bound to do whatsoever the sentence of final Decision shall determine*, as it is plain men are bound to yield such an obedience to all Courts of civil judicature: yet he says not, they *are bound to think* that determination lawful, and that sentence just. Nay, it is plain he says, that *they must do according to the Judge's sentence, though*

*though in their private opinion it ſeem unjuſt.* As if I be caſt wrongfully in a ſuit at Law, and ſentenced to pay an hundred pound, I am bound to pay the money; yet I know no Law of God or man, that binds me in conſcience to acquit the Judge of error in his ſentence. The queſtion therefore being only what men ought to think, it is vain for you to tell us what M. *Hooker* ſays 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 do, for point of external obedience. When, in the very ſame place, he ſuppoſeth and alloweth, that in their private opinion they may think, This ſentence to which they yield a paſſive obedience, to ſwerve 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 judicial and final deciſion juſt and right, though it ſeem in their private opinion to ſwerve utterly from what is right*; It is manifeſt, you make him contradict himſelf, and make him ſay in effect, They muſt think thus, though at the ſame time they think the contrary. Neither is there any *neceſſity, that he muſt either acknowledge the univerſal infallibility of the Church, or drive men into diſſembling againſt their conſcience*, ſeeing nothing hinders, but I may obey the ſentence of a Judge, paying the money he awards me to pay, or forgoing the houſe or land which he hath judged from me, and yet withal plainly profeſs, that in my conſcience I conceive his judgment erroneous. To which purpoſe, they have a ſaying in *France*, that *whoſoever is caſt in any cauſe, hath liberty for ten days after, to rail at his Judges.*

110. This anſwer to this place, the words themſelves offered me, even as they are alleadged by you: But upon peruſal of the place in the Author himſelf, I find 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 have them do whatſoever the ſentence of judicial and final Deciſion ſhall determine.* Obſerve, I pray, He ſays 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 have plain Scripture or Reaſon, neither for them nor againſt them, and wherein men are perſwaded this or that way, *Upon their own only probable collection*; In ſuch caſes, *This perſwaſion* (ſaith he) *ought to be fully ſetled in mens hearts, that the will of God is, that they ſhould not diſobey the certain commands of their lawful Superiours, upon uncertain grounds: But do that which the ſentence of judicial and final deciſion ſhall determine.* For the purpoſe, a Queſtion there is, Whether a Surplice may be worn in Divine Service: The Authority of Superiours injoyns this Ceremony, and neither Scripture nor Reaſon plainly forbids it. *Sempronius* notwithſtanding, is, by ſome inducements, which he confeſſes to be only probable, led to this perſwaſion, that the thing is unlawful. The *quare* is, Whether he ought for matter of practice to 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 live in, are to be obeyed in all things, not certainly unlawful.* Which rule is your own, and by you extended to the commands of all Superiours, in the very next Section before this, in theſe words, *In caſes of uncertainty we are not to leave our Superiour, nor caſt off his Obedience, or publickly oppoſe his Decrees.* And yet, if a man ſhould conclude upon you, that either you make all Superiours univerſally infallible, or elſe drive men into perplexities and labyrinths of doing againſt conſcience, I preſume you would not think your ſelf fairly dealt with; but alleadge, 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. *Hooker's* words which are apparently alſo reſtrained to *caſes of uncertainty.* For as for requiring a blind and an unlimited obedience, to Eccleſiaſtical deciſions univerſally and in all caſes, even when plain Texts or Reaſon ſeems to controul them, M. *Hooker* is as far from making ſuch an Idol of Eccleſiaſtical Authority, as the Puritans whom he



he writes againſt: *I grant* (ſaith he) *that proof derived from the authority of mans judgment, is not able to work that aſſurance which doth grow by a ſtronger proof. And therefore although ten thouſand General Councils would ſet down one and the ſame definitive Sentence, concerning any point of Religion whatſoever; yet one demonſtrative Reaſon alledged, or one manifeſt Teſtimony cited from the Word of God himſelf, to the contrary, could not chuſe but overweigh them all: in as much as for them to be deceived, it is not impoſſible; it is, that Demonſtrative Reaſon, or Divine Teſtimony, ſhould deceive.* 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 prevail 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 kind of captivity of judgment; and, though there be reaſon to the contrary, not to liſten to it, but follow like Beaſts, the firſt in the Herd, this were brutiſh.* Again, *That authority of men ſhould prevail with men either againſt or above reaſon, is no part of our belief. Companies of learned men, be they never ſo great and reverend, are to yield unto reaſon, the weight whereof, is no whit prejudiced by the ſimplicity of his perſon which doth alledge it, but being found to be ſound and good, the bare opinion of men to the contrary, muſt of neceſſity ſtoop and give place.* Thus Mr. *Hooker* in his 7. §. Book 2. which place becauſe it is far diſtant from that which is alledged 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 Sect. out of which you take this corrupted ſentence, he hath very pregnant words to the ſame effect: *as for the orders eſtabliſh'd, ſith equity and reaſon favour that which is in being, till orderly judgment of deciſion be given againſt it, it is but juſtice to exact of you, and perverſeneſs in you it ſhould be to deny thereunto your willing obedience. Not that I judge it a thing allowable, for men to obſerve thoſe Laws, which in their hearts they are ſtedfaſtly perſwaded to be againſt the Law of God: But your perſwaſion in this caſe, ye are all bound for the time to ſuſpend; and, in otherwiſe doing, ye offend againſt God, by troubling his Church without juſt and neceſſary cauſe. Be it that there are ſome reaſons inducing you to think hardly of our Laws: Are thoſe Reaſons demonſtrative, are they neceſſary, or but meer probabilities only? An argument neceſſary and demonſtrative is ſuch, as, being propoſed to any man and underſtood, the mind cannot chooſe but inwardly aſſent. Any one ſuch reaſon diſcharged, I grant, the Conſcience, and ſetteth it at full liberty. For the publick 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 proof that they are not good, it muſt give place.* This plain declaration of his judgment in this matter, this expreſs limitation of his former reſolution, he makes in the very ſame Section, which affords your former quotation; and therefore what Apology can be made for you, and your Store-houſe Mr. *Brerely*, for diſſembling of it, I cannot poſſibly imagine.

111. D. *Potter*, p. 131. ſays, *That 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 Schiſmaticks. From hence you conclude that the ſame condemnation muſt paſs againſt the firſt Reformers, ſeeing they alſo oppoſed the commands of the Church, impoſed on them, for ſilencing all Diſputes, and ſetling Peace and Unity in Government.* But this Collection is deceitful, 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 do 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 *Luther*'s person, and none against his cause, which alone I have undertaken to justifie, and therefore I pass 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 and done, especially of them whom *Bellarmine* believes, in such a long train *to have gone to the Devil*, 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 esteem it not unpardonable in the great and Heroical spirit of *Luther*, if, being opposed, and perpetually baited with a world of Furies, he 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 Gospel? Unless you desire to hear of your killing of Kings, Massacring of Peoples, Blowing up of Parliaments; and have a mind to be askt, Whether it be probable, that that should be Gods cause, which needs to be maintain'd by such devilish means?

113. *Ad* § 44, 45. In the two next Particles, which are all of this Chapter, that remain unspoken to, you spend a great deal of reading, and wit, and reason, against some men, who pretending to honour and believe the Doctrine and 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 judgment cannot be defended. For if they believe the Doctrine of your Church, then must they believe this Doctrine, that they are to return to your Communion. And therefore if they do 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 Work which you profess to have written meerly against Protestants, all this might have been spared.

## CHAP. VI.

### *That* Luther, *and the rest of the Protestants have added Heresie unto Schism.*

BEcause Vice is best known by the contrary Virtue, we cannot well determine what *Heresie* is, nor who be *Heretiques*, but by the opposite virtue of *Faith*, whose Nature being once understood as far as belongs to our present purpose, we shall pass on, with ease, to the definition of heresie, and so be able to discern who be *Heretiques*. And this I intend to do, not by entring into such particular Questions, as are controverted between Catholiques and Protestants, but only by applying some general grounds, either already proved, or else yielded to on all sides.

2. Almighty God having ordained Man to a supernatural End of Beatitude by *supernatural means*, it was requisite that his understanding should be enabled to apprehend that *End*, and *Means*, by a *supernatural* knowledge. And because if such a knowledge were no more than *probable*, it could not be able sufficiently to overbear our will, and encounter with humane probabilities, being backed with the strength of flesh and blood; It was further necessary, that this supernatural knowledge should be most *certain* and infallible; and that *Faith* should believe nothing more *certainly* than that it self is a most *certain* Belief, and so be able to beat down all gay *probabilities* of humane *Opinion*. And because the aforesaid *means* and *end of Beatifical Vision* do far exceed the reach of natural wit, the *certainty* of faith could not always be joyned with such *evidence* of reason, as is wont to be found in the *Principles*, or *Conclusions*, of humane
(a) 2 Cor. 10. natural *Sciences*, that so all flesh might not glory in the arm of flesh, but 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 unknown, or *inevident* by any humane discourse, but that absolutely also it should be obscure in it self, and (ordinarily speaking) be void even of supernatural evid nce, 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 *Understanding* to his *Wisdom* and *Words*, captivating (as the Apostle
(b) 2 Cor. 10. 5. speaks) the same *Understanding* (b) to the obedience of Faith: Which occasion had been wanting, if Almighty God had made clear 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 abstain from believing, by suspending our Judgments, 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 example of innumerable Arch-heretiques can bear witness. This obscurity of faith we learn 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 glass* (d) *in a dark manner: but then face to face*. And accordingly S. Peter saith, *Which you do well attending unto, as to* (e) *a candle shining in a dark place*.
(c) Heb. 11.
(d) 1 Cor. 13.
(e) 2 Pet. 1. 19.

3. Faith being then *obscure* (whereby it differeth from natural *Sciences*) and yet being most *certain* and



and *infallible* (wherein it surpasseth humane Opinion) it must rely 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 *formal 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 and ground of our Faith were *obscurely propounded* to us, but were not in it self *infallible*, it would leave our assent in *obscurity*, but could not indue it with *certainty*. We must therefore for the ground of our faith, find out a motive obscure to *us*, but most certain *in it self*; that the act of faith may remain 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 supernatural truth, since God hath been no less perfect than he is, although he had never revealed any of those objects which we now believe.

4. Nevertheless, because Almighty God out of his infinite wisdom and sweetness doth concur with his Creatures in such sort as may befit the temper, and exigence of their natures; and because Man is a Creature endued with *reason*, God doth not exact of his Will or Understanding any other then, as the Apostle saith, *rationabile* (f) *obsequium*, an Obedience sweetned with good reason; which could not so (f) Rom. 12. 1. appear, if our Understanding were summoned to believe with *certainty*, things no way represented as infallible and *certain*. And therefore Almighty God obliging us under pain of eternal damnation to believe with greatest certainty divers verities, not known by the light of natural reason, cannot fail to furnish our Understanding with such inducements, motives, and arguments as may sufficiently perswade any mind which is not partial or passionate, that the objects which we believe, proceed from an Authority so *Wise*, that it cannot 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 *argumenta credibilitatis, arguments of credibility*, which though they cannot make us *evidently* see what we believe, yet they *evidently* convince that, in true wisdom, and prudence, the objects of faith deserve credit, and ought to be accepted as things revealed by God. For without such reasons and inducements, our judgment of faith could not be conceived prudent, holy Scripture telling us, that, *he who soon* (h) *believes, is light of heart*. By these arguments and inducements our Understanding is both satisfied with *evidence of credibility*, and the objects of faith retain their *obscurity*: because it is a different thing to be evidently *credible*, and evidently *true*; as those who were present at the Miracles wrought by our blessed Saviour, and his Apostles, did not evidedtly 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 truth revealed by God.
(g) Psal. 92.
(h) Eccles. 19. 4.

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 Predecessors, and these from their upwards, till we come to the Apostles, and our Blessed Saviour; which gradation is known by evidence of sense, by reading Books, 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 self same thing, if it had been but a fiction invented by themselves, as ancient *Tertullian* well saith, *How is it likely that so many* (i) *and so great Churches should err 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 infernal spirits; and lastly, the perpetual 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 powerful ways, did communicate to their Doctrin, & to the Church of their times, together with the divine Certainty which *they* received from our blessed Saviour himself, revealing to mankind what he heard from his 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 known by means of holy *Tradition*, we cannot conjoyn the present Church, and Doctrine, with the Church, and Doctrine of the Apostles, but must invent some new means, 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 can be known but by *Tradition*; as is truly observed by *Tertullian*, saying, *I will prescribe, that* (l) *there is no means to prove what the Apostles preached, but by the same Church which they founded*.
(i) *Præscript.* c. 28.
(k) *Præscr.* c. 21. & 37.
(l) *Præscr.* c. 21.

6. Thus then we are to proceed: By evidence of manifest and incorrupt Tradition, I know that there hath always 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, Unity, *&c.* and, by all those ways whereby the Apostles, and our Blessed Saviour himself 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 *formal object* 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 cometh to be endued with those 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 mean as is infallible in it self, and to us is evidently known that it proposeth this point or that, and which can manifestly declare in what sense it proposeth them; which means we have proved to be only the visible Church of Christ. *Obscurity*, from the manner in which God speaks to mankind, which ordinarily is such, that it doth not manifestly shew the person who speaks, nor the truth of the thing spoken. *Prudence* is not wanting, because

cause our faith is accompanied with so many arguments of *Credibility*, that every well disposed *Understanding*, 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 by God, and is sufficiently propounded to us for such*: which proposal is ordinarily made by the Visible Church of Christ. I say, *Sufficiently proposed by the Church*; not that I purpose to dispute whether the proposal of the Church enter into the *formal Object*, or *Motive* of Faith: or whether any error be an heresie, *formally and precisely*, because it is against the proposition of the Church, as if such proposal were the formal Object of Faith, which D. *Potter*, to no purpose at all, labours so very hard to disprove: But I only affirm, that when the Church propounds any Truth, as revealed by God, we are assured that it is such indeed; and so it instantly grows, to be a fit object for Christian Faith, which inclines and enables us to believe whatsoever is duly 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 lawful Superiour notifies his will, by the means, and, as it were, proposal of some faithful messenger, the subject of such a Superiour in performing, or neglecting what is delivered by the Messenger is said to obey, or disobey his own lawful Superiour. And therefore because the testimony of God is notified by the Church, we may, and we do most truly say, that not to believe 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 go* (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 terms, 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 concern points in themselves great or small, fundamental or not fundamental. For more being required to an act of Virtue, than of Vice, if any truth though never so small may be believed by *faith* as soon as we know it to be testified by divine revelation; much more will it be a formal *Heresie* to deny any least point sufficiently propounded as a thing witnessed by God.

10. This divine Faith is divided into *Actual* and *Habitual*. *Actual* faith, or faith actuated, is when we are in act of consideration, and belief of some mystery of Faith; for example, that our Saviour Christ, is true God, and Man, *&c.* *Habitual* faith, is that from which we are denominated *Faithful*, or *Believers*, as by *Actual* 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 Soul, even when we are sleeping, or not thinking of any mystery of faith. This is the first among the three *Theological* Virtues. For *Charity* unites us to God, as he is infinitely *Good in himself*; *Hope* ties us to him, as he is unspeakably *Good to us*, Faith joyns us to him, as he is the *Supreme immovable Verity*. *Charity* relies on his *Goodness*; *Hope* on his *Power*; *Faith* on his divine *Wisdom*. From hence it followeth, that *Faith* being one of the Virtues which Divines term *Infused* (that is, which cannot be acquired by humane wit, or industry, but are in their Nature and Essence supernatural) it hath this property; that it is not destroyed by little and little, (contrarily to the *Habits* called *acquisiti*, that is, *gotten by humane endeavour*, which as they are successively produced, so also are they lost successively, 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 overthrown, and, as it were, demolished, and razed by every such act. Wherefore, as *Charity*, or the love of God, is expelled from our soul by any one act of *Hatred*, or any other mortal sin 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 *Heresie*, because every such act is directly, and formally opposite thereunto. I know that some sins which (as Divines speak) are *ex genere suo*, in their kind, grievous and *mortal*, may be much lessened, and fall to be *venial, ob levitatem materiæ*, because they may happen to be exercised in a matter of small consideration; as for example, to steal a peny is venial, although Theft in his kind be a deadly sin. But it is likewise true, that this Rule is not general for all sorts of sins; there being some so inexcusably wicked of their own nature, that no smalness of matter, nor paucity in number can defend them from being deadly sins. For, to give an instance, what blasphemy against God, or voluntary false Oath is not a deadly sin? 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 redounding to the injury of God's supreme wisdom and goodness, is always great, and enormous. They were no precious stones which *David* (n) pickt out of the water, to encounter *Golias*, and yet if a man take from the number but one, and say they were but four, against the Scripture affirming them to have been five, he is instantly guilty of a damnable sin. Why? Because by this substraction of *One*, he doth deprive God's Word and Testimony of *all* credit and infallibility. For, if either he could deceive, or be deceived in any *one* thing, it were but wisdom to suspect him in *all*. And seeing every *Heresie* opposeth some Truth revealed by God: it is no wonder that no one can be excused from deadly, and damnable sin; for, if voluntary *Blasphemy*, and *Perjury*, which are opposed only to the *infused Moral* Virtue of *Religion*, can never be excused from mortal sin: much less can *Heresie* be excused, which opposeth the *Theological* Virtue of *Faith*.

(n) 1 *Reg.* 17.

11. If any object, that *Schism* may seem to be a greater sin than *Heresie*: because the Virtue of *Charity* (to which Schism is opposite) is greater than 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 Objects, one principal to wit, the Divine* (p) *Goodness*; *and another secondary, namely the good of our Neighbour*: *But Schism and other sins which are committed against our Neighbour, are opposite to Charity in respect of this secondary good, which is less than the object of Faith, which is God, as he is the Prime Verity, on which Faith doth rely*; *and therefore these sins are less than Infidelity*. He takes *Infidelity* after a general manner, as it comprehends *Heresie*, and other vices against Faith.

(o) 1 Cor. 13. 13.
(p) 2. 2. *q.* 39. *ar.* 2. *in corp.* & *ad* 3.

12. Having therefore sufficiently declared, wherein *Heresie* 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 err 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



13. Now, that *Luther* and his followers cannot be excused from formal *Heresie*, I prove by these reasons. To oppose any truth propounded by the visible true Church, as revealed by God, is formal *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 she propounded, as divine revealed truths, things which they judged either to be false, or humane inventions: Therefore they committed formal *Heresie*.

14. Moreover, every Errour against any doctrine revealed by God, is a damnable Heresie, whether the matter in it self be great or small, as I proved before: and therefore either the Protestants or the *Roman* Church must be guilty of formal Heresie, because one of them must err against the word and testimony of God: but you grant (perforce) that the *Roman* Church doth not err damnably, and I add that she cannot err damnably because she is the truly Catholique Church, which you confess cannot err damnably: Therefore Protestants must be guilty of formal *Heresie*.

15. Besides, we have shewed that the visible Church is Judge 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 Heresie.

16. Again, 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 formal Heretique I demonstrate in this manner. To say, that God's visible true Church is not universal, but confined to one only place or corner of the world, is according to your own express words (q) *properly* Heresie, *against that Article of the Creed, wherein we profess to believe the holy Catholique Church*: And you brand *Donatus* with Heresie, because he limited the universal Church to *Africa*. But it is manifest, and acknowledged by *Luther* himself, and other chief Protestants, that *Luther*'s Reformation when it first began (and much more for divers ages before) was not *Universal*, nor spread over the world, but was confined to that compass of ground which did contain *Luther*'s body. Therefore his Reformation cannot be excused from formal Heresie. 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 do 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 City of *Wittemberg*, or to the place where *Luther*'s feet stood, but must be spread over the whole world. It is therefore *most impudent vanity and dotage* to limit her to *Luther*'s Reformation. In another place also this holy Father writes no less effectually against *Luther* than against the *Donatists*. For having out of those words, *In thy seed all Nations shall be blessed*, proved that God's Church must be *Universal*, he saith, *Why* (s) *do you super-add, by saying that Christ remains heir in no part of the earth, except where he may have* Donatus *for his Coheir. Give me this* (Universal) *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 Universal 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 Universal Church: *She hath this* (t) *most certain mark, that she cannot be hidden*: *She is then known to all Nations. The Sect of* Donatus *is unknown to many Nations*; *therefore that cannot be she. The Sect of* Luther (at least when he began, and much more before his beginning) *was unknown to many Nations, therefore that cannot be she*.

(q) *Pag.* 126.
(r) *Epist.* 50.
(s) *De Unit. Eccles. cap.* 6.
(t) *Cont. lit. Petil. lib.* 1. *cap.* 104.

17. And that it may yet further appear 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 than 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 *Traditors*, 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 City, 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 sign of being a true Catholique. They had also, as S. *Augustin* witnesseth, a pretended (w) Church in the house and territory of a Spanish Lady called *Lucilla*, 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 affirm 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 nevertheless they sufficiently declared, that they did not hold that the true Church ought necessarily to be confined to one place, but only by meer 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, than he who should affirm that *Luther*'s Reformation in the very beginning was *spread over the whole Earth*; being at that time by many degrees not so far 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 likeness of phrase with the *Donatists*, who called the Chair of *Rome*, the Chair of pestilence, and the *Roman* Church an Harlot, which is D. *Potter*'s own phrase, wherein he is less excusable than they, because he maintaineth her to be a true Church of Christ: and therefore let him duly ponder these words of S. *Augustine* against the *Donatists*, *If I persecute him justly 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 do even in this your Book write against some of your Protestant Brethren, or as you call them Zealots 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 universal;

(u) *Anno* 321. *nu.* 2. *Spond.*
(w) *De Uni. Eccles. c.* 3.
(x) *Ep.* 163.
(y) *Conc. super gest. cum Emerit.*

universal: For which very cause S. *Augustine* complains of *Ticonius*, that although he wrote against the Donatists, yet he was of *an heart* (z) *so extremely 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 unity 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, than by yielding thereto, to be overcome by those Churches in Africa, which enjoyed the Communion of that Unity 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 pass, and only urge the main point: That since *Luther*'s 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 affirm 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 heresie follows out of the doctrin of D. *Potter*, and other Protestants, that the Church may err in points not fundamental, because we have shewed that every error against any one revealed truth, is *Heresie*, and *damnable*, whether the matter be otherwise, of it self, great or small. And how can the Church more truly be said to perish, than when she is permitted to maintain a *damnable Heresie*? Besides, we will hereafter prove, that by any act of Heresie, all divine faith is lost; and to imagine a true Church of faithful persons without any faith, is as much as to fancy a living man without life. It is therefore clear, that Donatist-like they hold that the Church of Christ perished: yea, they are worse than 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 go forward to other reasons.

(z) *De doct. Christ. lib. 3. cap. 30.*

(a) *Cont. Parm. l. 1. cap. 1.*

18. The holy Scripture, and ancient Fathers do assign Separation from the visible Church as a mark of *Heresie*; according to that of S. *John*, *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 known that *Luther* and his followers departed out of *her*: Therefore she is no way liable 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 Universal 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 likewise is no less clearly proved out of S *Cyprian*, saying, *Not we* (g) *departed from them, but they from us, and since Heresies and Schisms are bred afterwards, while they make to themselves divers Conventicles, they have forsaken the head and origin of truth.*

(b) *1 Joan.* 19.
(c) Acts 15. 24.
(d) Acts 20. 30.
(e) *Lib. adversus hær. c.* 34.

(f) *Dimid. temp. cap.* 5.

(g) Ep. 57. *ad Damas.*

19. And that we might not remain doubtful what Separation it is, which is the mark of *Heresie*, 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 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. *Hierom* writing to Pope *Damasus*, saith, *I am in the Communion* (h) *of the Chair of* Peter; *I know that the Church is built upon that Rock. Whosoever shall eat the Lamb out of this house, he is prophane. If any shall not be in the Ark of* Noah, *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 Books 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 Angel should denounce otherwise than it hath once been preached.* S. *Ambrose* recounting how his Brother *Satyrus* inquiring for a Church wherein to give thanks for his delivery from shipwrack, saith, *He called unto* (l) *him the Bishop, neither did he esteem 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 Rites* (m) *of Venerable Communion do flow to all.* Saint *Cyprian* saith, *They are bold* (n) *to sail to the Chair of* Peter, *and to the principal Church, from whence Priestly Unity hath sprung. Neither do they consider, that they are* Romans, *whose faith was commended by the preaching of the Apostle, to whom falshood cannot have access.* Where we see this holy Father joyns together the *principal Church*, and the *Chair of Peter*: and affirmeth that *falshood* not only hath not had, but *cannot have access to that Sea.* And elsewhere, *Thou wrotest that I should send* (o) *a Copy of the same letters to* Cornelius *our Colleague, that laying aside all sollicitude, he might now be assured that thou didst communicate with him, that is, with the Catholique Church.* What think you Mr. 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*? St. *Irenæus* saith, *Because it were long to number the succession of all Churches,* (p) *we declaring the Tradition* (and faith preached to men, and coming 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, coming to us by succession of Bishops; we confound all those who any way either by evil complacence of themselves, or vain-glory, or by blindness, or ill opinion, do gather otherwise than they ought. For to this Church for a more powerful Principality, it is necessary that all Churches resort, that is, all faithful people of what place soever: in which* (Roman *Church*) *the Tradition which is from the Apostles hath always been conserved from those who are every where.* Saint *Augustine* saith, *It grieves us* (q) *to see you so to lie cut off. Number the Priests even from the See of* Peter, *and consider in that order of Fathers who succeeded to whom She is the Rock which the proud Gates of Hell do* not

(h) *Lib. 1. Apolog.*

(i) *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. partem Donati.*



*not overcome.* And in another place, speaking of *Cæcilianus*, he saith: *He might contemn the conspiring* (r) *multitude of his enemies, because he knew himself to be united, by Communicatory letters both to the* Roman *Church in which the Principality of the See Apostolique did always flourish; and to other Countries from whence the Gospel came first into* Africa. Ancient *Tertullian* saith, *If thou be near* Italy, *thou hast* Rome, *whose* (s) *Authority is neer at hand to us: a happy Church, into which the Apostles have poured all Doctrine, together with their Blood.* Saint *Basil* 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 mayest discern betwixt that which is counterfeit, and that which is lawful and pure, and without any diminution mayest preach the faith of our Ancestors. Maximinianus* Bishop of *Constantinople* about twelve hundred years ago, said, *All the bounds of the earth who have 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 Sun, &c. For the Creator of the world, amongst all men of the world elected him,* (he speaks of St. *Peter*) *to whom he granted the Chair of Doctor to be principally possessed by a perpetual right of Priviledge; that whosoever is desirous to know any Divine and profound thing, may have recourse to the Oracle, and Doctrine of this Instruction. John* Patriarch of *Constantinople*, more than eleven hundred years ago in an Epistle to Pope *Hormisda*, writeth thus, *Because* (u) *the beginning of salvation is to conserve the rule of right Faith, and in no wise to swerve from the Tradition of our Fore-fathers; because the words of our Lord cannot fail, saying, Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock will I build my Church: the proofs of deeds have made good those words; because in the Sea Apostolical the Catholique Religion is always 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 produced to this purpose; but these may serve to shew, that both the *Latin* and *Greek* Fathers held for a Note of being a Catholique, or an Heretique, to have been united, or divided from the See of *Rome*. And I have purposely alledged only such Authorities of Fathers, as speak of the priviledges of the See of *Rome*, as of things permanent and depending on our Saviour's promise to S. *Peter*, from which a general rule, and ground ought to be taken for all Ages, because *Heaven and Earth shall* (w) *pass, but the word of our Lord shall remain for ever.* So that I here conclude, that seeing it is manifest that *Luther* and his followers divided themselves from the See of *Rome*, they bear the inseparable Mark of *Heresie*.

(r) Ep. 162.

(s) *Prescr. c.* 36.

(t) *Epist. ad Pont. Rom.*

(u) *Epist. ad Hormisd. P. P.*

(w) Mat. 24. 35.

20 And though my meaning be not to treat the point of Ordination or Succession, in the Protestants Church, because the Fathers alledged in the last reason, assign Succession as one mark of the true Church; I must not omit to say, that according to the grounds of *Protestants* themselves, they can neither pretend *personal 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 Divines call a *Character*, which cannot be taken away by *deposition, degradation*, or other means whatsoever; and endued also with Jurisdiction and Authority to teach, to preach, to govern the Church by laws, 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 affirm, that when their pretended Bishops or Priests are deprived of Jurisdiction, or degraded, they remain meer lay persons as before their Ordination; fulfilling what *Tertullian* objects as a mark of Heresie: *To day a Priest, to morrow* (x) *a Lay-man.* For if here be no immovable *Character*, their power of *Order* must consist only in Jurisdiction, and authority; or in a kind of moral 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 Jurisdiction. For all the Authority, or Jurisdiction, 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 give them Authority. But, according to their own Doctrine, they believe that the Pope neither *hath, or ought to have any Jurisdiction, Power, Superiority, Preheminence, or Authority Ecclesiastical, or Spiritual within this Realm*, which they swear even when they are ordained Bishops, Priests, and Deacons: How then can the Pope give Jurisdiction where they swear he neither *hath, or OUGHT to have, any!* Or, if yet he had, how could they without *Schism* withdraw themselves from his obedience? Beside, the *Roman* Church never gave 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 gave Authority to their pretended Successors? The Primate of *England*? But from whom had he such Authority? And after his decease, who shall confer Authority upon his Successors? The Temporal Magistrate? King *Henry*, neither a Catholique nor a Protestant? King *Edward*, a Child? Queen *Elizabeth* a Woman? An Infant of one hours Age, is true King in case of his Predecessors decease: But shall your Church lie fallow till that Infant-King and green Head of the Church come to years of discretion? Do 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 chief Protestants, as D. *Andrews*, *Wotton*, &c. not held for any necessary point of Faith; And from whom I pray you, had Bishops their Authority when there were no Christian Kings? Must the *Greek* Patriarchs receive spiritual Jurisdiction from the *Great Turk*? Did the Pope by the Baptism of Princes, lose the spiritual Power he formerly had of conferring spiritual Jurisdiction vpon Bishops? Hath the Temporal Magistrate authority to preach, to assoil from sins, to inflict Excommunications, and other Censures? Why hath he not power to Excommunicate, as well as to dispense in Irregularity, as our late Sovereign Lord King *James*, either dispensed with the late Archbishop of *Canterbury*, or else gave Commission to some Bishops to do it? And since they were subject to their Primate, and not he to them, it is clear, 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 have no such authority, how can he give to others what himself hath not? Your Ordination, or Consecration of Bishops and Priests imprinting no *Character*, can only consist in giving a Power, Authority, Jurisdiction, or (as I said before) some kind of Deputation to exercise Episcopal, or Priestly functions; If then, the Temporal Magistrate confers this power, *&c.* he can, nay he cannot

(x) *Prescr. c.* 41.

cannot chuse but, Ordain and Consecrate Bishops, and Priests, as often as he confers Authority or Jurisdiction: and your Bishops assoon as they are designed and 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 be more unwilling to grant, than 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 receive any Spiritual Jurisdiction from any Temporal Prince, and therefore if Jurisdiction must be derived from Princes, he hath none at all: and yet either you must acknowledge, that he hath true Spiritual Jurisdiction, or that your selves can receive none from him.

21. Moreover, this new Reformation, or Reformed Church of Protestants, will by them be pretended to be *Catholique* or *Universal*, 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 personal succession, unless of such fat-beneficed Bishops as *Nicholas Amsfordius*, who was consecrated by *Luther*, (though *Luther* himself 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 Kingdom with *personal 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 personal Succession of Bishops, they retain the note of *Schism*, and *Heresie*. So that the Church of Protestants must either not be *universal*, as being confined to *England*: Or if you will needs comprehend all those Churches which want succession, you must confess, that your Church doth not only communicate with *Schismatical* and *Heretical* 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 heretical Churches. For it is impossible to retain Communion with the true Catholique Church, and yet agree with them who are divided from her by Schism, or Heresie; because that were to affirm, that for the self 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 maintain that Heresie 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 review in the *fifth Chapter*, and 17. *Number*.

(y) *In Millenario sexto, Pag.* 187.

22. But besides this defect in the personal Succession of Protestant Bishops, there is another of great moment; which is, that they want the right *Form* 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 fail to do 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 form of our Ordination with that of Protestants; and to remember that if the form which they use either in consecrating Bishops, or in ordaining Priests be at least doubtful, they can neither have undoubted Priests, nor Bishops. For *Priests* cannot be ordained but by true *Bishops*, nor can any be a true Bishop, unless he first be *Priest*. I say, their Ordination is at least doubtful; because that sufficeth for my present purpose. For Bishops and Priests, whose Ordination is *notoriously known* to be but doubtful, 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 Baptism, with manifest danger of invalidity, and with obligation to be at least conditionally repeated) so Protestants must remain doubtful of Remission of sins, of their Ecclesiastical 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 essential 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, *An.* 3. *Edw.* 6. *cap.* 2. when he was a Child about 12 years of age, *It was enacted, that such* (a) *form of making, and consecrating of Bishops and Priests, as by six Prelates, and six other to be appointed by the King, should be devised* (mark this word *devised*) *and set forth under the great Seal; 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. *Horn* a Protestant Bishop of *Winchester*, for his refusal of the Oath of Supremacy; and he excepting against the Indictment because D. *Horn* was no Bishop; all the Judges resolved that his exception was good, if indeed D. *Horn* 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 means of any Certificate by any Bishop or Archbishop made before this last Act. Whereby it is clear, that they made some doubt of their own Ordination, and that there is nothing but uncertainty in the whole business of their Ordination, which (forsooth) must depend upon Six Prelates, the great Seal, Acts of Parliament being contrary one to another, and the like.

(z) See *Adam. Tannerum, tom.* 4. *disp.* 7. *quæst.* 2. *dub.* 3. & 4.

(a) *Dyer, fol.* 234. *term. Mich.* 6. & 7 *Eliz.*

23. But though they want Personal Succession, yet at least they have succession of Doctrin as they say, and pretend to prove, because they believe as the *Apostles* believed. This is to beg the Question, and to take what, they may be sure, will never be granted. For if they want Personal Succession, and slight Ecclesiastical Tradition, how will they perswade any man, that they agree with the Doctrin of the Apostles? We have heard *Tertullian* saying, *I will prescribe* (b) (against all Heretiques) *that there is no means to prove what the Apostles preached, but by the same Churches which they founded.* And S. *Irenæus* tells 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 certain gift of truth.* S. *Augustine* saith, *I am kept in the Church* (e) *by the Succession of Priests from the very See 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 wholesome Rule (happy, if himself 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;*

(b) *Sup. c.* 5.

(c) *Lib.* 3. *c.* 5.

(d) *l.* 4. *c.* 43.

(e) *Contr. epist. Fundam. c.* 4.

(f) *Præf. ad lib. Periarchon.*



*let the preaching of the Church be kept, which is delivered by the Apostles by order of Succession, and remains 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 do these men brag of the doctrine of the Apostles, unless 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. *Austin*, is deduced *by undoubted SUCCESSION from the Sea* (g) *of the Apostles, even to the present Bishops.*

(g) *Cont. Faust. cap.* 2.

24. But yet nevertheless, 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 days of those persons, who challenge such a *Succession*. And so S. *Augustine* saith: we are to believe that Gospel which from the time of the Apostles *the* (h) *Church* hath brought down to our days *by a never-interrupted course of times and by undoubted succession of connection.* Now, that the Reformation, begun 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 sought to revive, and reduce to the knowledge, and practise of men. And they ought not to prove that they have a Succession of doctrine, because they agree with the doctrine of the Apostles; but contrarily we must infer, 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 amiss to note, that although the *Waldenses*, *Wickliff*, &c. had agreed with Protestants in all points of doctrine; yet they could not brag of Succession from them, because their doctrine hath not been free from *interruption*, which necessarily crosseth *Succession*.

(h) *Lib.* 28. *cont. Faust. cap.* 2.

25 And as want of Succession of Persons and *Doctrine*, cannot stand with that *Universality of Time*, which is inseparable from the *Catholique* Church; so likewise the disagreeing Sects which are dispersed through divers Countries, and Nations, cannot help towards that *Universality* of *Place*, wherewith the true Church must be endued: but rather such local multiplication, doth more and more lay open their division, and want of succession in Doctrine. For the excellent observation of S. *Austin* doth punctually agree with all Modern Heretiques; wherein this holy Father having cited these words out of the Prophet *Ezekiel*, (i) *My flocks are dispersed upon the whole face of the earth*; he adds 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 Heresie in the East, another in Egypt, another in Mesopotamia. In divers places there are divers: one mother, pride hath begot them all, as our own Mother the Catholique Church hath brought forth all faithful people dispersed throughout the whole world. No wonder then, if Pride breed Dissention, and Charity Union.* And in another place applying to Heretiques those words of the Canticles: *If thou know not* (l) *thy self, go forth, and follow after the steps of the flocks, and feed thy kids*, he saith: *If thou know not thy self, go* (m) *thou forth, I do not cast thee out, but go thou out, that it may be said of thee: They went from us, but they were not of us. Go 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 wandering flocks; And feed thy Kids, not as Peter, to whom is said, Feed thy sheep: but feed thy kids in the Tabernacle 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 down the marks of Heresie, to wit, *going out* from the Church, and want of Unity 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 *Universality* of *Time*, or *Place*, cannot avoid the just note of Heresie.

(i) *Cap.* 24.

(k) *Lib. de Past. cap.* 8.

(l) *Cant.* 1.

(m) *Ep.* 48.

26. Hitherto we have brought arguments to prove, that *Luther*, and all Protestants are guilty of *Heresie* against the *Negative* Precept of *Faith*, which obligeth her under pain of damnation, not to imbrace any one error, 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 *supernatural 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.

27. 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 prove to be wanting in the belief of Protestants even in those points which are true in themselves, and to which they yield assent, as happeneth in all those particulars, wherein they agree with us; from whence it will follow, that they wanting true *Divine faith*, want means absolutely necessary to salvation.

28. And first, that their belief wanteth *Certainty* I prove, because they denying the Universal infallibility of the Church can have no certain ground to know what objects are revealed, or testified by God. Holy Scripture is in it self most true and infallible; but without the direction and declaration of the Church, we can neither have certain means to know what Scripture is Canonical, nor what Translations be faithful, 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 deceived: And therefore it is clear that they have no one certain ground whereon to relie for understanding of Scripture. And seeing they hold all the Articles of Faith, even concerning fundamental points, upon the self same ground of Scripture, interpreted, not by the Churches Authority, according to some other Rules, which, as experience of their contradictions teach, do sometimes fail; it is clear 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 error: As all Arch-heretiques believing some truths, and withal divers errors 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 error.

The Faith of Protestants wanteth certainty.

29. Another cause of uncertainty in the faith of Protestants, must rise from their distinction of points fundamental, and not fundamental. For since they acknowledge, that every error in fundamental points

destroyeth the substance of faith, and yet cannot determine what points be fundamental, it followeth that they must remain uncertain whether or no they be not in some fundamental error, and so want the substance of faith, without which there can be no hope of salvation.

30. And that he who erreth against any one revealed truth (as certainly some Protestants must do, because contradictory Propositions cannot both be true) doth lose all *Divine Faith*, is a very true doctrine delivered by Catholique Divines, with so general a consent, that the contrary is wont to be censured as temerarious. The Angelical Doctor S. *Thomas* proposeth this Question: *Whether* (o) *be 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 denial of any one Article of Faith.* Whereof he gives this farther reason: *Because* (saith he) *the nature of every habit doth depend upon the formal Motive and Object thereof, which Motive being taken away the nature of the habit cannot remain. But the formal object of Faith is the supreme Truth as it is manifested in Scriptures, and in the doctrin of the Church which proceed from the same supreme Verity. Whosoever therefore doth not rely upon the doctrine of the Church (which proceeds from the supreme Verity, manifested in Scripture) as upon an infallible Rule, he hath not the habit of Faith, but believes those things which belong to Faith, by some other means than by Faith: as, if one should remember some conclusions, and not know the reason of that demonstration, it is clear that he hath not certain knowledge, but only opinion. Now it is manifest, that he who relies on the doctrine of the Church, as upon an infallible Rule, will yield his assent to all, that the Church teacheth. For, if among those things which she teacheth, he hold what he will, and doth not hold what he will not, he doth not rely upon the doctrine of the Church, as upon an infallible Rule, but only upon his own will. And so it is clear, that an Heretick, 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 whosoever 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 St. *Thomas*. And afterward, *A man doth believe* (q) *all the Articles of Faith for one and the self 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 whosoever falls from this reason, or motive, is totally deprived of Faith.* From this true doctrine we 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 God's Divine testimony, which is involved in every least error against Faith. And since some Protestants must needs err, and that they have no certain rule to know, why rather one than another, it manifestly follows that none of them have any certainty for the substance of their Faith in any one point. Moreover D. *Potter*, being forced to confess that the *Roman* Church wants not the substance of Faith, it follows that she doth not err in any one point against Faith, because, as we have seen out of S. *Thomas*, every such error destroys the substance of Faith. Now, if the *Roman* Church did not err in any one point of Faith, it is manifest that Protestants err in all those points wherein they are contrary to her. And this may suffice to prove that the Faith of Protestants wants Infallibility.

(o) 2. 2. q. 5. art. 3. in corp.

(q) Ad 2.

*They want the second Condition of Faith: Obscurity.*

31 And now for the second condition of Faith, I say, If Protestants 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 Protestants, is setled on these two Principles: These particular Books are Canonical Scripture: And the sense and meaning of these Canonical Scriptures, is clear and evident, at least in all points necessary to Salvation. Now these Principles being once supposed, it clearly 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 *certain* and *evident* that whatsoever is contained in these Books is true. Which *Conclusion* I take for a *Major* 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, Original 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 natural discourse, but only to the *eye of reason cleared by grace*, as you speak. For supernatural evidence, no less (yea rather more) draws and excludes *obscurity*, than natural 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 clear a light: And therefore your imaginary faith is not the true faith defined by the Apostle, but an invention of your own.

*Their faith wants Prudence.*

32. That the faith of Protestants wanteth the third Condition which was *Prudence*, is deduced from all that hitherto hath been said. What wisdom 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 Universality of *Time* and *Place*; A Church which if it be 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 perpetual Existence, and Being. To leave, I say, such a Church, and frame a Community, without either Unity, or means to procure it; a Church which at *Luther*'s first revolt had no larger extent than where his body was; a Church without *Universality* 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 wisdom was it to follow such men as *Luther*, in an opposition against the Visible Church of Christ, begun upon meer passion? What wisdom is it to receive from *Us*, a Church, Ordination, Scriptures, Personal 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. *Austin* calls it) Foolishness, set down by him against the *Manichees*, and by me recited before. *I would not* (saith he) *believe* (r) *the Gospel, unless the Authority of the Church did move me. Those therefore whom I obeyed, saying, Believe the Gospel, why should I not obey the same men saying unto me, Do not believe Manichæus,* (Luther, Calvin, &c.) *Chuse what thou pleasest: If thou say, Believe the Catholiques; they warn me not to believe thee. Wherefore if I believe them, I cannot believe thee. If thou say, Do not believe the Catholiques; thou shalt not do well, in forcing me to the faith of Manichæus, because by the Preaching of Catholiques, I believed the Gospel it self. If thou say; you did well to believe them* (Catholiques) *commending the Gospel, 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 Foolishness, but meer *Madness*, 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 have thought to have been, or to be, if the belief thereof had been recommended by thee to me? 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 which deserves Authority. What MADNESS 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 self, that I were not to believe Christ, then I should learn any thing concerning him from other than those, by whom I believed him.* Lastly, I ask, What wisdom it could be to leave all visible Churches, and consequently the true Catholique Church of Christ, which you confess cannot err in points necessary to salvation, and the *Roman* Church which you grant doth not err in fundamentals, and follow private men who may err even in points necessary to salvation? Especially, if we add, 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 coming to dispute against other Heretiques, he is forced to give the Lye both to his own words and deeds, in saying, *We freely confess* (t) *that in the Papacy there are many good things worthy the name of Christian, which have come from them to us. Namely, we confess that in the Papacy there is true Scripture, true Baptism, the true Sacrament of the Altar, the true keys for the remission of sins, the true office of Preaching, true Catechism, as our Lords Prayer, Ten Commandments, Articles of faith,* &c. And afterward, *I avouch, that under the Papacy is true Christianity, yea, the Kernel and Marrow of Christianity, and many pious and great Saints.* And again he affirmeth, that *the Church of* Rome *hath the true Spirit, Gospel, Faith, Baptism, Sacraments, the Keys, the Office of Preaching, Prayer, Holy Scripture, and whatsoever Christianity ought to have.* And a little before, *I hear and see that they bring in Anabaptism only to this end, that they may spight the Pope, as men that will receive nothing from Antichrist; no otherwise than the Sacramentaries do, who therefore believe only Bread and Wine to be in the Sacrament, meerly in hatred against the Bishop of* Rome; *and they think that by this means they shall overcome the Papacy. Verily these men rely upon a weak ground, for by this means they must deny the whole Scripture, and the Office of Preaching. For we have all these things from the Pope, otherwise we must go make a new Scripture. O Truth, more forcible* (as St. *Austin* says) *to wring out* (x) *Confession, then is any rack, or torment!* And so we may truly say with *Moses*: *Inimici nostri sunt Judices, Our very enemies give* (y) *sentence for us.*

(r) Cont. ep. Fund. c. 5.

(s) Lib. de util. Cred. c. 14.

(t) In epist. cont. Anab. ad duos Parochos, to. 2. Germ. Wit. fol. 229, & 230.

(x) Cont. Donat. post collat. c. 24.

(y) Deut. 32. 31.

*Their faith wants Supernaturality.*

33. Lastly, since your faith wanteth *Certainty* and *Prudence*, it is easie to infer that it wants the fourth Condition, *Supernaturality*. For being but an *Humane* perswasion, or Opinion, it is not in nature or essence *Supernatural*. And being *imprudent*, and rash, it cannot proceed from Divine Motion and Grace; and therefore it is neither supernatural in it *self*, nor in the *cause* from which it proceedeth.

34. Since therefore we have proved, that whosoever errs against any one point of faith, loseth all divine faith, even concerning those other Articles wherein he doth not err; and that although he could still retain true faith for some points, yet any one error in whatsoever matter concerning faith, is a grievous sin; it clearly follows, 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 rashness, ambition, and fury; as D. *Potter* is very free in this kind: I desire every one to ponder the whole words of S. *Chrysostom*, who teacheth, that every least error overthrows all faith, and whosoever is guilty thereof is in the Church, like one, who in the *Commonwealth* forgeth false coin. *Let them hear* (saith this holy Father) *what S.* Paul *saith: Namely, that they who brought in some small error* (z) *had overthrown the Gospel. For, to shew how small a thing ill mingled doth corrupt the whole, he said, that the Gospel was subverted. For as he who clips a little of the stamp from the King's money, makes the whole piece of no value: so whosoever takes away the least particle of sound faith, is wholly corrupted, always going from that beginning to worse things. Where then are they, who condemn us as contentious persons, because we cannot agree with Heretiques: and do often say, that there is no difference betwixt us and them, but that our disagreement proceeds from Ambition to dominiter?* And thus having shewed that Protestants want true *Faith*, it remaineth that, according to my first design, I examine whether they do not also want *Charity*, as it respects a mans self.

(z) Gal. 1. 7.

## The ANSWER to the SIXTH CHAPTER.

### *That Protestants are not Heretiques.*

HE 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 greatness of his Evidence do equal, 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 yielded on all sides*: and after to raise a firm and stable structure of convincing arguments upon them. But both these I find to be meer and vain pretences, and having considered this Chapter also without prejudice or passion, as I did the former; I am enforc'd by

Ad sect. 1.

by the light of Truth, to pronounce your whole discourse, a painted and ruinous building upon a weak and sandy Foundation.

2. *Ad* Q 2, 3. First for your grounds; a great part of them, is falsly said to be either proved or granted. It is true indeed, that *Man by his natural wit or industry could never have attained to the knowledge of Gods will to give him a supernatural and eternal happiness*; nor of the means, by which his pleasure was to bestow this happiness upon him. And therefore your first ground is good, *That it was requisite his understanding should be enabled to apprehend that end and means, by a knowledge supernatural.* I say this is good, if you mean by *knowledge*, an apprehension or belief. But, if you take the word properly and exactly, it is both false; for faith is not knowledge, no more than three is four, but eminently contained in it: so that he that knows, believes and something more; but he that believes many times does not; nay, if he doth barely and meerly believe, he doth never know: and besides, it is retracted by your self presently, where you require, *That the object of Faith must be both naturally and supernaturally unknown.* And again in the next page, where you say, *Faith differs from science in regard of the object's obscurity.* For that science and knowledge properly taken are Synonymous terms, 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 proof of them.

3. But then whereas you add, *That, if such a knowledge were no more than probable, it could not be able sufficiently to over-bear our will, and encounter with humane probabilities, being backed with the strength of flesh and blood, and therefore conclude, that it was farther necessary, that this supernatural knowledge should be most certain and infallible*: To this I answer, that I do heartily acknowledge and believe, the Articles of our Faith to 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 finds in himself such a degree of Faith, such a strength of adherence: This I have already demonstrated to be a great error, and of dangerous and pernicious consequence. And because I am more and more confirm'd in my persuasion that the truth which I there delivered, is of great and singular use, I will here confirm it with more reasons. And to satisfie you that this is no singularity of my own, my Margent presents you with a (*a*) Protestant Divine of great authority, and no way singular in his opinions, who hath long since preached and justified the same doctrine.

(*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 sense. And is it as certain? Yea I taught, that the things which God doth promise in his word, are surer unto us than 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 proof than the thing proved, otherwise it is no proof. How is it that if ten men do all look upon the Moon, every one of them knows it as certainly to be the Moon as another: but many believing one and the same promises, all have not one and the same fulness of perswasion? How falleth it out, that men being assured of any thing by sense can be no surer of it than they are? whereas the strongest in faith that liveth upon the earth, had always need to labour, and strive, and pray, that his assurance concerning heavenly and spiritual things, may grow, increase, and be augmented.

4. I say, That every Text of Scripture which makes mention of any that were *weak*, or of any that were *strong in faith:* of any that were *of little*, 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 prayer you make to God to increase your faith, or (if you conceive such a prayer



prayer derogatory from the perfection of your faith,) the Apostles praying to Christ *to increase 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 sin, absolutely destructive, so long as it lasts, of all true and saving faith: which you are so far from granting, that you make it no sin at all, but only an occasion of merit: and if you should esteem it a sin, then must you acknowledge, contrary to your own Principles, that there are Actual sins meerly involuntary. The same is furthermore invincibly confirmed by every deliberate sin that any Christian commits; by any progress in Charity that he makes. For seeing, as S. *John* 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 than most certain,) then certainly their victory over the world, and therefore over the flesh, and therefore over sin, must of necessity be perfect, and so it should be impossible for any true believer to commit any deliberate sin; and therefore he that commits any sin, must not think himself 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 progress in it, but all true believers should be equal in Charity, as in faith you make them equal: and from thence it would follow unavoidably, that whosoever finds in himself any true faith, must presently perswade himself 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 clear and apparent; which shews 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 to Truth but even to all Religion and Piety, and fit for nothing but to make men negligent of making any progress in Faith or Charity. And therefore I must entreat and adjure you either to discover unto me (which I take God to witness 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 appear upon examination to be resolved finally into a groundless Assertion of your own, contrary to all truth and experience, and that is, *That no degree of faith, less than a most certain and infallible knowledge, can be able sufficiently to over-bear 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 forego many times their present ease and pleasure, undergo great and toilsom labours, encounter great difficulties, adventure upon 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 eternal, but finite and temporal? Who sees not that many men abstain from many things they exceedingly desire, not upon any certain assurance, but a probable fear of danger that may come after? What man ever was there so madly in love with a present penny, but that he would willingly spend it upon any little hope that by doing so he might gain an hundred thousand pound? And I would fain know, *what gay probabilities* you could devise to dissuade 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 eternal happiness, provided for all those that obey *Christ Jesus*, and much more a firm faith, though not so certain, in some sort, as sense or science, may be able to sway our will to obedi-

ence,

ence, and encounter with all those temptations which Flesh and Blood can suggest to avert us from it? Men may talk 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 eternal felicity, but as firmly and undoubtedly as that there is such a City as *Constantinople*, nay but as much as *Cæsar's* Commentaries, or the History of *Salust*; I believe the lives of most men, both Papists and Protestants would be better than 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 only reason *because any less degree, could not be able to overbear our will*, &c. imports, that if a less degree of faith were able to do this, then a less degree of faith may be true and divine and saving Faith: But experience shews, and reason confirms, 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 follows 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 have employed to shew that such a most certain and infallible faith as here you talk of, is not so necessary, but that 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 be saved without it*. Wherein you boldly intrude into the Judgment-seat of God, and damn men for breaking Laws, not of God's but your own making. But withal, you clearly contradict your self, not only where you affirm, *That your faith depends finally upon the Tradition of Age to Age, of Father to Son*, which cannot be a fit ground, but only for a Moral 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 pass for means sufficient of a sufficient Certainty, and that they should not be 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 will not justifie, and with a pretty tergiversation to shew D. *Potter* your means of moral certainty; whereas the objection was, that you had no means or possibility of infallible certainty, for which you are plainly at as great a loss, and as far to seek, as any of your Adversaries. And therefore it concerns you highly not to damn others for want of it, lest you involve your selves in the same condemnation; according to those terrible words of St. *Paul, Thou art inexcusable, O Man, whosoever thou art that judgest: For, wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thy self; for thou that judgest dost the same things*, &c. In this therefore you plainly contradict your self. And lastly most plainly, in saying as you do here, you contradict and retract your pretence of Charity to Protestants in the beginning of your Book: For there you make profession, that *you have no assurance but that Protestants dying Protestants, may possibly die 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.*

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 self, and, ordinarily speaking, be void even of supernatural evidence*. Which words must have a very favourable construction, 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 always thought, that known and unknown, obscure and evident had been affections, not of our Assent, but the Object of it, not



not of our belief, but the thing believed. For well may we assent to a thing unknown, obscure, or unevident; but that our assent it self should be called therefore unknown or obscure, seems to me as great an impropriety, as if I should say; Your sight were green or blue, 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 necessary to faith that the objects of it, the points which we believe, should not be so evidently certain, as to necessitate our understanding 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 himself, 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 have the absolute evidence of sense or demonstration; therefore I might let this doctrine pass without exception, for any prejudice that can redound to us by it. But yet I must not forbear 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 be faith without it; and this you must confess, unless 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: unless you will question S. *John* for saying, *that which we have seen with our eyes, and which our hands have handled*, &c. *declare we unto you*: nay, our Saviour himself for saying, *Thomas because thou seest, thou believest, Blessed are they which have not seen and yet have believed*. Yet, if you will say that in respect of the things which they saw, the Apostles assent was not pure and proper and meer faith, but somewhat more; an assent containing faith but superadding to it, I will not contend with you; for it will be a contention about words. But then again I must crave leave to tell you, that the requiring this condition, is in my judgment 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 attempered & duly proportioned object for an absolute certainty natural or supernatural: But requiring as you do, *that faith should be an absolute knowledge of a thing not absolutely known, an infallible certainty of a thing, which, though it be in it self, yet it is not made appear to us to be, infallibly certain*, to my understanding you speak impossibilities. And truly for one of your Religion to do 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 have it so, let it be a free necessitated, certain uncertain, evident obscure, prudent and foolish, natural and supernatural unnatural assent. But they which are unwilling to believe non-sense themselves, or to perswade others to do so, it is but reason they should make the faith wherewith they believe, an intelligible, compossible, consistent thing, and not define it by repugnancies. Now nothing is more repugnant, than that a man should be required to give most certain credit unto that which cannot be made appear most certainly credible: and, if it appear to him to be so, then is it not obscure that it is so. For if you speak of an acquired, rational, 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 supernatural infused faith, then you either suppose it infused by the former means, and then that which was said before must be said again: for whatsoever effect is wrought meerly by means, must bear proportion to, and cannot exceed the virtue of the means, by which it is wrought: As nothing by water can be made more cold than water, nor by fire more hot than fire, nor by honey more sweet than honey, nor by gall more bitter than gall: Or, if you will suppose it infused without means, then that power which infuseth into the understanding assent which bears Analogy to sight

in

in the eye, must also infuse evidence, that is, Visibility into the Object: and 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 go ten mile an hour upon an horse that will go but five: to discern a man certainly through a mist or cloud that makes him not certainly discernable; to hear a sound more clearly than it is audible; to understand a thing more fully than 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, hear something inaudible, understand something that is wholly unintelligible. For he that demands ten of me, knowing I have 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 than it is made to me evidently credible, you require in effect that I believe something which appears 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; and 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, nor 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 be 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 do 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 and not believe, neither is it possible unless our evidence of it, be it natural or supernatural, were of the highest degree;) yet I deny not, but we ought to be and may be infallibly certain that we are to believe the Religion of Christ. For first, this is most certain, That we are in all things to do according to wisdom and reason, rather than against it. Secondly, this is as certain, That wisdom and reason require, that we should believe those things which are by many degrees more credible and probable than 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 poor 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 Religion is true, than the contrary. And from all these premisses, this conclusion evidently follows, That it is infallibly certain, that we are firmly to believe the truth of Christian Religion.

9. Your discourse therefore touching the fourth requisite to Faith which is Prudence, I admit so far as to grant. 1. That if we were required to believe with certainty (I mean a Moral 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 wisdom 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 rashness and levity.

10. But



10. But then for your making Prudence, not only a commendation of a believer, and a justification of his faith, but also essential to it, and part of the definition of it, in that questionless 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 Prophesie*: That all that believe the true Religion *were able* (according to S. *Peter*'s injunction) *to give a reason of the hope that is in them*, a reason why they hope for eternal happiness by this way rather than any other! neither do I think it any great difficulty that men of ordinary capacities, if they would give their mind to it, might quickly be enabled to do so. But should I affirm that all true believers can do so, I suppose it would be as much against experience and modesty, as it is against Truth and Charity, to say as you do, that *they which cannot do so, either are not at all, or to no purpose true believers*. And thus we see that the foundations you build upon, are ruinous and deceitful, 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 do, by opposing clear 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 Heresie to oppose any truth propounded by the Church, but only such a Truth as is an essential part of the Gospel 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 Heresie: Now either Protestants or the Roman Church must err against the word of God: But the Roman Church we grant (perforce) doth not err damnably, neither can she, because she is the Catholique Church, which* we (you say) *confess cannot err damnably: Therefore Protestants must err against God's word, and consequently are guilty of formal Heresie.* 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 Heresie, unless it be revealed publickly and plainly with a command that all should believe 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 damn some men amongst you: and this you your self confess in divers places of your Book, where you tell us, that he *allows 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 pass for a part of it. And again, that the *Catholique Church cannot fall into any error of it self damnable*; for it may do 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 unaffected ignorance. Lastly, though the thing be true, yet I might well require some proof of it from you, that either Protestants or the Roman Church must err against God's 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 Judge of Controverſies, and therefore Infallible, from whence you ſuppoſe that it follows, that to oppoſe her is to oppoſe God.* To which I anſwer, that you have ſaid only, and not ſhewed, that *the Viſible Church is Judge of Controverſies.* And indeed how can ſhe be Judge of them if ſhe cannot decide them? And how can ſhe decide them, if it be a queſtion, Whether ſhe be judge of them? That which is queſtion'd it ſelf cannot with any ſenſe be pretended to be fit to decide other queſtions; and much leſs this queſtion, Whether it have Authority to judge and decide all queſtions? 2. If ſhe were Iudge, it would not follow that ſhe were infallible; for we have many Judges in our Courts of Judicature, yet none infallible. Nay, you cannot with any modeſty deny, that every man in the world ought to judge for himſelf, 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 leſs manifeſtly, that to oppoſe her Declaration is to oppoſe God: unleſs 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.* Inſtead 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 formal Heretique, you endeavour to prove by this moſt formall Syllogiſm; *To ſay the Viſible Church is not univerſal, is properly an Hereſie: But* Luther's *Reformation was not Univerſal: Therefore it cannot be excuſed from formal Hereſie.* 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 formal Heretique, and yet that thoſe who follow him may be only ſo materially and improperly, and indeed no Heretiques. Your own men out of St. *Auſtin* diſtinguiſh between *Heretici & Hereticorum ſequaces:* And you your ſelf though you pronounce *the leaders among the* Arrians *formal Heretiques*, yet confeſs that *Salvian* was at leaſt doubtful whether thoſe *Arrians*, who in ſimplicity followed their Teachers, might not be excuſed by ignorance. And about this ſuſpenſion of his you alſo ſeem ſuſpended; for you neither approve nor condemn it. Secondly, to the ſecond part, I ſay, that, had you not preſumed upon your ignorance in Logick as well as Metaphyſicks and School Divinity, you would never have obtruded upon us this rope of ſand for a formal Syllogiſm. It is even Couſen-German to this, To deny the Reſurrection is properly an Hereſie, But *Luther's* Reformation was not Univerſal, Therefore it cannot be excuſed from formal Hereſie! Or to this, To ſay the Viſible Church is not Univerſal is properly an Hereſie: But the preaching of the Goſpel at the beginning was not Univerſal: Therefore it cannot be excuſed from formal Hereſie. For as he whoſe Reformation is but particular, may yet not deny the Reſurrection, ſo may he alſo not deny the Churches Univerſality. And as the Apoſtles who preached the Goſpel in the beginning, did believe the Church Univerſal, though their preaching at the beginning was not ſo: So *Luther* alſo might and did believe the Church Univerſal, though his Reformation were but particular. I ſay, he did believe it Univerſal, even in your own ſenſe, that is, Univerſal *de jure*, though not *de facto*. And as for Univerſality in fact, he believed the Church much more Univerſal than his Reformation: For he did conceive (as appears 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 unſyllogiſtical ſyllogiſm, I anſwer, That to ſay the true Church is not always *de facto* Univerſal, is ſo far from being an Hereſie, that it is a certain truth known to all thoſe that know the world, and what Religions poſſeſs far 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. *Auſtin*; 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 always muſt be ſo: but moſt palpably miſtaken in conceiving that it was then ſpread over the whole earth; and known to all nations; which, if paſſion did not trouble you, and make you forget how lately almoſt half the world was diſcovered, and in what eſtate it was then found, you would very eaſily ſee and confeſs.



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 do it with as much ſpight and malice as could well be deviſed, but in vain: For *Lucilla* might do ill in promoting the Sect of the Donatiſts, and yet the mother and the daughter, whom you glance at, might do well in *miniſtring influence* (as you phraſe it) *to Proteſtants in England.* Unleſs you will conclude, becauſe one woman did one thing ill, therefore no woman can do any thing well: or becauſe it was ill done to promote one Sect, therefore it muſt be ill done, to maintain any.

16. The *Donatiſts might do ill in calling the Chair of* Rome *the Chair of Peſtilence, and the Roman Church an Harlot*; and yet, the ſtate of the Church being altered, Proteſtants might do well to do ſo: and therefore though S. *Auſtin 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 horns be ſhort, ſeeing the Roman Church is not now what it was in St. *Auſtin's* time. And hereof the concluſion of your own Book affords us a very pregnant teſtimony: where you tell us out of S. *Auſtin*, that one grand impediment, which among many kept the ſeduced followers of the faction of *Donatus* from the Churches Communion, was, a calumny raiſed againſt the Catholiques, That *they did ſet ſome ſtrange thing upon their Altar. To how many* (ſaith St. *Auſtin*) *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 Rhetorical 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 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 doth St. *Auſtin* and *Optatus* make to this Accuſation? Do they confeſs and maintain it? Do they ſay, as you would now, It is true we do ſet Pictures upon our Altar, and that not only for ornament or memory, but for worſhip alſo; but we do well to do 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 contrary not only deny the crime, but abhor and deteſt it. To little purpoſe therefore do you hunt after theſe poor ſhadows of reſemblances between us and the *Donatiſts*: unleſs 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 be 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 ſucceſs have you in comparing D. *Potter* with *Tyconius* whom as S. *Auſtin finds fault with for continuing in the Donatiſts ſeparation, having forſaken the ground of it, the Doctrine of the Churches periſhing: ſo you condemn the*

*Doctor, for continuing in their communion, who hold* (as you say) *the very same Heresie.* 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 than Donatists, who said that the Church remained at least in* Africa? These things methinks hang not well together. But to let this pass; The truth is, this difference, for which you would fain 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 affirm not.

18. These therefore are but velitations, and you would seem to make but small account of them. But the main point you say is, that *since* Luther's *Reformed Church was not in being for divers Centuries before* Luther, *and yet was in the Apostles time, they must of necessity affirm 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 seems you are resolute perpetually to confound *True* and *Unspotted*; and to put no difference between a corrupted Church and none at all. But what is this, but to make no difference between a diseased and a dead man? Nay what is it but to contradict your selves, who cannot deny but that sins are as great stains and spots and deformities in the sight of God, as errors; and confess your Church to be a congregation of men, whereof every particular, not one excepted, (and consequently the generality which is nothing but a collection of them) is polluted and defiled with sin? You proceed.

19. But say you, *The same Heresie follows out of* D. Potter *and other Protestants, that the Church may err in points not fundamental; because we have shewed that every error against any revealed truth is Heresie and Damnable, whether the matter be great or small: And how can the Church more truly be said to perish, than when she is permitted to maintain damnable Heresie? Besides, we will hereafter prove that by every act of Heresie all divine faith is lost, and to maintain a true Church without any faith, is to fancy a living man without life. Answ.* 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 Heresie*, then, I hope I shall have your leave to subsume, That the Dominicans in your account must hold a damnable heresie, who hold an error against the immaculate Conception: which you must needs esteem a revealed truth, or otherwise why are you so urgent and importunate to have it defined, seeing your rule is, *Nothing may be defined, unless 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, chuse you whether, must without contradiction hold a damnable Heresie; 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 begin to temper the crudeness of your former assertion, and tell us, that neither of you are Heretiques, because the Truth against which you err 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 methinks, it is as plain that your Churches 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, than when she is permitted to maintain a damnable Heresie?* I answer, she may be more truly said to perish, when she is not only permitted to do so, but *de facto* doth maintain a damnable Heresie. Again, she may be more truly said to perish, when she falls into an Heresie, which is not only damnable in it self, and *ex natura rei*, as you speak, but such an Heresie, the belief of whose contrary Truth is necessary, not only *necessitate præcepti* but *medii*, and therefore the Heresie so absolutely and indispensably destructive of salvation, that no ignorance can excuse it, nor any general repentance, without a dereliction of it, can beg a pardon for it. Such an Heresie if the Church should fall into, it might be more truly said to perish, then *if* it fell only into some Heresie 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 and would not, cannot upon any good ground hope for salvation, yet without question, it might send many souls to heaven, who would gladly have embrac'd the truth, but that they wanted means to discover it. Thirdly and lastly, she may yet more truly be said to perish when she Apostates from Christ absolutely, or rejects even those Truths out of which her Heresies may be reformed; as if she should directly deny *Jesus 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 uneffectual for her Reformation.



20, *Ad* § 18. I was very glad when I heard you say, *The holy Scripture and ancient Fathers do assign 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, unless he 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 self, good Sir, it is a very hainous crime to say, *Thus saith the Lord, when the Lord doth not say so.* I expected therefore some Scripture should have been alledged, wherein it should have been 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 always 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; we 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 *Unum 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.* We suppose them lastly wise men, especially being assisted by the Spirit of Wisdom, and such as knew that a doubtful and 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. Methinks, the Evangelists, undertaking to write the Gospel of Christ, could not possibly have omitted, any one of them, this most necessary point of faith, had they known it necessary, (S. *Luke* especially, who plainly professes that *his intent was to write all things necessary.*) Methinks S. *Paul* writing to the *Romans* could not but have congratulated this their Priviledge to them! Methinks, instead of saying, *Your faith is spoken of, all the world over* (which you have no reason to be very proud of, for he says the very same thing to the *Thessalonians*) he could not have fail'd to have told them, once at least in plain terms, that *their Faith was the Rule for all the world for ever.* But sure he would have forborn to put them in fear of an impossibility, as he doth in his eleventh Chapter, 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 Jews had done. Methinks, in all his other

other Epiſtles, at leaſt in ſome, at leaſt in one of them, he could not have failed to have 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.* Methinks writing ſo often of Heretiques and Antichriſt, he ſhould have given the world this (as you pretend) only 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 Succeſſors, the Biſhops of *Rome*? How was it poſſible that S. *James* and S. *Jude* in their Catholique Epiſtles ſhould not give this Catholique direction? Methinks S. *John* inſtead of ſaying, *He that believeth that Jeſus is the Chriſt is born of God,* (the force of which direction your gloſſes do quite enervate, and make unavailable to diſcern who are the ſons of God) ſhould have ſaid, *He that adheres to the doctrine of the Roman Church, and lives according to it, he is a good Chriſtian, and by this mark ye ſhall know him!* What man not quite out of his wits, if he conſider as he ſhould, the pretended neceſſity of this doctrine, that without the belief hereof no man ordinarily can be ſaved, can poſſibly force himſelf 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 of them ſay it plainly ſo much as once, but leave it to be collected from uncertain Principles, by many more uncertain Conſequences? Certainly, he that can judge ſo uncharitably of them, it is no marvail 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 aſſigns ſeparation from the viſible Church as a Mark of Hereſie.* But inſtead hereof what have you brought us, but meer impertinencies? S. *John* 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 Council 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 St. *Paul* in the ſame book forewarns 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 ſtrange and unheard of ſtrain of Logick. Unleſs 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 Jeſus to be the Chriſt*: See the place and you ſhall confeſs as much. The ſecond place, it is certain, you muſt not ſay it ſpeaks of Heretiques; for it ſpeaks only of ſome who believed and taught an Error, while it was yet a queſtion, and not evident; and therefore according to your doctrine no formal Hereſie. The third ſays indeed, that of the Profeſſors of Chriſtianity, ſome ſhall ariſe that ſhall teach Hereſie: But not one of them all that ſays or intimates, that whoſoever ſeparates from the viſible Church in what ſtate ſoever is certainly an Heretique. Heretiques I confeſs do always do ſo; But they that do ſo, are not always Heretiques; for perhaps the ſtate of the Church may make it neceſſary for them to do ſo; as Rebels always diſobey the command of their King, yet they, which diſobey a King's command (which perhaps may be unjuſt) are not preſently Rebels.

21. Your Allegations out of *Vincentius*, *Proſper*, and *Cyprian*, are liable to theſe exceptions. 1. That they are the ſayings of men not aſſiſted by the Spirit of God, and whoſe Authority 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 Hereſie; and the former



former ſpeaking plainly of ſeparation from Univerſality, 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 far forth as ſhe had done ſo and no farther. And laſtly, the latter part of *Proſper*'s words cannot be generally true, according to your own grounds; For you ſay a man may be divided from the Church upon meer Schiſm without any mixture of Hereſie: And a man may be juſtly excommunicated for many other ſufficient cauſes beſides Hereſie. 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 univerſally 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 See of S.* Peter, (I conceive you mean, as it is that particular Church) *is the mark of Hereſie.* Which kind of argument I might well refuſe to anſwer, unleſs 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 contrary to the doctrine of the *Roman* Church. For I conceive nothing in the world more unequal or unreaſonable then that you ſhould preſs 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 tribunal of the Fathers; nay, not of the Fathers, whoſe ſentences are here alledged. Let us conſider them in order, and I doubt not to make it appear that far the greater part of them; nay, all of them that are any way conſiderable fall ſhort of your purpoſe.

23. S. *Hierom* (you ſay) *writing to Pope* Damaſus, ſaith, *I am in the Communion of the Chair 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 again, that he ſays only, that *he was then in Communion with the Chair of* Peter, Not that he always would, or of neceſſity muſt be ſo: for his reſolution to the contrary is too evident out of that which he ſaith elſewhere which ſhall be produced hereafter. He ſays, that the *Church at that preſent was built upon that Rock*; but, not that only, nor that always. Nay his judgment, as ſhall appear, is expreſs to the contrary. And ſo likewiſe the reſt of his expreſſions (if we mean to reconcile *Hierom* with *Hierom*) muſt be 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 conceiv'd it neceſſary for him and all men to conform their judgment in matters of Faith, to the judgment of the Biſhop and Church of *Rome*, how came it to paſs that he choſe rather to believe the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews* Canonical, upon the authority of the Eaſtern Church, than to reject it from the Canon upon the authority of the *Roman*? How comes it to paſs 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 St. *Hierom*, I fear you will loſe your Fort by maintaining your Out-works; and by avoiding this, run into a greater danger of being forc'd to confeſs the preſent *Roman* Church oppoſite herein to the Ancient. How was it poſſible, that he ſhould ever believe that *Liberius* Biſhop of *Rome*, either was or could have been brought over by *the ſolicitation 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, 1300 years almoſt after the thing is ſaid

*Hierom de ſcrip. Eccl. tit. Fortunatianus.*

ſaid to be done, and ſpeaking for themſelves in their own *Cauſe*, rather than the diſ-intereſſed time-fellows, or immediate-Succeſſors of *Liberius* himſelf: yet I hope, they will not proceed to ſuch a degree of immodeſty, as once to queſtion, Whether S. *Hierom* thought ſo. And if this cannot be denied, 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 *Roman* faith received no deluſions, no not from an Angel? I ſuppoſe, he could not have ſaid ſo with any coherence to his own belief; and therefore conceive it undeniable that what he ſaid to *Damaſus*, he ſaid it (though perhaps he ſtrained 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 Biſhop and the *Roman* Church were then at unity; ſo that whoſoever agreed with the later could not then but agree with the former. But that this Rule was perpetual, and that no man could ever agree with the Catholique Biſhops, but he muſt agree with the *Roman* Church, this he ſays 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 gain-ſay 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 affirms nor imports, that ſeparation from the *Roman* Church is a certain mark of Hereſie. For the rights of Communion (whatſoever it ſignifies) might be laid to flow from it, if that Church were, by Eccleſiaſtical Law, the head of all other Churches: But unleſs it were made ſo by divine Authority, and that abſolutely, Separation from it could not be a mark of Hereſie.

25. For S. *Cyprian*; all the world knows 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 Fermilianus* 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 Excommunication could not but involve S. *Cyprian*, who defended the ſame opinion as reſolutely as *Firmilianus*, though Cardinal *Perron* magiſterially and without all colour of proof affirm the contrary) and *Cyprian* in particular ſo far caſt off, as for it to be pronounc'd by *Stephen*, *A falſe Chriſt.* 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 *Rome*'s Authority, were commanded by him not only to deny them the Churches peace and Communion, but even lodging and entertainment: manifeſtly declaring, that they reckoned them among thoſe whom S. *John* forbids *to receive to houſe, or to ſay God ſpeed to them.* All theſe terrors notwithſtanding S. *Cyprian* holds ſtill his former opinion. And 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* and his adherents, (*e*) to hold a pernicious error. And S. *Auſtin*, (though diſputing with the *Donatiſts* he uſeth ſome Tergiverſation in the point) yet confeſſeth elſewhere, that *it is not found that* Cyprian *did ever change his opinion.* And ſo far was he from conceiving any neceſſity of doing ſo, by ſubmitting to the judgment of the Biſhop and Church of *Rome*, that he plainly profeſſeth that no other Biſhop, *but our Lord Jeſus only, had power to judge* (with authority) *of his judgment*; and as plainly intimates that *Stephen* for uſurping ſuch a power, and making himſelf a *Judge over Biſhops, was little better than a Tyrant*: and as heavily almoſt he cenſures him, and peremptorily oppoſes him as obſtinate in error, in that very

(b) It is confeſſed by *Baronius, Anno* 258. *N.* 41. By *Bellar. l.* 4. *de R. Pont. c.* 7. *Sect. Tertia ratio.*
(c) Confeſſed by *Baronius, An.* 258. *N.* 14. & 15. By *Car. Perron*'s Rep. *l.* 1. *c.* 25.
(d) *Ibid.*

(d) *Vide Conc. Carth. apud. Cyp. to.* 1.
(e) *Bell. l.* 2. *de Conc. c.* 5. *Aug. ep.* 48. & *l.* 1. *de Bap. c.* 18.



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 ſeems, but a man might have the Church for his Mother, who ſtood in oppoſition to the Church of *Rome*, and being far 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. *Peter*'s Chair was a mark (I mean, a certain mark) either of Schiſm or Hereſie. 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 *falſhood could not have acceſs to the* Roman *Church*, and that oppoſition to it was the brand of an Heretick: may we not well expect, that you will the next time you write, vouch *Luther* and *Calvin* alſo for Abettors of this Phanſie, and make us poor 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 always accounted in the number of Catholicks*; nor in *Caniſius*, that he was a *moſt excellent Doctor and a glorious Martyr*; nor in your Calender, 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 Schiſmatick and an Heretick, as having on him the Mark of the Beaſt, *oppoſition to the Chair of* Peter. Nay, that he (whatever he pretended, knew and believed himſelf to be ſo; in as much as he knew as you pretend) and eſteemed this oppoſition to be the Mark of Hereſie, and knew himſelf to ſtand, and ſtand out, in ſuch an oppoſition.

*Bell. l.* 2. *de Con. c.* 5. *Sect.* 12. *Caniſius in Initio Catech. Sept. die* 14.

26. But we need not ſeek ſo far for matter to refute the vanity of this pretence. Let the Reader but peruſe this very Epiſtle out of which this Sentence is alleadged, and he ſhall need no farther ſatisfaction againſt it. For he ſhall find, firſt, that you have helped the Dice a little with a falſe, or at leaſt with a very bold and ſtrained Tranſlation: for S. *Cyprian* ſaith not, *to whom falſhood cannot have acceſs*, by which many of you favourable Readers, I doubt, underſtood, that *Cyprian* had exempted that Church from a poſſibility of error; but to whom *perfidiouſneſs cannot have acceſs*, meaning by perfidiouſneſs in the abſtract, according to a common figure of ſpeech, thoſe perfidious Schiſmaticks whom he there complains of: and of theſe by a Rhetorical inſinuation, he ſays, that *with ſuch good Chriſtians as the* Romans *were, it was not poſſible they ſhould find favourable entertainment.* Not that he conceived it any way impoſſible they ſhould do ſo (for the very writing this Epiſtle, and many paſſages in it, plainly ſhew the contrary;) but becauſe he was confident, or at leaſt would ſeem to be confident, they never would, and ſo by his good opinion and confidence in the *Romans*, lay an obligation upon them, to do as he preſumed they would do; as alſo in the end of his Epiſtle, he ſays 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 Hereticks.* 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 beginning 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 publickly to the whole Clergy and Laity of* Rome, *to the intent, that if any contagion of their poyſoned ſpeech and peſtiferous ſemination, had crept in amongſt them, it might be wholly taken away from the ears and the hearts of the Brethren: and that the entire and ſincere charity of good men might be purged from all droſs of heretical 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 evil communication would corrupt good manners, becauſe wicked men carry perdition in their mouths, and hide fire in their lips*? All which had been but vain and ridiculous pageantry, had he verily believed the *Romans* ſuch inacceſſable Forts, ſuch immovable Rocks, as the former ſentences would ſeem to import; if we will expound them rigidly and ſtrictly, according to the exigence of the words, and not allow him who was profeſſed Maſter of the Art, to have uſed here a little Rhetorick, 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 do as he promiſed himſelf they would do. For as for *joyning the principal Church and the Chair of* Peter, how that will ſerve for your preſent purpoſe of proving ſeparation from the *Roman* Church a mark of Hereſie, I ſuppoſe it is hard to underſtand! Nor indeed how it will advantage you in any other deſign againſt us, who do not altogether deny, but that the Church of *Rome* might be called the *Chair of Peter*, in regard he is ſaid to have preached the Goſpel there; and *the Principal Church*, becauſe the City was the Principal and Imperial City: which *Prerogative of the City*, if we believe the Fathers of the Council 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 far 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 Catholick Church, is *always* (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 Catholick Church, as *Cornelius* at that time did, then whoſoever communicates with him, cannot but communicate with the Catholick Church: and then by accident one might truly ſay, ſuch an one communicates with you, that is, with the Catholick Church, and that to communicate with him is to communicate with the Catholick Church. As if *Titius* and *Sempronius* be togther, he that is in company with *Titius*, cannot but be at that time in company with *Sempronius*. As if a General be marching to ſome place with an Army, he that is then with the General muſt at that time be with the Army: And a man may ſay without abſurdity, Such a time I was with the General, that is, with the Army, and that to be with the General 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 General and not with his Army, he being abſent from the Army. And therefore by like reaſon your collection is ſophiſtical, being in effect but this, to communicate with ſuch a Biſhop of *Rome*, who did communicate with the Catholick Church, was to communicate with the Catholick Church, therefore abſolutely and always it muſt be true, that, To communicate with him, is by conſequent to communicate with the Catholick Church, and to be divided from his Communion is to be an Heretick.

28. In urging the place of *Irenæus*, you have ſhewed much more ingenuity than many of your fellows. For whereas they uſually begin at, *Declaring the Tradition of the*, &c. and conceal 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 Apoſtolick Churches. Either therefore you muſt ſay, that he conceived the Teſtimony of other Apoſtolick Churches divine and infallible, (which certainly he did not,



not, neither do 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 than any one Church beſide, (as one man's Teſtimony is more credible than anothers;) but certainly much more credible, which was enough for his purpoſe, than that ſecret Tradition, to which thoſe Hereticks pretended, againſt whom he wrote, over-bearing them with an Argument of their own kind, far ſtronger than 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 mark of a Catholick, or ſeparation from it a certain mark of an Heretick.

29. Again, whereas your great *Achilles* Cardinal *Perron* in *French*; as alſo his *Noble Tranſlatreſs*, miſled by him, in *Engliſh*, knowing that mens reſorting to *Rome* would do his cauſe little ſervice, hath made bold with the *Latine* Tongue, as he does very often with the *Greek*, and rendered *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 Hereticks; For, to this Church, all Churches muſt agree*, what had this been, but to give for a reaſon, that which was more queſtionable than the thing in queſtion: as being neither evident in it ſelf, 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 otherſide, if we conceive him to ſay thus, *You Hereticks decline a trial 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 a 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 unjuſt and unreaſonable: but yet moreover, aſſure your ſelves, that if you will be tried, by Tradition, even by that alſo you will be overthrown. For our Tradition is far more famous, more conſtant, and in all reſpects more credible, than that which you pretend to. It were eaſie 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 ſelf 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 far beyond the Tradition you build upon; as the light of the Sun is beyond the light of a Glowworm. For to this Church, by reaſon it is placed in the Imperial City, whither all mens affairs do neceſſarily draw them, or by reaſon of the powerful principality it hath over all the adjacent Churches, there is, and always hath been, a neceſſity of a perpetual recourſe of all the faithful round about: who if there hath been any alteration in the Church of* Rome, *could not in all probability but have obſerved it. But they to the contrary have always 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 rational: which if inſtead 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 falſifie, but only twice in this ſentence miſtake *Undique* for *Ubique*; and tranſlate it, *every where*, and *of what place ſoever*, inſtead of *round about*. For that it was neceſſary *for all the faithful of what place ſoever to reſort to* Rome, is not true. That *the Apoſtolick Tradition hath always 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 *undique* 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 powerful principality, there is a necessity that all the Churches, that is, all the faithful round about, should resort, in which the Apostolick Tradition hath been always 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 far from censure. But I would intreat him to consider, whether it be not likely that the same *Greek* word signifying *observo* and *conservo*, the Translator of *Irenæus*, who could hardly speak *Latine*, might not easily mistake, and translate διατηρεῖται *conservata est*, instead of *observata est*; Or, whether it be not likely, that those men which anciently 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 God's 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 material. For if the rest be rightly translated, neither will *Conservata* afford you any argument against us, nor *Observata* help us to any evasion. For though at the first hearing of the glorious attributes here given, (and that justly) to the Church of *Rome*, *The confounding Hereticks with her Tradition, and saying, It is necessary for all Churches to resort to her*, may sound like Arguments for you; yet he that is attentive, I hope, will easily discover, that it might be good and rational in *Irenæus* having to do with Hereticks, who, somewhat like those, who would be the only Catholicks, declined a trial by Scripture, as not containing 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 rational in *Irenæus* to urge them, with any Tradition of more credit than their own, especially a Tradition consonant to scripture, and even contained in it; and yet that it may be irrational in you to urge us, who do not decline Scripture, but appeal to it as a perfect rule of faith, with a Tradition which we pretend is many ways repugnant to Scripture; and repugnant to a Tradition far more general than 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 then a far greater Argument of the Truth of her Tradition when it was United with all other Apostolick Churches, than 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 Error but Tradition*; and therefore *Irenæus* his Argument may be very probable, yet yours may be worth nothing. Thirdly, that fourteen hundred years may have made a great deal of alteration in the *Roman* Church: as Rivers, though near the fountain they may retain their native and unmixt sincerity, yet in long progress cannot but take in much mixture that came not from the Fountain. And therefore the *Roman* Tradition, though then pure, may now be corrupted 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* plays the Historian only, and not the Prophet, and says only, that the *Apostolick Tradition had been always there as in other Apostolick Churches conserved or observed*, choose you whether, but that *it should be always so*, he says not, neither had he any warrant. He knew well enough that there was foretold a *great falling away* of the Churches of Christ to Antichrist: that the *Roman* Church in particular was fore-warned that she also,
Rom. 11. *Nay, the whole Church of the Gentiles might fall if they lookt not to their standing*: and therefore to secure her that she should stand for ever, he had no Reason nor Authority. Fourthly, that it appears manifestly out of this Book of *Irenæus* quoted by



by you, that the doctrine of the Chiliasts was in his judgment Apostolick Tradition, as also it was esteemed (for ought appears 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 *Justin Martyr* professeth that *all good and Orthodox Christians of his time believed it*, and those that did not, he reckons amongst Hereticks. 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 Heretical, 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 Error by holding contradictions. Fifthly and lastly, that out of the Story of the Church it is as manifest as the light at noon, that though *Irenæus* did esteem the *Roman* Tradition a great Argument of the doctrine which he there delivers and defends against the Hereticks of his time, *viz. That there is one God*, yet he was very far from thinking that Church was, and ever should be a safe keeper, and an infallible witness of Tradition in general: Inasmuch as in his own life, his action proclaimed the contrary. For when *Victor* Bishop of *Rome* obtruded the *Roman* Tradition touching the time of *Easter* upon *Asian* Bishops under the pain of Excommunication, and *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 this 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 Hereticks though separated and cut off from the *Roman* Church.

*In Dial. cum. Tryphon.*

Cardinal *Perron*, to avoid the stroke of this convincing 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 dispel; and let his Idolaters see that Truth is not afraid of Giants: His words are these.

*Lib. 3. cap. 2. Of his Reply to King James. c. 2. sect. 32.*

*The first instance then that* Calvin *alleadgeth against the Popes Censures, is taken from* Eusebius *(a) an Arrian Author, and from* Ruffinus *(b) enemy to the* Roman *Church his Translator: who writ, (c) that.* S. Irenæus *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. John *had introduced (d) for a time in their Provinces, because of the neighbourhood of the* Jews; *and to bury the Synagogue with honour, and not according to the universal 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 he this, but (e) against those that object it? For who sees not, that* S. Irenæus, *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?* Irenæus (*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. Irenæus *have reprehended the Pope for want of power; he that cites:* To

*Calv. ubi supra.*

*Ruffin. in vers. hist. Eccl. Eus. l 5. c. 24.*

*Eus. hist Eccl. l. 5. c. 24.*

*Ruffin. ib c. 24. Iren. l 3 c. 3. 1. Book. Ch. 15*

To the *Roman* Church, becauſe of a more powerful principality; (*that is to ſay*) *as above appeareth,* (*b*) *becauſe of a Principality more powerful than the Temporal: or* (*as we have expounded otherwhere*) *becauſe of a more powerful Original* (*c*) It is neceſſary that every Church ſhould agree? *And* (*k*) *therefore alſo S.* Irenæus *alledgeth not to Pope* Victor, *the example of him, and of the other Biſhops of the* Gauls *aſſembled in a Council holden expreſly for this effect, who had not excommunicated the* Aſians: *nor the example of* Narciſſus *Biſhop of* Jeruſalem, *and of the Biſhops of* Paleſtina *aſſembled in another Council, holden expreſly 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 cuſtom, *&c.* and neverthe leſs none of thoſe that obſerved it, have been excommunicated. *And yet, O admirable providence of God, the* (*l*) *ſucceſs of the after-ages ſhewed, that even in the uſe of his power, the Popes proceeding was juſt. For after the death of* Victor, *the Councils 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 Hereticks, under the titles of Hereticks* Quarto-decumans.

Euſeb. biſt. Eccl. l. 5. c. 22.

Iren. apud Euſeb. biſt. Eccl. l. 5. c. 26.

Conc. Antioch. c. 8. Conc. Conſt. c. 7 Conc. Eph. p. 2. act. 6.

*But to this inſtance* Calvins *Sect do 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 appears by the anſwer of the ſame* Polycrates *to Pope* Victor, *which is inſerted in the Writings of* Euſebius, *and of St.* Jerom, *and which* Jerom *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 univerſal Communion of the Church. To the firſt then we ſay, that ſo far is this Epiſtle of* Polycrates *from abating and diminiſhing the Popes Authority, that contrariwiſe it greatly magnifies and exalts it. For although* Polycrates *blinded with the love of the cuſtom of his Nation, which he believed to be grounded upon the Word of God, who had aſſigned the fourteenth of the Month of* March, *for the obſervation of the* Paſche, *and upon the example of St.* John's *Tradition maintains it obſtinately; Nevertheleſs, this that he anſwers, ſpeaking in his own Name, and in the name of the Council of the Biſhops of* Aſia, *to whom he preſided;* I fear not thoſe that threaten us; for my Elders have ſaid, It is better to obey God than man: *Doth it not ſhew, that had it not been, that he believed the Pope's threat, was againſt the expreſs Word of God, there had been cauſe to fear it, and he had been obliged to obey him; for* (*m*) *who knows not, that this anſwer,* It is better to obey God than men, *is not to be made but to thoſe whom we were obliged to obey, if their commandments were not contrary to the Commandments of God; And that he adds, that he had called the Biſhops of* Aſia, *to a National Council, being* (*n*) *ſummoned to it by the Pope; doth it not inſinuate, that the other Councils whereof* Euſebius *ſpeaks, that were holden about this matter, through all the Provinces of the earth, and particularly that of* Paleſtina, *which if you believe the act that* Beda *ſaid came to his hands,* Theophilus *Archbiſhop of* Cæſarea *had called by the authority of* Victor, *were holden at the inſtance of the Pope, and conſequently, that the Pope was the firſt mover of the Univerſal Church? And that the Councils of* Nicea, *of* Conſtantinople, *of* Epheſus, *embraced the Cenſure of* Victor, *and excommunicated thoſe that obſerved the cuſtom of* Polycrates *that was deceived, in believing that the Popes commandment, was againſt Gods commandment? And that S.* Jerom *himſelf celebrates the Paſchal Homilies of* Theophilus *Patriarch of* Alexandria, *which followed the Order of* Nicea *concerning the* Paſche; *doth*

Euſeb. biſt. Eccl. l. 5. c. 24. Hieron. in ſcript. Eccl. in Polycr.

Exod. 12.

Hieron. ubi ſupra.

Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 5. c. 23.

Beda in frag. de æquinoctio vernali.



*doth it not juſtifie, that when S.* Jerom *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 Cardinal's words; the moſt material 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 *Arrianiſm*, 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* ſays, he ſays out of *Irenæus*: Neither doth or can the Cardinal deny the ſtory to be true, and therefore he goes about by indirect Arts to foil it, and caſt a blur upon it. Laſtly, whenſoever *Euſebius* ſays any thing, which the Cardinal thinks for the advantage of his ſide, he cites him; and then he is no *Arrian*: or at leaſt he would not take that for an anſwer to the Arguments he draws out of him.

(*b*) That *Ruffinus* was enemy to the *Roman* Church, is ſaid, but not proved, neither can it be.

(*c*) *Euſebius* ſays the ſame alſo of *cæteri omnes Epiſcopi*, all the other Biſhops; That they adviſed *Victor* to keep thoſe things that belonged to peace and unity, and that they ſharply reprehended *Victor* for having done otherwiſe.

(*d*) This is ſaid, but no offer made of any proof of it: The Cardinal 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 Cardinal 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 Judge, of what was neceſſary to be believed and done, what not: what was univerſal 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, conform themſelves to the Church of *Rome*?

(*f*) This is to ſuppoſe, that Excommunication is an Act, or Argument, or ſign of power and Authority in the party excommunicating, over the party excommunicated; whereas it is undeniably evident out of the Church-Story, that it was often uſed by Equals upon Equals, and by Inferiours upon Superiours, if the Equals or Inferiours, thought their Equals or Superiours did any thing which deſerved it.

(*g*) And what is this but to confeſs, 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 proof of your exception. 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 prefers, the power of the *Roman* Church. And it is evident out of the Council 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 Imperial City.* Whereupon, when afterwards *Conſtantinople* was the Imperial City, they decreed that *that Church ſhould have equal 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

* Can. 28.

the

the Bishops of *Rome* by God, or grounded upon Scripture, but only by the Church, and therefore alterable at the Churches pleasure.

(*i*) This is falsely translated. *Convenire ad Romanam Ecclesiam*, every body knows, signifies no more but to resort or come to the *Roman* Church: which then there was a necessity that men should do, because that the affairs of the Empire were transacted in that place. But yet *Irenæus* says not so of every Church simply, which had not been true, but only of the Adjacent Churches: for so he expounds himself in saying, *To this Church it is necessary that every Church*, that is, all the faithful, *round about should resort*. With much more reason therefore we return the Argument thus. Had *Irenæus* thought that all Churches must of necessity agree with the *Roman*, how could he and all other Bishops have then pronounced, 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 Cardinal *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 than truly, that all Cardinal *Bellarmines* works, are so consonant to themselves as if he had written them in two hours. Had Cardinal *Perron* wrote his Book in two hours, 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 actual practice: which Proceeding, there he justly condemns of evident injustice. His words are *, *For who knows not that it is too great an injustice to alleadge consequences from passages, and even those ill interpreted and misunderstood, and in whose Illation there is always some Paralogism hid against the express words, and the lively and actual practice of the same Fathers from whom they are collected: and that it 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 believed and practised.*

* In his Letter to *Casaubon*, towards the end.

(*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 employed against *Victor*, as domestique examples are fitter and more effectual than forrain: and for his omitting to press 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 parallels with this of *Easter*, he presseth *Victor* with the example of himself and others, not Bishops of *Rome*; *Both they* (saith he, speaking of other Bishops) *notwithstanding this difference, retained peace among themselves*; and *we also among our selves retain it*; inferring from his example, that *Victor* also ought to do so.

(*l*) If the Pope's 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 do you account them Saints and Martyrs? But the truth is, that these Councels did no way shew the Pope's proceedings just, but rather the contrary. For though they setled an uniformity in this matter, yet they setled it as a matter formerly indifferent, and not as a matter of faith or necessity, as it is evident out of * *Athanasius*; and consequently, they rather declare *Victor*'s proceeding unjust, who excommunicated so many Churches, for differing from him in an indifferent matter.

* *In ep. ad Episcopos in Affrica*: Where he clearly shews that this question was not a question of faith: By saying, *The Council of* Nice *was celebrated, by occasion of the* Arrian *Heresie, and the difference about Easter. Insomuch as they in* Syria *and* Cilicia *and* Mesopotamia, *did differ herein from us, and kept this Feast on the same day with the Jews:* But thanks *be to* God, an agreement was made, as concerning the Faith, so also concerning this holy Feast.

(*m*) It



(*m*) It seems 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 Commandments of God. Besides, S. *Peter* himself, 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 inferiour and obliged to obey him. Lastly, who sees not, that when the Pope commands us any thing unjust, as to communicate Lay-men in one kind, to use the *Latin* Service, *&c.* we may very fitly say to him, *It is better to obey God than men*, and yet never think of any authority he hath over us?

(*n*) Between requesting and summoning, methinks, there should be some difference; and *Polycrates* says no more, but *he was requested by the Church of* Rome to call them, and did so. Here then (as very often) the Cardinal is fain to help the dice with a false Translation; and, his pretence being false, every one must see that that which he pretends to be insinuated by it, is clearly 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 one nor the other, but an indifferent matter, wherein God had not interposed his Authority. Neither did the Council of *Nice* embrace the Censure of *Victor*, by acknowledging his Excommunication to be just and well grounded, for which the Cardinal neither doth pretend, nor can produce any proof, any way comparable to the fore-alledged 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. *Austin*, and to the first place out of him, where he *seems 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. *Austin* himself was not, but retracts it as uncertain, and *leaves to the Reader whether he will think that, or another more probable, Retr. l. 1. c. 26.* Secondly, What he says of the Succession in the Roman Church in this place, he says it elsewhere, 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, an Argument of their Error: So, elsewhere he presseth them with their Separation from other Apostolique Churches, nay more from these than from that, because *in Rome* the Donatists had a Bishop though not a perpetual 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 Books the Churches to which the Apostles wrote, and have no Bishop in them: But what is more perverse and mad, than to the Letters 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 seem, great service) in upbraiding the Donatists as Schismatiques, because they had not Communion with the Church of *Rome*, overthrows and undoes it all again, and as it were with a spunge wipes out all that he hath said for you, by adding after that they were Schismatiques, because *They had not the fellowship of Communion with the seven Churches of Asia, to which S.* John *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, do you esteem the Authority of these Fathers a sufficient assurance, that separation from these other Apostolique Churches, was a certain mark of Heresie, or not? If so, then your Church hath been for many Ages Heretical. If not, How is their authority, a greater Argument for the Roman, than for the other Churches? If you say, they conceived separation from these Churches a note of Schism, 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 do that. In a word, whatſoever anſwer you can deviſe to ſhew, that theſe Fathers made not ſeparation from theſe other Churches a mark of Hereſie, 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 condemn the multitude of his Adverſaries, becauſe thoſe that were united with him were more, and of more account than thoſe that were againſt him.* Had he preferr'd the Roman Church alone, before *Cæcilian*'s enemies, this had been little, but ſomething; but when other Countries from which the Goſpel 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 learn! Neither do 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 Goſpel came firſt into *Africa*, not from her, but from other Churches.

(a) You do ill to tranſlate it *the Principality of the Sea Apoſtolique*, as if there were but one; whereas Saint *Auſtin* preſently after ſpeaks of Apoſtolical Churches, in the plural number; and makes the Biſhops of them joynt-Commiſſioners for the judging of Eccleſiaſtical cauſes.

33. Thus you ſee his words make very little, or indeed nothing for you. But now his Action, which according to Cardinal *Perron*'s rule, is much more to be regarded than his words, as not being ſo obnoxious to miſ-interpretation, I mean his famous oppoſition of three Biſhops of *Rome* in Succeſſion, touching the great queſtion of Appeals, wherein he and the reſt of the African Biſhops proceeded ſo far in the firſt or ſecond *Milevitan* Councel, as to (*b*) *decree any African Excommunicate that ſhould appeal to any man out of Africk*, and therein continued reſolute unto death: I ſay this famous action of his, makes clearly, 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 Union 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 God's command neceſſary to Salvation, how was it poſſible they ſhould have oppoſed it in this? Unleſs 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 ſo horribly impious, as believing this doctrine of the Roman Church true, and her power to receive Appeals derived from divine Authority, notwithſtanding to oppoſe and condemn it, and to Anathematize all thoſe Africans, of what condition ſoever, that ſhould appeal unto it. I ſay, *of what condition ſoever*: For it is evident, that they concluded in their determination, Biſhops as well as the inferiour Clergy and Laity: And Cardinal *Perron*'s pretence of the contrary, is a ſhameleſs falſhood, repugnant to the plain words of the (*c*) Remonſtrance of the African Biſhops to *Celeſtine* Biſhop of *Rome*.

(*b*) The words of the Decree (which alſo *Bellarm l.1. de Matrim. c. 17.* aſſures us to be perform'd by S. *Auſtin*) 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, à nullo intra Africam in Communionem ſuſcipiatur.* This Decree is by *Gratian* moſt impudently corrupted. For whereas the Fathers of that Council intended it particularly againſt the *Church of Rome*, he tells they forbad Appeals to all, *excepting only the Church of Rome.* (*c*) The words are theſe, *Præfato debito ſalutationis officio, impendiò deprecamur; ut deinceps ad aures veſtras hinc venientes, non facilius admittatis; nec à nobis excommunicatos ultra in Communionem velitis recipere, quia hoc etiam Niceno Concilio definitum facile adverſtet venerabilitas tua. Nam ſi de inferioribus Clericis vel Laicis videtur id præcaveri, quanto magis hoc de Epiſcopis volnit obſervari.*

34. Your allegation of *Tertullian* is a manifeſt conviction of your want of ſincerity: For you produce with great oſtentation what he ſays of the Church of *Rome*: but you and your fellows always conceal and diſſemble, that immediately 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 near *Italy*, ſo thoſe near *Achaia* he ſends to *Corinth*, thoſe about *Macedonia* to *Philippi* and *Theſſalonica*, thoſe of *Aſia* to *Epheſus*. His words are, *Go to now thou that*



*that wilt better imploy thy curioſity in the buſineſs of thy ſalvation, run over the Apoſtolical Churches, wherein the Chairs of the Apoſtles are yet ſate upon in their places, wherein the Authentique Epiſtles are recited, ſounding out the voice, and repreſenting the face of every one! Is Achaia near thee? there thou haſt Corinth: If thou art not far from Macedonia, thou haſt Philippi, thou haſt Theſſalonica: If thou canſt go into Aſia, there thou haſt Epheſus: If thou be adjacent to Italy, thou haſt Rome, whoſe Authority is near 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 you 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 juſtly and rationally as you alledge it to vindicate this priviledge to the *Roman* Church only? Certainly, if you will ſtand to *Tertullian*'s judgment, you muſt either grant the Authority of the *Roman* Church (though at that time a good Topical Argument, and perhaps a better than 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 general, yet, as I have ſaid, for point of direction he makes them all equal, and therefore makes them (chuſe 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 ſhews) 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 diſcern between that which is counterfeit, and that which is lawful and pure, and without any diminution may preach the faith of our Anceſtors.* Which certainly he might do, if ambition and covetouſneſs did not hinder him, or elſe I ſhould never condemn him for doing otherwiſe. But is there no difference between *may* and *muſt*? Between he may do ſo, and he cannot but do ſo? Or doth it follow, becauſe he may do ſo, therefore he always ſhall or will do ſo? In my opinion rather the contrary ſhould follow! For he that ſaith, you may do thus, implies according to the ordinary ſenſe of words, that if he will he may do otherwiſe. 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 witneſs I would willingly have examined, but it ſeems you are unwilling he ſhould be found, otherwiſe you would have given us your direction where we might have him. Of that *Maximianus* who ſucceeded *Neſtorius*, I can find no ſuch thing in the Councils: Neither can I believe that any Patriarch of *Conſtantinople* twelve hundred years ago was ſo baſe a paraſite of the Sea of *Rome*.

37. Your laſt witneſs, *John* of *Conſtantinople*, I confeſs, ſpeaks home, and advanceth the Roman Sea, even to heaven! But I fear it is, that his own may go up with it, which he there profeſſes to be 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 little 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 Grecian is not extant in Greek but in Latin only. Laſtly, it comes out of a ſuſpicious place, an old book of the *Vatican Library*: which Library the world knows to have been the Mint of very many Impoſtures.

38. *Ad §.* 20,21,22,23. The ſum of your diſcourſe in the four next Sections, if it be pertinent to the queſtion, in agitation muſt be this: *Want of ſucceſſion of Biſhops and Paſtors, holding always the ſame doctrine, and of the forms 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 error can make or prove any man or Church heretical. For if he be a true Ariſtotelian, or Platoniſt, or Pyrrhonian, or Epicurean, who holds the doctrine of *Ariſtotle*, or *Plato*, or *Pirrho*, or *Epicurus*, although he cannot aſſign any that held it before him for many ages together; why ſhould I not be made a true and orthodox Chriſtian, by believing all the doctrine of Chriſt, though I cannot derive my deſcent from a perpetual Succeſſion that believ'd it before me? By this reaſon you ſhould ſay as well, that no man can be a good Biſhop or Paſtor, or King or Magiſtrate, or Father, that ſucceeds a bad one. For, if I may conform my will and actions to the Commandments of God, why may I not embrace his doctrine with my underſtanding, although my predeceſſor did not ſo? You have above in this Chapter defin'd *Faith, A free infallible, obſcure, ſupernatural aſſent to divine Truths, becauſe they are revealed by God and ſufficiently propounded:* This definition is very phantaſtical; but for the preſent I will let it paſs, and deſire you to give me ſome piece or ſhadow of reaſon why I may not do all this without a perpetual ſucceſſion of Biſhops and Paſtors that have done ſo before me? You may judge as uncharitably, and ſpeak as maliciouſly of me, as your blind zeal 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 do believe the Goſpel of Chriſt (as it is delivered in the undoubted books of Canonical Scripture) as verily as that it is now day, that I ſee the light, that I am now writing: and I believe it upon this Motive, becauſe I conceive it ſufficiently, abundantly, ſuperabundantly proved to be divine Revelation: and yet in this, I do not depend upon any Succeſſion of men that have always believed it without any mixture of Error; nay I am fully perſwaded, there hath been no ſucceſſion, and yet do not find my ſelf any way weakened in my faith by the want of it, but ſo fully aſſured of the truth of it, that not only though your Devils at *Lowden* do tricks againſt it, but though an Angel from heaven ſhould gain-ſay 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 do believe all this, I deſire you to tell me, how are you ſure that you believe the Church of *Rome*? For, if a man may perſwade himſelf he doth believe what he doth not believe, then may you think you believe the Church of *Rome*, and yet not believe it. But if no man can err concerning what he believes, then you muſt give me leave to aſſure my ſelf that I do believe, and conſequently that any man may believe the foreſaid truths upon the foreſaid motives, without any dependance upon any ſucceſſion that hath believed it always. And as from your definition of Faith, ſo from your definition of Hereſie, this fancy may be refuted. For queſtionleſs no man can be an Heretique but he that holds an Hereſie, and an Hereſie you ſay *is a voluntary error*; 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 perpetual Succeſſion of Believers in all points Orthodox, is not a thing which is in our own power; therefore our being or not being Heretiques depends not on it. Beſides, What is more certain, then that he may make a ſtraight 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 believes the Scripture to be the word of God, and Rule of Faith, regulate his Faith by it, and conſequently believe aright, without much regarding what other men will do or have done? It is true indeed there is a neceſſity that if God will have his word believed, he by his providence muſt take order, that, either by ſucceſſion of men, or by ſome other means natural or ſupernatural,



ral, it be preſerv'd and delivered, and ſufficiently notified to be his word; but that this ſhould be done by a Succeſſion of men that holds no error againſt it, certainly there is no more neceſſity, then that it ſhould be done by a Succeſſion of men that commit no ſin againſt it. For if men may preſerve the Records of a Law, and yet tranſgreſs it, certainly they may alſo preſerve directions for their Faith, and yet not follow them. I doubt not but Lawyers at the Bar do find by frequent experience, that many men preſerve and produce evidences, which being examined oft-times make againſt themſelves. This they do ignorantly, it being in their power to ſuppreſs, 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 alledged, it was impoſſible for them to corrupt them? Seeing therefore this is all the neceſſity that is pretended of a perpetual Succeſſion of men orthodox 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 proof of this, which was your Major in your former Syllogiſm, That want of Succeſſion is a certain mark of Hereſie, 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; and 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 than a mans perſwaſion that he has not taken Phyſick or Poyſon, will make him not to have taken it if he has, or hinder the operation of it?) And whether *Tertullian* in the place quoted by you, ſpeak of a Prieſt made a Layman, by juſt depoſition or degradation, and not by a voluntary deſertion of his Order? And whether in the ſame place he ſet not ſome mark 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 Eccleſiaſtical? And, if by Eccleſiaſtical only, Whether he might poſſibly ſo abuſe his power, as to deſerve to loſe it? Whether *de facto*, he had done ſo? Whether, ſuppoſing he had deſerved to loſe 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 unlawful to go 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 we cannot believe that he had any before his deprivation? Whether, without Schiſm, a man may not withdraw obedience from an uſurp'd Authority commanding unlawful 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 Judge to judge againſt him, if his cauſe be bad; as well as *Trajan* gave his Sword to his Præfect with this Commiſſion, that, *If he governed well, he ſhould uſe it for him, if ill, 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 Goſpel of Chriſt, and conſequently againſt her doctrine, if it ſhould contradict any part of the Goſpel of Chriſt? Whether it be not acknowledged lawful in the Church of *Rome*, for any Lay-man or woman, that has ability, to perſwade others by word or writing

ting 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 than that of a Chriſtian, to do 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 any unneceſſary diſturbance of order) to perſwade men out of a falſe unto a true way of eternal happineſs? 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 ſoul from death, and ſhall hide a multitude of ſins*? 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 Cardinals do 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 Canonical exception? Whether the Doctrine, that the King is Supreme Head of the Church of *England*, (as the Kings of *Judah*, and the firſt Chriſtian Emperors were of the Jewiſh and Chriſtian Church) be any new-found doctrine? Whether it may not be true, that Biſhops being made Biſhops, have their authority immediately from Chriſt, though this or that man be not made Biſhop without the King's Authority; as well as you ſay, the Pope being Pope, has authority immediately from Chriſt, and yet this or that man cannot be made Pope without the authority of the Cardinals? Whether you do well to ſuppoſe, that Chriſtian Kings have no more authority in ordering the affairs of the Church, than 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 Kingdom, and yet not be capable of doing it himſelf: as well as a Biſhop may give authority to a Phyſician, to practiſe Phyſick in his Dioceſs, which the Biſhop cannot do himſelf? Whether, if *Nero* the Emperor would have commanded S. *Peter* or S. *Paul* to preach the Goſpel of Chriſt, and to exerciſe the office of a Biſhop of *Rome*, whether they would have queſtion'd his Authority to do ſo? Whether there were any Law of God or man, that prohibited King *JAMES* to give Commiſſion to Biſhops, nay, to lay his Injunction upon them, to do any thing that is lawful? Whether a caſual irregularity may not be lawfully diſpens'd with? Whether the Pope's irregularities, if he ſhould chance to incur any, be indiſpenſable? And if not, who is he, or who are they, whom the Pope is ſo ſubject unto, that they may diſpenſe 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 immediately by infuſion from God himſelf, yet, if they were the King's Subjects, he wants not Authority to command them to build him a Palace for his uſe, or a Fortreſs, for his ſervice: Or, as the King of *France* pretends not to have power to make Prieſts himſelf, yet, I hope, you will not deny him power to command any of his Subjects that has this power, to ordain any fit perſon Prieſt, whom he ſhall deſire to be ordained? Whether it do 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 King's 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 do 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 do ſo, whether juſtly or unjuſtly; neither the King himſelf, nor any body elſe, would eſteem the perſon Biſhop upon the King's deſignation? Whether many Popes, though they were not conſecrated Biſhops by any temporal Prince, yet might not, or did not receive authority from the Emperor to exerciſe their Epiſcopal 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 do indeed pretend that their Reformation is univerſal? Whether in ſaying, the *Donatiſts Sect was confined to* Africa, you do not forget your ſelf, 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 Schiſmatical and Heretical for thinking ſo? Whether your form of ordaining Biſhops and Prieſts, be eſſential to the conſtitution of a true Church? Whether the forms of the Church of *England* differ eſſentially from your forms? 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 external forms and orders, and government, be ſo neceſſary to the being of a Church, but that they may 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 Syllogiſm, 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 *Major*, *That want of Succeſſion is a certain note of Hereſie*, which for the preſent remains both unprov'd and unprobable.



40. *Ad* §. 23. *The Fathers*, you ſay, *aſſign Succeſſion as one mark of the true Church*: I confeſs they did urge Tradition as an Argument of the truth of their doctrine, and of the falſhood of the contrary; and thus far 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 leaf 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 be found out of them, by thoſe who know not Tradition, for that it was not delivered in writing*, (they did mean wholly) *but by word of mouth: And that thereupon* Paul *alſo ſaid, we ſpeak wiſdom amongſt the perfect*. So *Irenæus* in the very next Chapter before that which you alledge. Againſt theſe men being thus neceſſitated to do ſo, they did urge Tradition, but what, or whoſe Tradition was it? Certainly no other but the joynt 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 St. *Auſtin*, in the place before alledged by me. This Tradition they did urge againſt theſe men, and in a time, in compariſon of ours, almoſt contiguous to the Apoſtles: So near, that one of them, *Irenæus*, was Scholar to one who was Scholar to St. *John* the Apoſtle. *Tertullian* and *Origen* were not an

an age remov'd from him: and the last of them all, little more than 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 than 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 err in one faith* (it should be, should have erred into one Faith.) And this was the condition of this argument as the Fathers urg'd it. Now if you having to deal with us, who question no Book of Scripture, which was not anciently questioned by some whom you your selves esteem good Catholiques; nay who refuse not to be tried by your own Canon, and your own Translation, 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 Judges; if you will come fifteen hundred years after the Apostles, a fair time for the purest Church to gather much dross 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 self alone, and Heretical to all the rest: nay not only with her ancient and original Traditions, but also with her post-nate introduc'd Definitions, and these as we pretend repugnant to Scripture, and ancient Tradition, and all this to decline an indifferent tryal by Scripture, under pretence (wherein also you agree with the calumny 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 forementioned 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 liberal to you, and grant what you cannot prove, that the Fathers make Succession a certain and perpetual mark of the true Church; I beseech you what will come of it? What, that want of Succession is a certain sign of an Heretical company? Truly, if you say so, either you want Logick, which is a certain sign of an ill disputer: or are not pleas'd to use it, which is a worse. For speech is a certain sign 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 he is so, as eating, drinking, breathing, moving: So, though the constant and universal 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 wickedness, be contracted from its universality, and interrupted in its perpetuity, and so lose this argument, and yet not want others to justifie 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 express terms, or deducible from it by apparent consequence. If therefore you intend to prove want of a perpetual Succession of Professors a certain note of Heresie, you must not content your self to shew, that having it, is one sign of truth; but you must shew it to be the only sign 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 do it, you will marr all: for by proving this an inseparable sign of Catholique doctrine, you will prove your own, which apparently wants it in many points, not to be Catholique. For whereas you say *this Succession requires two things, agreement with the Apostles doctrine, and an uninterrupted conveyance of it down to them that challenge 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 always, as, your condemning the Doctrine of the Chiliasts, and holding the Eucha-



rist 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 *Universality of place, the want whereof you object to Protestants as a mark of Heresie*: You have not set down clearly 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 comparison of any other Religion, or only of heretical Christians: or, if in comparison of these, whether in comparison of all other Sects conjoyned, 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 Heresie: For those places of S. *Austin* do not deserve the name. And truly in my judgment you have done advisedly in proving it no better. For as for Universality of right, or a right to Universality, all Religions claim it, but only the true has it; and which has it cannot be determined, unless it be first determined which is the true. An absolute Universality 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, *Mahumetism* 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 than any one Sect of Christians, it would presently be replied, that it is uncertain 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 *opposed 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 himself, *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, do the Stars of the Heaven.* (As (*c*) S. *Austin* 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 *Nazianzen*'s life testifies, *That* (*e*) *the Heresie 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 poverty, who define the Church by the multitude, and despise the little flock? They have the People, but we the Faith.* And lastly, when *Athanasius* was so overborn with Sholes and Floods of Arrians, that he was enforced to write a Treatise on purpose (*g*) against those, *who judge of the truth only by plurality of adherents.* So that if you had proved want of Universality, even thus restrained, to be an infallible note of heresie, there would have been no remedy but you must have confessed, that the time was when you were Hereticks, And besides, I see not how you would have avoided this great inconvenience, of laying grounds and storing 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 wilderness.*

a *Hier. Cont. Luciferianos.*
b *In Theod. Hist. l.* 16. *c.* 2.
c *In ep.* 48. *ad Vincentium.*
d *Commentorii. lib.* 1. *c.* 4.
e *In vita Nazianz.*
f *In Orat. Arian. & pro se ipso.*
g *Tom.* 2.

43. *Ad* §. 25, & 26. The remainder of this Chapter if I would deal strictly with you, I might let pass as impertinent to the question now disputed. For whereas your argument promises that this whole Chapter shall be imployed in proving *Luther* and the Protestants guilty of Heresie, 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 Hereticks, or that they are therefore Hereticks

becauſe they have this faith? *Ariſtotle* believed there were Intelligences which moved the Spheres; he believed this with an humane perſwaſion, and not with a certain, obſcure, prudent, ſupernatural faith: and will you make *Ariſtotle* an Heretick, becauſe he believed ſo? You believe there was ſuch a man as *Julius Cæſar*, that there is ſuch a City as *Conſtantinople*, and your belief hereof has not theſe qualifications which you require to divine faith: And will you be content that this ſhall paſs for a ſufficient proof that you are an Heretick? Hereſie you have defined above to be a voluntary error: but he that believes truth, though his belief be not qualified according to your mind, yet ſure in believing truth he believes no error; and from hence according to ordinary Logick methinks it ſhould follow, that ſuch a man for doing ſo, cannot be guilty of Hereſie.

44. But you will ſay, though he be not guilty of Hereſie for believing theſe truths, yet if his faith be not ſaving, to what purpoſe will it be? Truly very little to the purpoſe of Salvation, as little as it is to your proving Proteſtants guilty of Hereſie. But out of our wonted indulgence, let us pardon this fault alſo, and do you the favour to hear what you can ſay, to beget this faith in us, that indeed we have no faith, ar 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 policy, disjoynted, and given us the grounds of it in the beginning 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 deceitful. I have ſhewed by many certain arguments, that though the ſubject matter of our faith be in it ſelf moſt certain, yet that abſolute certainty of adherence is not required to the eſſence of faith, no nor to make it acceptable with God, but that to both theſe effects it is ſufficient, if it be firm enough to produce Obedience and Charity. I have ſhewed beſides, that Prudence is rather commendable in faith, than intrinſecal and eſſential 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 produced but vain Sophiſms, and for the moſt part, ſuch arguments as return moſt violently upon your ſelves. Thus then you ſay.

45. Firſt, *that their belief wanteth certainty, I prove, becauſe they denying the univerſal Infallibility of the Church, can have 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 do you know that your Church is infallible? Upon what certain ground do 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 alleadge for your infallibility, are incorrupted: that that which you pretend is the true ſenſe of them? When you have produced certain grounds for all theſe things, I doubt not but it will appear 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 and 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



46. But you proceed, and tell us, that *Holy Scripture is in it ſelf moſt true and infallible, but without the direction and declaration of the Church, we can neither have certain means to know what Scripture is Canonical, nor what Tranſlations be faithful, 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 proof of it can be pretended, but only ſome Texts of Canonical Scripture, truly interpreted: Therefore either you are miſtaken, in thinking there is no other means to know theſe things, but your Churches infallible direction; or we are excluded from all means of knowing her direction to be infallible.

47. *But Proteſtants, though, as you ſuppoſe, they are perſwaded their own opinions are true, and that they have uſed ſuch means 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 clear, 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 clearly 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 do ſometimes fail, becauſe the diſagreement of Logicians and Geometricians ſhew, that ſome of them are deceived. Might not a Jew 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 Turk might uſe the ſame argument againſt both Jews and Chriſtians, and an Atheiſt againſt all Religions, and a Sceptick againſt all Reaſon. Might not one ſay, Mens diſagreement in Religion, ſhews that there is no certainty in any; and the other, that experience of their contradictions teacheth, that the rules of reaſon do ſometimes fail? Do not you ſee and feel how void of reaſon and how full of impiety your ſophiſtry is? And how, tranſported with zeal 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 anſwer is eaſie 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 fundamental, and therefore muſt remain uncertain, whether or no they be not in ſome fundamental error.* Anſw. By like reaſon ſince you acknowledge, that every error in Points defined and declared by your Church deſtroys 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 fundamental 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 appears from your own words, c. 4. §. 3. of your ſecond Part, where, ſay you, *No leſs impertinent is your diſcourſe concerning the difficulty to know what is Hereſie: For we grant that it is not always eaſie to determine in particular occaſions, whether this or that Doctrine be ſuch, becauſe it may be doubtful, 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 divers Points, which ſome of you ſay are defined, others the contrary. And others hang in ſuſpence, 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 fundamental, yet believing all the Bible, we are certain enough that we believe all that is fundamental. 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 loseth all Divine Faith, is a very true Doctrine delivered by Catholick Divines,* (you mean your own) *with so general a consent, that the contrary is wont to be censured as temerarious: Now certainly some Protestants must do so, because they hold contradictions which cannot all be true: Therefore some of them at least, have no divine faith.* *Answ.* I pass by your weakness, in urging Protestants with the authority of your Divines, which yet in you might very deservedly be censured. For when D. *Potter*, to shew the many actual dissentions between the Romish Doctors, notwithstanding their brags of potential Unity, refers to *Pappus*, who has collected out of *Bellarmine* their contradictions, and set them down in his own words to the number of 237. and to *Flacius, de Sectis & Controversiis Religionis Papisticæ*; you making the very same use of M. *Brerely* against Protestants, yet jeer and scorn D. *Potter*, as if he offered you for a proof, 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 Hereticks, to prove your many contradictions*: As if he had proved this with the bare authority, the bare judgment of these men, which sure he does not, but with the formal words of *Bellarmine* faithfully collected by *Pappus*. And why then might we not say to you, Is it not pretty that you bring *Brerely* as flat an Heretick as *Pappus* or *Flacius*, to prove the contradictions of Protestants? Yet had he been so vain as to press you with the meer authority of Protestant Divines in any point, methinks, for your own sake, you should have pardoned him, who here, and in many other places, urge us with the judgment of your Divines as with weighty Arguments. Yet if the authority of your Divines were even Canonical, 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 destroys all divine faith.* For they all require, (not your self excepted) that this truth must not only be revealed, but revealed publickly, 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 vain 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 truths about which they differ, are of this quality and condition. But though out of courtesie we may suppose this Doctrine true, yet we have no reason to grant it, nor to think it any thing but a vain and groundless fancy: and that this very weak and inartificial argument, from the authority of your Divines, is the strongest pillar which it hath to support it. Two reasons you alleadge for it out of *Thomas Aquinas*, the first whereof vainly supposeth against reason and experience, that *by the commission of any deadly sin, 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 turn us all into stone, and in confidence of it, insult upon Doctor *Potter*, as if he durst not come near it, yet in very truth having considered it well, I find it a serious, grave, prolixe, and profound *nothing*. I could answer it in a word, by telling you, that it begs without all proof or colour of proof, the main question between us, That the infallibility of your Church is either the formal 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 add a large confutation of this

vain



vain fancy, out of one of the most rational 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 general readiness to believe whatsoever the Church believes, yet err 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, do yet choose to dissent from it, either by doubting of it, or affirming the contrary. For of the former the answer is easie; but of these, that is, of Hereticks 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 do not err, first experience seems to convince: For many at this day denying, for example sake, Purgatory or Invocation of Saints, nevertheless firmly hold, as by divine revelation, that God is Three and One, that the Son 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 Catholicks: So that they assisted them very much against the Arrians, as Socrates relates in his Ecclesiastical History. Moreover the same is proved by the example of the Apostles, who in the time of Christ's Passion being scandalized, lost their faith in him: as also, Christ after his Resurrection upbraids them with their incredulity, and calls* Thomas *incredulous, for denying the Resurrection.* John 20. *Whereupon S.* Austin *also in his Preface upon the 96* Psalm *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 Eternal life, and such like other Articles. Besides, the Jews before Christs coming, 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 firmly as they did before.*

*Add hereunto, that neither Jews nor Hereticks seem 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, Chap. 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 Jews and Hereticks, though they err in many things, yet in other things may be so divinely illuminated as to believe aright. So S.* Austin *seems to teach in his Book* De Unico Baptismo contra Petilianum *c. 3. in these words: When a Jew comes to us to be made a Christian, we destroy not in him God's good things, but his own ill. That he believes, One God is to be worshipped, that he hopes for Eternal life, but 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 subjoyning 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 formal object of Faith seems 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 kind 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 Heretick 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,

*teacheth, and so would not be an Heretick. 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 Heretick true faith, in respect of the Article in which he doth not err. Others, as* Scotus *and* Bonaventure, *define not the matter plainly, but seem to choose a middle way.*

*To the authority of S.* Austin *and these School-men, this may be adjoyned, That it is usual with Good Christians to say, that Hereticks have not the entire faith. Whereby it seems to be intimated, that some part of it they do retain. Whereof this may be another reason: That if the truths which a Jew or a Heretick holds, he should not hold them by faith, but after some other manner, to wit, by his own proper will and judgment, it will follow, that all the 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.* Austin, *both elsewhere, and especially in the end of his Book* De potentia.

*As for the reason alleadged to the contrary, We answer: It is impertinent to faith, by what means we believe the prime Verity, that is by what means God useth to confer upon men the gift of faith. For although now the ordinary means be the Testimony and teaching of the Church, yet it is certain that by other means, faith hath been given heretofore, and is given still. For many of the Ancients, as* Adam, Abraham, Melchisedeck, Job, *received faith by special 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 means, when as yet they had heard nothing of the infallibility of the Church. To little Children by Baptism, without any other help, faith is infused: 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 do indeed truly belong to the faith; either because they are now, or heretofore have been confirmed by Miracles; or because he manifestly sees that the ancient Church taught so; or upon some other inducement. And yet nevertheless we must not say, that Hereticks and Jews do hold the Faith, but only some part of the Faith. For the Faith signifies an entire thing, and compleat in all parts; whereupon an Heretick is said to be simply an Infidel, 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 readiness of will, wherewith by others are held all those Points which appertain to the Faith.* And thus far *Æstius.* Whose discourse I presume may pass for a sufficient refutation of your argument out of *Aquinas.* And therefore your Corollaries drawn from it, That *every error against Faith, involves opposition against God's 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 too blame for requiring to faith contradicting conditions. If certainty and obscurity will stand together, what reason can be imagined that a Protestant may not entertain them both as well as a Papist? Your bodies and 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 make this long discourse against Protestants, why may not we 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*



*cessary to salvation. Now these Principles being once supposed, it clearly followeth, that what Papists believe 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 lawfulness of the half Communion, The lawfulness 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 natural discourse, but only by the eye of Reason cleared by Grace: For supernatural evidence, no less (yea, rather more) drowns and excludes obscurity, than natural evidence doth. Neither can the Party so enlightned, be said voluntarily to captivate his understanding to that light, but rather his understanding is by necessity made captive, and forced not to disbelieve 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.*

And having thus cried 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 injury, in setling your faith upon principles which you disclaim. And if you alleadge this disparity, That you are more certain of your principles than we of ours, and yet you do not pretend that your Principles are so evident, as we do that ours are: what is this to say, but that you are more confident than we, but confess you have less reason for it? For the evidence of the thing assented to, be it more or less, 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 believe 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 increased as long as they *walk 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 and 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 evedently certain, or of it self, and being devested of the motives of credibility, evidently credible: For they are not so fond as to conceive, nor so vain as to pretend, that all men do 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 he would certainly without a miracle believe it to be the Word of God: which he could not chuse if it were evidently credible. What then do they affirm of it? Certainly, no more than 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 believe 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 yield unto it firm faith and sincere obedience. Let that learned man *Hugo Grotius* speak for all the rest, in his Book *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 scandal and an objection against Christianity. He then in the last Chapter of his second

Book

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 ways 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 suspicion of untruth; otherwise down goes all the frame and use of History, and a great part of the Art of Physick, together with all dutifulness 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 believe (so that the very belief thereof may be imputed to us for obedience) should not so evidently appear, as those things which are apprehended by sense and plain demonstration, but only be so far forth revealed as may beget faith, and a perswasion thereof, in the hearts and minds of such as are not obstinate: That so the Gospel may be as a touch-stone for trial 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 faults of other mens infidelity is not for want of sufficient testimony, but because they would not have that to be bad and embraced for truth, which is contrary to their wilful 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 do, if they admit of Christ's Doctrine, and obey what he hath commanded. And this is the rather to be noted of them, for that many other Historical 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 do declare the History of Christ to be true.*

52. And now you see, I hope, that Protestants neither do need nor pretend to any such evidence in the Doctrine they believe, 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 is, *want of Prudence.* Touching which Point, as I have already demonstrated, that wisdom is not essential to faith, but that a man may truly believe 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 than you; and that if a wiser than *Solomon* were here, he should have better reason to believe the Religion of Protestants than Papists, the Bible rather than the Council of *Trent.* But let us hear what you can say!

53. *Ad §. 31.* You demand then first of all, *what wisdom 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 lies no Prescription, and therefore certainly it might be great wisdom to forsake ancient errors for more ancient Truths. One God is rather to be followed than innumerable worlds of men: And therefore it might be great wisdom 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 do so, although all the world besides were madly resolute to do the contrary. It might be great wisdom to forsake the errors though of the only Visible Church, much more of the *Roman*, which in conceiving her self the whole Visible Church, does somewhat like the Frog in the Fable, which thought the ditch he lived in, to be all the world.

54. You demand again, *what wisdom was it to forsake a Church acknowledg'd to want nothing necessary to Salvation, indued with Succession of Bishops, &c. usque ad Election or choice?* I answer: Yet might it be great wisdom 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



victed 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 perpetual succession of Bishops, holding always the same doctrine; and with a ridiculous impudence pretending perpetual possession of all the world: whereas the world knows, that a little before *Luther's* arising, your Church was confined to a part of a part of it. Lastly a Church vainly glorying in the dependance of other Churches upon her, which yet she supports no more than those crouching Anticks which seem in great buildings to labour under the weight they bear, do 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 Jews) 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 lawful 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 we ask 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 little 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 pass for a true Church. Such a Church (and no better) as you do sometimes acknowledge Protestants to be, that is, a company of men, wherein some ignorant souls may be saved. So that in this ballancing of Religion against Religion, and Church against Church, it seems you have nothing of weight and moment to put into your scale; nothing but smoak and wind, vain shadows and phantastical 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 means to procure it; no farther extent when *Luther* arose than *Luthers* body; no universality 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 quarrel 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 grains of partiality your Scale might seem to turn. But then, if it may appear that part of these objections are falsly made against them, the rest vainly; that whatsoever of truth is in these imputations, is impertinent to this trial, and whatsoever is pertinent is untrue; and besides, that plenty of good matter may be alledged for Protestants which is here dissembled: Then, I hope, our cause may be good, notwithstanding these pretences.

55. I say then that want of Universality of time and place, the invisibility or not existence of the professors of Protestant Doctrine before *Luther*, *Luther's* being alone when he first opposed your Church, Our having our Church, Ordination, Scriptures, personal and yet not doctrinal 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 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 do 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 Unity and means of proving it*, Luther's *oppoſing your Church upon meer paſſion*, *Our following private men rather than the Catholique Church*, the firſt and laſt are meer untruths, for we want not Unity, nor means to procure it in things neceſſary. Plain places of Scripture, and ſuch as need no interpreter are our means to obtain it. Neither do 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 *Luther's oppoſing your Church upon meer 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 condemn us, unleſs 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 been in the choice of your arguments, to prove Proteſtants unwiſe in the choice of their Religion.

56. It remains now, that I ſhould ſhew that many reaſons of moment may be alledged 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 do not underſtand by your Religion the doctrine of *Bellarmin*, or *Baronius*, or any other private man amongſt you, nor the doctrine of the *Sorbon*, or of the *Jeſuites*, or of the *Dominicans*, or of any other particular Company among you; but that wherein you all agree, or profeſs to agree, *the Doctrine of the Council of Trent*: ſo accordingly on the other ſide, by the *Religion of Proteſtants*, I do not underſtand the Doctrine of *Luther*, or *Calvin*, or *Melanchthon*; nor the confeſſion of *Auguſta*, or *Geneva*, nor the Catechiſm of *Heidelberg*, nor the Articles of the Church of *England*, no nor the *Harmony* of Proteſtant Confeſſions; but that wherein 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 coherence to their own grounds believe it themſelves, nor require the belief of it of others, without moſt high and moſt Schiſmatical preſumption. I for my part after a long and (as I verily believe and hope) impartial ſearch of *the true way to eternal happineſs*, do profeſs 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, Councils againſt Councils, 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 ſelf 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 profeſs, according to this I will live, and for this, if there be occaſion, I will not only willingly, but even gladly loſe 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 or no, and, ſeem it never ſo incomprehenſible to humane reaſon, I will ſubſcribe it with hand and heart, as knowing no Demonſtration can be ſtronger than this, God hath ſaid ſo therefore it is true. In other things, I will take no mans liberty of judgment from him; neither ſhall any man



man take mine from me. I will think no man the worſe man, nor the worſe Chriſtian: I will love no man the leſs, for differing in opinion from me. And what meaſure I mete 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 than this, To believe the Scripture to be God's 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 than if I had guided my ſelf 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 find 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 me. 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 fail of Salvation?

58. Beſides, whatſoever may be pretended to gain to your Church the credit of a Guide, all that and much more may be ſaid for the Scripture. Hath your Church been ancient? The Scripture is more ancient. Is your Church a means to keep men at unity? ſo is the Scripture, to keep thoſe that believe it and will obey it in unity of belief, in matters neceſſary or very profitable; and in unity of Charity, in points unneceſſary. Is your Church univerſal for time or place? Certainly the Scripture is more univerſal. For all the Chriſtians in the world (thoſe I mean that in truth deſerve this name) do now, and always have believed the Scripture to be the word of God, ſo much of it at leaſt, as contains all things neceſſary; whereas only you ſay, that you only are the Church of God, and 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 tacitly confeſs that your ſelves are ſurer of the truth of the Scripture than of your Churches authority. For we muſt be ſurer of the proof than of the thing proved, otherwiſe it is no proof.

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. Fifthly, to follow the Scripture I have God's expreſs warrant and command, and no colour of any prohibition: But to believe your Church infallible, I have no command at all, much leſs an expreſs command. Nay I have reaſon to fear that I am prohibited to do ſo in theſe words, *Call no man Maſter on the earth: They fell by infidelity, Thou ſtandeſt by faith, Be not high minded but fear: 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, unleſs he be of a perverſe mind, that the Scripture is the

word of God: And then no reaſon can be greater than this; God ſays 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, than the infallibility of your Church appears to be confirm'd by it: and conſequently muſt be ſo fooliſh as to believe your Church exempted from error upon leſs evidence, rather than ſubject to the common condition of mankind upon greater evidence. Now if I take the Scripture only for my Guide, I ſhall not need to do 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 *Prudential* 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 undergo 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 be prepar'd in mind to renounce my allegiance to the King, when the Pope ſhall declare him an Heretique and command mé not to obey him: and I muſt be prepar'd in mind *to eſteem Virtue Vice, and Vice Virtue, if the Pope ſhall ſo determine.* Indeed you ſay it is impoſſible he ſhould do the later; 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 Pope's commands ſhould be contrary to the Law of Chriſt, that they of your Religion muſt reſolve to obey rather the commands of the Pope than the law of Chriſt. Whereas if I follow the Scripture I may, nay I muſt, obey my Sovereign in lawful things, though an Heretique, though a Tyrant; and though, I do not ſay the Pope, but the Apoſtles themſelves, nay *an Angel from heaven ſhould teach any thing againſt the Goſpel 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 maintains 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 Wars, by Perſecutions, by Maſſacres, by Treaſons, by Rebellions; in ſhort, by all manner of carnal means 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 ſhould 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 Succeſſour of the Apoſtles, and Guide of Faith, it is even palpable, that he makes your Religion the inſtrument of his ambition, and by it ſeeks to entitle himſelf *directly or indirectly to the Monarchy of the world.* And beſides, it is evident to any man that has but half an eye, that moſt of thoſe Doctrines which you add to the Scripture do make one way or other, for the honour or temporal 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 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 *righteouſneſs* for which *Chriſt ſhall judge the world.*

69. Following the Scriptures, I ſhall believe that which Univerſal, never-failing



failing Tradition aſſures me, that it was by the admirable ſupernatural works 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 ſeem to give atteſtation to ſome parts of your Doctrine, yet this proves nothing but the truth of the Scripture, which foretold that (God's providence permitting it, and the wickedneſs of the world deſerving it) *ſtrange ſigns and wonders ſhould be wrought to confirm falſe doctrine, that they which love not the truth, may be given over to ſtrong deluſions.* Neither does it ſeem 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 ſelf Salvation without effectual dereliction and mortification of all vices, and the effectual practice of all Chriſtian Virtues: But your Church opens an eaſier and a broader way to Heaven, and though I continue all my life long in a courſe of ſin, and without the practice of any virtue, yet gives me aſſurance that I may be let into heaven at a poſtern gate, even by an act of Attrition at the hour 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, meekneſs, fortitude, conſtancy and gravity, contempt of the world, love of God and the love of mankind; In a word, of all vertues, and againſt all vice, which the Scriptures impoſe upon us, to be obeyed under pain of damnation: The ſum whereof is in manner compris'd in our *Saviours Sermon upon the Mount*, recorded in the 5. 6. and 7. of St. *Matthew*, which if they were generally obeyed, could not but make the world generally happy, and the goodneſs of them alone were ſufficient to make any wiſe and good man believe that this Religion rather than any other, came from God the Fountain of all goodneſs. And that they may be generally obeyed our Saviour hath ratified them all in the cloſe of his Sermon, with theſe univerſal Sanctions, *Not every one that ſaith Lord, Lord, ſhall enter into the Kingdom, 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 likened unto a fooliſh man which built his houſe upon the ſand, and the rain deſcended, and the flood came, and he 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 laws for all Chriſtians, but Counſels of perfection and matters of Supererogation: that a man ſhall do well if he do obſerve them, but he ſhall not ſin if he obſerve them not; That they are for them who aim at high places in heaven, who aſpire with the two ſons of *Zebedee*, to the right hand or the left hand of Chriſt: But if a man will be content barely to go to heaven, and to be a door-keeper in the houſe of God, eſpecially if he will be content to taſte of Purgatory in the way, he may obtain it at an 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 Fountain of holineſs and goodneſs.

72. Laſtly, if I follow your Church for my Guide, I ſhall do all one, as if I ſhould follow a company of blind men in a judgment 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 idleneſs refuſe the trouble of a ſevere trial of their Religion, (as if heaven were not worth it;) or out of ſuperſtition fear the event of ſuch a tryal, that they may be ſcrupled and ſtaggered and diſquieted by it; and therefore for the moſt part do it not at all? Or, if they do it, they do it negligently and hypocritically, and perfunctorily, rather for the ſatisfaction of others than themſelves:

but

but certainly without indifference, without liberty of judgment, 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 do you no injury: but it is very apparent to all men from your ranking, *doubting of any part of your Doctrine*, among mortal sins. For from hence it follows, that seeing every man must resolve that he will never commit mortal sin, that he must never examine the grounds of it at all, for fear he should be mov'd to doubt: or if he do, 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 himself in a firm belief of your Religion, though his reason and his understanding fail 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, lest you should do good! That have eyes to see and will not see, that *have not the love of truth* (which is only to be known by an indifferent tryal) and therefore deserve *to be given over to strong delusions*; men that love darkness more than 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 remains unspoken to in this Section, some places out of St. *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 *Luther*'s speeches, I told you, not long since, that we follow no private men, and regard not much what he says, 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 do it, but over-do it. He that will justifie all his speeches, especially such as he wrote in heat of opposition, I believe will have work enough. Yet in these sentences, though he over-reach in the particulars, yet what he says in general we confess true, and confess with him *that in the Papacy are many good things*, which have come from them to us; but withal we say there are many bad, neither do we 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 wisdom, to separate between the *precious 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 supernatural: and being imprudent and rash, it cannot proceed from Divine motion, and so is not supernatural in respect of the cause from which it proceedeth.* Ans. This little 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 the nature or essence of it, supernatural? 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 supernatural 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



75. And thus having weighed your whole Discourse, and found it altogether lighter than vanity, why should I not invert your conclusion, and say, Seeing you have not proved that whosoever errs against any one point of Faith loseth 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 sin, it follows 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. *Chrysostom* with which you conclude this Chapter may in a good sense be true: for oft-times 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 implies a repugnance and destroys it self. 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 Gospel of Christ, seeing he makes it uneffectual to the end for which it was intended, the Salvation of mens souls. 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 Sin, as long as they remain separated from the* Roman-*Church.*

THAT, due *Order* is to be observed in the Theological Virtue of *Charity*, whereby we are directed to prefer 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, (a) Cant. 2. 4
because the infinite goodness of God, which is the *formal Object*, or *Motive* of *Charity*, and for which all other things are loved, is differently participated by different Objects; and therefore the love we bear to them for Gods sake, must accordingly be unequal. In the virtue of *Faith*, the case is far otherwise; because all the Objects, or points which we believe, do 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 speak 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 error against *Faith*, is injurious to God and destructive of Salvation.

2. This order in Charity may be considered; towards God, our own Soul; the soul of our Neighbour; our own life, or goods; and the life or goods of our Neighbour. God is to be beloved above all things, both *Objectivè* (as the Divines speak) that is, we must wish or desire to God, a good more great, perfect and noble than to any, or all other things: namely, all that indeed He is, a Nature Infinite, Independent, Immense, &c. and also *Appretiativè*, that is, we must sooner lose what good soever, than 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 prefer the life and goods of our Neighbour before our own: we are bound to prefer the soul of our Neighbour before our own temporal goods or life, if he happen to be in extreme spiritual necessity, and that we by our assistance can succour him, according to the saying of Saint *John*: *In this we have known* (b) *the Charity of God, because he hath yielded his life for us, and we ought to yield our life for our Brethren* And Saint *Augustine* likewise (b) 1 Joan. 3. v. 16
saith, *A Christian will not doubt (c) to lose his own temporal life, for the eternal life of his Neighbour.* Lastly (c) De mend. cap. 6.
we are to prefer the *spiritual* good of our own soul, before both the spiritual and temporal 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 self it enclines him to procure those things whereby the said union with God is effected, rather to himself then to others. And from hence it follows, that in things necessary to salvation, no man ought in any case, or in any respect whatsoever, to prefer the spiritual good, either of any particular person, or of the whole world before his own soul; according to those words of our blessed Saviour: *What doth it* (d) *avail a man, if he gain the whole world, and* (d) Mat 6.
*sustain the damage of his own soul?* And therefore (to come to our present purpose) it is directly against the *Order* of Charity, or against Charity as it hath a reference to our selves, which Divines call *Charitas propria*, to adventure either the omitting of any means 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 something necessarily required to salvation, or else to perform some act against it, we commit a most grievous sin against the virtue of *Charity*, as it respects our selves, and so cannot hope for salvation without repentance.

3. Now of things necessary to salvation, there are two sorts, according to the doctrine of all 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, keep the Commandments.* In which kind of things, (e) Matth. 19. 17.
as probable ignorance of the Law, or of the Commandment, 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 medii, finis*, or *salutis*; because they are Means appointed by God to attain our *end* of eternal *salvation*, in so strict a manner, that it were *presumption* to *hope* for Salvation

tion without them. And as the former means are said to be necessary, because they are commanded, so the later are commonly said to be commanded, because they are necessary; that is, although there were no other special precept concerning them; yet supposing they be once appointed as means absolutely necessary to salvation, there cannot but arise an obligation of procuring to have them, in virtue of that universal precept of Charity, which obligeth every man to procure the salvation of his own soul. In this sort *divine infallible Faith* is necessary to salvation; as likewise repentance of every deadly sin, and in the doctrine of Catholiques, Baptism *in re*, that is, in *Act*, to Children, and for those who are come to the use of reason, *in voto*, or *hearty* desire, when they cannot have it in act. And as Baptism is necessary for remission of *Original* and *Actual* sin committed before it; so the Sacrament of *Confession*, or penance is necessary *in re*, or *in voto*, in *act* or *desire*, for the remission of mortal sins, committed after Baptism. The minister of which Sacrament of Penance being necessarily a true Priest, true Ordination is necessary in the Church of God for remission of sins 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 himself of all deadly sins, although he die suddenly, or unexpectedly fall out of his wits, and so commit no new sin by omission of repentance; yet he shall be eternally punished for his former sins committed, and never repented of. If an Infant die without Baptism, he cannot be saved; not by reason of any actual sin committed by him in omitting Baptism, but for Original sin, not forgiven, by the means 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 Mr. *Bilson*, late of *Winchester* (f) and others, hold it to be true, even in the Children of the faithful. And if Protestants in general disagree from Catholiques in this point, it cannot be denied but that our disagreement is in a point very *fundamental*. And the like I say of the Sacrament of Penance, which they deny to be necessary to salvation, either in act or in desire; which error is likewise fundamental, because it concerns (as I said) a thing necessary to salvation: And for the same reason, if their Priesthood and Ordination be doubtful, as certainly it is, they are in danger to want a means without which they cannot be saved. Neither ought this rigour to seem strange, or unjust: For Almighty God having, of his own *Goodness*, without our *merit*, first ordained man to a *supernatural* end of eternal 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 means which in his infinite wisdom he thinks most fit; who can say, Why doest thou so? or who can *hope* for that *End*, without such *means*? Blessed be his Divine Majesty, for vouchsafing to ordain us, base creatures, to so sublime an end, by any means at all!

(f) In his true difference, &c. Part. 4. Pag. 163. and 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 sin, that we proceed prudently, and by the conduct of some probable opinion maturely weighed and approved by men of virtue, learning, and wisdom. Neither are we always obliged to follow the most strict, and severe, or secure part, as long as the doctrine which we 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 affairs and discourse, evidence and certainty cannot be always expected. But when we treat not precisely of avoiding sin, but moreover of procuring some thing without which I cannot be saved; I am obliged by the *Law* and *Order* of *Charity*, to procure as great certainty as morally I am able, and am not to follow every 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 a case, I shall incur a new sin against the *Virtue* of *Charity* towards my *self*, which obligeth every one not to expose his soul to the hazard of eternal 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 sin 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 *Moral infused* Virtue *of Religion*; yet when they are such Sacraments, as the invalidity thereof may indanger the salvation of souls, all do with one consent agree, that it is a grievous offence to use a doubtful, or only probable *Matter* or *Form*, when it is in our power to procure certainty. If therefore it may appear, that though it were not certain that Protestancy unrepented destroys Salvation (as we have proved to be very certain) yet at least that it is *probable*, and withal, 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 embrace that safe way.

5. Now that Protestants have reason, at least to doubt in what case they stand, is deduced from what we have said, and proved about the universal infallibility of the Church, and of her being Judge of Controversies, to whom all Christians ought to submit their Judgment (as even some Protestants grant) and whom to oppose in any one of her definitions, is a grievous sin: As also from what we have said of the *Unity*, *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 fundamental and not fundamental, (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 Schism, of Heresie, of the persons who first revolted from *Rome*, and of their Motives; of the Nature of Faith, which is destroyed by any least error, and it is certain, that some of them must be in error, and want the substance of true Faith; and since all pretend the like certainty, it is clear that none of them have any certainty at all, but that they want true faith, which is a means *most absolutely necessary* to Salvation. Moreover, as I said heretofore, since it is granted that every Error in fundamental points is damnable, and that they cannot tell in particular, what points be fundamental, it follows that none of them knows, whether he, or his Brethren do not err damnably, it being certain that among so many disagreeing persons some must err. Upon the same ground of not being able to assign what points be fundamental, I say, they cannot be sure whether the difference among them be fundamental or no, and consequently whether they agree in the substance of Faith and hope of Salvation. I omit to add, that you want the Sacrament of Penance, instituted for remission of sins, or at least you must confess that you hold it not necessary; and yet your own Brethren, for example the *Century Writers* do (g) acknowledge that in times of *Cyprian* and *Tertullian*, *Private Confession* even of *Thoughts was used*; and that it was then *commanded and thought* neces-

(g) Cent. 3. cap. [illegible] 127.



*necessary*. The like, I say, concerning your Ordination, which at least is very doubtful, and consequently all that depends thereon.

6. On the other side, that the *Roman* Church is the safer way to Heaven (not to repeat what hath been already said upon divers occasions) I will again put you in mind, that unless the *Roman* Church was the true Church there was no visible true Church upon earth. A thing so manifest, that Protestants themselves confess that more than 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 unless Ours be the true Church, you cannot pretend to any perpetual visible Church of your Own; but Ours doth not depend on yours, before which it was. And here I wish you to consider with fear and trembling how all *Roman* Catholicks, not one excepted; that is, those very men whom you must hold not to err damnably in their belief, unless you will destroy your own Church, and Salvation; do with unanimous consent believe, and profess that Protestancy unrepented destroys 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 acknowledge *not to be cut off from hope of Salvation*, (which are your own words) than to live in a Church, which the said confessedly true Church doth firmly believe, and constantly profess not to be capable of Salvation. And therefore I conclude, that by the most strict obligation of *Charity* towards your own soul, you are bound to place it in safety, by returning to that Church, from which your Progenitors Schismatically departed; lest 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 self. It is taken from the words of the Donatists, speaking to Catholicks in this manner: *Your selves confess* (k) *our Baptism, 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 souls. Neither is it grounded upon your *Charitable Judgment* (as you (l) speak) but upon an inevitable necessity for you, either to grant Salvation to our Church, or to entail certain damnation upon your own: because yours can have no being till *Luther*, unless ours be supposed to have been the true Church of Christ. And since you term this Argument a Charm, take heed you be none of those, who, according to the Prophet *David*, do not hear *the voice of him* (m) *who charmeth wisely*. But to come to the purpose: Catholicks 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 Catholicks, that the Donatists had true *Baptism*, when you come to the contrary words of the *Donatists*, you add, *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 Catholicks never yielded, that among the Donatists there was a true Church, or hope of Salvation. And your self, a few leaves after, acknowledge that the Donatists *maintained an error*, which *was in the Matter and Nature of it properly Heretical, against that Article of the Creed, wherein we profess to believe the holy* (n) *Catholick Church*: and consequently you cannot allow salvation to them, as you do, and must do to us. And therefore the *Donatists* could not make the like argument against Catholicks, as Catholicks make against you, who grant us salvation, which we deny to you. But at least (you will say) this Argument for the certainty of their Baptism, was like to Ours touching the Security and Certainty of our Salvation; and therefore that Catholicks should have esteemed the Baptism of the Donatists more certain than their own, and so have allowed Rebaptization of such as were baptized by Hereticks, or sinners, as the Donatists esteemed all Catholicks to be. I answer, No. Because it being a matter of Faith, that Baptism administred by Hereticks, observing due Matter, Form, *&c.* is valid: to rebaptize any so baptized, had been both a sacriledge in reiterating a Sacrament not reiterable, and a profession also of a damnable Heresie, and therefore had not been more *safe*, but certainly damnable. But you confess 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 profess as we do, cannot exclude Salvation, as Rebaptization must have done. But if the *Donatists* could have affirmed, with truth, that in the opinion both of Catholicks and themselves, their Baptism was good, yea, and good in such sort as that unless theirs was good, that of the Catholicks could not be such: but their's might be good, though that of the Catholicks were not: and further, that it was no damnable error to believe, that Baptism administred by the Catholicks was not good, nor that it was any Sacriledge to reiterate the same Baptism of Catholicks: 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 confess that our Doctrine contains no damnable error, and that our Church is so certainly a true Church, that unless ours be true, you cannot pretend any; Yea, you grant, that you should be guilty of Schism, if you did cut off our Church from the Body of Christ, and the hope of Salvation: But we neither do, 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?

l Page 81.

m Psal. 57. 6.

n Page 126.

9. But I wonder not a little, and so I think will every body else, what the reason may be, that you do not so much as go about to answer the Argument of the *Donatists*, which you say is all one with Ours, but refer us to S. *Augustine* there to read it; as if every one carried with him a Library, or were able to examine the place 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, unless you can confute it, ought alone to move every one who hath care of his soul, 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 Catholicks (o) approve the Baptism of Donatists, but abhor their heresie 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 theives; so though Baptism be good, yet it must not be sought for in the Conventicles of Donatists. But you free us from damnable heresie, and yield us salvation which I hope is

o A Lit. Peil. l. 2. cap. 108.
p Contra Cresc. lib. 1. cap. 21.

to be embraced 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 infer, that it is safest for you to seek salvation among us. You had good reason to conceal S. *Augustines* answer to the *Donatists*.

q Pag. 79. 10. You frame another Argument in our behalf, and make us speak thus: If Protestants *believe the* (q) *Religion* of Catholicks *to be a safe way to Heaven, why do they not follow it?* Which wise Argument of your own, you answer at large, and confirm your Answer by this instance; *The Jesuits and Dominicans hold different Opinions, touching Predetermination, and the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin: Yet so, that the Jesuit holds the Dominicans way safe, that is, his errors not damnable; and the Dominicans hold the same of the Jesuits; Yet neither of them with good consequence can press the other to believe his opinion, because by his own confession it is no damnable error.*

11. But what Catholick maketh such a wise demand as you put into our mouths? If our Religion be a safe way to heaven, that is, not damnable; why do you not follow it? As if every thing that is good, must be of necessity embraced 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* embrace it. And yet further, thus: Among different Religions and *contrary* ways 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 Arguments. And if the Dominicans and Jesuits did say one to another as we say to you; then one of them might with good consequence press *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 add also, in regard of the *Theological* Vertue of *Hope*, without which none can hope to be saved, and which you want, either by excess of *Confidence*, or defect by *Despaire*, not unlike to your *Faith*, which I shewed to be either deficient in *Certainty*, or excessive in *Evidence*; as likewise, according to the rigid Calvenists, it is either so strong, that once had, it can never be lost: or so more than weak, and so much nothing; that it can never be gotten. For the true Theological *Hope* of Christians, is a *Hope* which keeps a mean between *Presumption*, and *Desperation* which moves us to work our salvation with fear and trembling; which conducts us to make sure our salvation by good works, as holy Scripture adviseth: But, contrarily, Protestants do 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 vain *Presumption*, grounded upon a fantastical perswasion, that they are Predestinate; which Faith must exclude all fear and trembling. Neither can they make their Calling *certain by good works*, who do certainly believe, that before any good works they are justified, and justified even by Faith alone, and by that faith whereby they certainly believe they are justified. Which Point some Protestants do expressly affirm to be *the soul of the Church, the principal 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 do now relent from the rigour of the foresaid Doctrine, we must affirm, that at least some of them want the Theological 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 do directly overthrow all true Christian *Hope*. And for as much as concerns *Faith*, we must also infer, that they want *Unity* therein (and consequently have none at all) by their disagreement about *the soul of the Church*; *the principal Origin 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 soul of the Church*, &c. I must repeat what I have said heretofore, that, even by this Example, it is clear, you cannot agree what Points be *fundamental*. And so (to whatsoever answer you fly) I press you in the same manner, and say, that you have no Certainty, whether you agree in fundamental Points; or Unity and substance of Faith, which cannot stand with difference in fundamentals. And so, upon the whole matter, I leave it to be considered, whether, *Want of Charity can be justly charged* on us, because we affirm, that they cannot (without repentance) be saved, who want of all other the most necessary means of salvation, which are the three *Theological* Vertues, FAITH, HOPE, *and* CHARITY.

13. And now I end this *first part*, having, as I conceive, complied with my first design, (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 Means* to decide all Controversies concerning Religion, and to propound truth revealed by Almighty God; and this means can be no other, but the *Visible Church of Christ*, which at the time of *Luther's* 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 becomes guilty of *Schism* and *Heresie*, which since *Luther*, his Associates, and Protestants have done, and still continue to do; it is not *want of Charity*, but abundance of evident cause, that forceth us to declare this necessary Truth, *PROTESTANCY UNREPENTED DESTROIES SALVATION.*

The



## The ANSWER to the SEVENTH CHAPTER.

*That Protestants are not bound by the Charity which they owe to themselves, to reunite themselves to the* Roman-*Church.*

THE *first four Paragraphs* of this Chapter, are wholly spent in an unnecessary introduction unto a truth, which I presume, never was, nor will be, by any man in his right wits, either denied or questioned; and that is, That *every man in Wisdom and Charity to himself, is to take the safest way to his eternal Salvation.*

2. The *fifth* and *sixth* are nothing in a manner, but references to discourses, already answered by me, and confuted in their proper places.

3. The *seventh, eighth, ninth, tenth,* and *eleventh,* have no other foundation but this false pretence, That *we confess 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 general, to be in the state of sin 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 returned upon Papists, as it is urged against Protestants; in as much as all Papists either hold the Doctrine of Predetermination, and absolute Election, or communicate with those that do hold it. Now from this Doctrine, what is more prone and obvious, than for every natural man (without Gods especial preventing grace) to make this practical collection, Either I am elected, or not elected; If I be, no impiety possible can ever damn me: If not, no possible industry can ever save me. Now whether this disjunctive perswasion be not as likely (as any Doctrine of any Protestants) to extinguish Christian hope, and filial fear, and to lead some men to despair, others to presumption, all to a wretchless and impious life, I desire you ingeniously to inform me; and if you deny it, assure your self 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 charged with the absurd consequences which naturally flow from them, yet the men themselves are not; I mean, if they perceive not the consequence of these absurdities, nor do 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 deal rigidly and strictly with you. Yet that you may not think your self contemned, nor have occasion to pretend, that your arguments are evaded, I will intreat 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 seem to require an answer: and then I doubt not, but what I have affirmed in general will appear in particular.

5. *Ad §.* 1. To the *First* then I say: 1. It was needless 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 spoyled by being disordered! Yet if it stood in need of proof, I fear this place of the Canticles, *He hath ordered Charity in me,* would be no enforcing demonstration of it. 2. The reason alleadged by you why we ought *to love one object more than another, because one thing participates the Divine Goodness more than another,* is phantastical and repugnant to what you say presently after. For by this rule, no man should love himself more than all the world; which yet you require, unless he were first vainly perswaded that he doth more participate the Divine Goodness than all the world. But the true reason why one thing ought to be loved more than another, is, because one thing is better than another, or because it is better to us, or because God commands us to do so, or because

God himſelf does ſo, and we are to conform our affections to the will of God. 3. It is not true, that *all objects which we believe, do equally participate the Divine Teſtimony or Revelations*: 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 *Well-wiſhing* 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 prefer the ſpiritual good of the whole world before his own ſoul*: In ſaying this, you ſeem to me to condemn one of the greateſt acts of Charity, of one of the greateſt Saints that ever was, I mean S. *Paul*, who *for his brethren deſired to be an Anathema from Chriſt*. And as for the Text alleadged by you in confirmation of your ſaying, *What doth it avail a man if he gain the whole world, and ſuſtain the damage of his own ſoul*? It is nothing to the purpoſe: For without all queſtion, it is not profitable for a man to do ſo; but the queſtion is, whether it be not lawful for a man to forgo and part with his own particular profit, to procure the univerſal, ſpiritual, and eternal benefit of others? 3. Whereas you ſay, *It is directly againſt Charity to our ſelves, to adventure the omitting of any means 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 help or conduce to my ſalvation, that may make the way to it more ſecure or leſs dangerous. And therefore if the errors of the *Roman* Church do but hinder me in this way, or any way endanger it, I am, in Charity to my ſelf, 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 hazzard to want ſomething neceſſary to Salvation, we commit a grievous ſin 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 die out of the *Roman* Church, without putting our ſelves in any ſuch hazard: Nay, to live and die in it is as dangerous as to ſhoot a gulf, which though ſome good ignorant ſouls may do 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*; and herein firſt I obſerve this acknowledgement of yours, *That in things neceſſary only becauſe commanded, a probable ignorance of the Commandment excuſes the Party from all fault, and doth not exclude Salvation*. From which Doctrine it ſeems 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 clear and evident conſequences that may be; and ſeeing an infinity of great Objections lies againſt it, which ſeem ſtrongly to prove that that 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 find it true, and am ſtill willing to do ſo; but the more I ſeek, 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 charitabe 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*



*Divine infallible faith, Baptiſm 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 mortal ſin*: In theſe words you ſeem to me to deliver a ſtrange Paradox, *viz.* That Faith, and Baptiſm, 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 means, 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 Credence into infinite perplexity, who cannot poſſibly by any ſure Mark diſcern whether their Faith be Divine or Humane; or if you have any certain ſign, whereby they may diſcern whether they believe your Churches infallibillity 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 *Baptiſm in act is neceſſary for Infants, and for men only in deſire*, You ſeem to me in the later to deſtroy the foundation of the former. For if a deſire of Baptiſm will ſerve men inſtead of Baptiſm, then thoſe words of our Saviour, *Unleſs a man be born again of water*, &c. are not to be underſtood literally and rigidly of external Baptiſm; for a deſire of Baptiſm is not Baptiſm, and ſo your foundation of the abſolute neceſſity of Baptiſm is deſtroyed. And if you may gloſs the Text ſo far, as that men may be ſaved by the deſire, without Baptiſm it ſelf, becauſe they cannot have it, Why ſhould you not gloſs 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 Baptiſm, than for the former to have the thing it ſelf? Laſtly, for your *Sacrament of Confeſſion*, we know none ſuch, nor any ſuch abſolute neceſſity of it. They that confeſs their ſins and forſake them ſhall find mercy, though they confeſs them to God only, and not to men. They that confeſs them both to God and men, if they do not effectually and in time forſake them, ſhall not find mercy. 3. Whereas you ſay, that *ſuppoſing theſe means 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 fail of the end, for want of the means, 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 knows to be impoſſible. For to command in earneſt, is to command with an intent to be obeyed, which is not poſſible he ſhould do, when he knows the thing commanded to be impoſſible. Laſtly, whoſoever is obliged to do any thing, and does it not, commits a fault; but Infants commit no fault in not procuring to have Baptiſm; 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 Baptiſm for infants, it cannot be denied but that our diſagreement is in a point fundamental*; If you mean a point eſteemed ſo by you, this indeed cannot be denied: But if you mean, a point that indeed is fundamental, 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 deal unjuſtly with them; but how in particular he will deal with them concerns not us, and therefore we need not much regard it. 5. Whereas you ſay the like of your *Sacrament of Penance*, you only ſay ſo, but your proofs are wanting. Laſtly, whereas you ſay, *This rigour ought not to ſeem ſtrange or unjuſt in God, but that we are rather to bleſs him for ordaining*

*ordaining us to Salvation by any means* : 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 questioned lawfully and 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 do so.

8. *Ad* §.4. In the *fourth Paragraph*, you deliver this false and wicked Doctrine, *that for the procuring our own salvation we are always bound under pain of mortal sin, to take the safest way ; but for avoiding sin we are not bound to do so, but may follow the opinion of any probable Doctors*, though the contrary way be certainly free from sin, and theirs be doubtful. Which Doctrine in the former part of it is apparently false. For though Wisdom and Charity to our selves would perswade us always to do so, yet many times, that way which to our selves and our salvation is more full of hazard, is notwithstanding not only lawful 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 condemn him of impiety, who should resolve not to use his liberty in this matter, but for Gods greater glory, the greater honour of truth, and the greater confirmation of his brethren in the faith, choose to stand out the storm and endure the firy trial, rather than avoid ; rather to put his own soul to the hazard of a temptation, in hope of Gods assistance to go through with it, than to baulk 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 judgment, a resolution to avoid sin, to the uttermost of your power, is no necessary means of Salvation ; nay, that a man may resolve not to do so, without any danger of damnation. Therein you teach us that we are to do more for the love of our selves, and our own happiness, than 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 soul, and with all our strength* ; and hath taught us, *that the love of God consists in avoiding sin and keeping his commandments*. Therein you directly cross S. *Pauls* Doctrine, who though he were a very probable Doctor, and had delivered his judgment for the *lawfulness 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 sin, but only be *a weak brother* ; whereas he, who should do it with a doubtful conscience, ( though the action were by S. *Paul* warranted lawful, yet ) *should sin and be condemned for so doing*. You pretend indeed to be rigid defenders and stout champions for the necessity of good works ; but the truth is, *you speak lies in hypocrisie*, and when the matter is well examined, 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 effectual mortification of the habits of all vices, and effectual conversion to newness of life, and universal obedience, and withal 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 performed 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 Baptized and Absolved by you, and that with intention : and in the mean time warrants them that for avoiding of sin, they may safely follow the uncertain guidance of vain man, who you cannot deny may either be deceived himself, or out of malice deceive them, and neglect the certain direction of God himself, and their own consciences. What wicked use is made of this Doctrine, your own long experience can better inform you than it is possible for me to do : yet my own little conversation



conversation with you affords one memorable example to this purpose. For upon this ground I knew a young Schollar in *Doway*, licenced 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 do so*. And upon the same ground, whensoever you shall come to have a prevailing party in this Kingdom, and power sufficient to restore your Religion, you may do 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 do, though in your own opinion it be unlawful, because * *Bellarmine*, a man with you of approved vertue, learning, and judgment, hath declared his opinion for the lawfulness of it in saying, that *want of power to maintain a rebellion, was the only reason that the Primitive Christians did not rebel against their persecuting Emperors*. By the same rule, seeing the Priests and Scribes and Pharisees, men of greatest repute among the Jews for vertue, learning, and wisdom, held it a lawful and a pious work to persecute Christ and his Apostles, it was lawful for their 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 wisdom ; nay, by such as sate in *Moses* chair, and of whom it was said, *Whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do* : which Universal you pretend is to be understood universally, and without any restriction or limitation. And as lawful was it for the Pagans to persecute the Primitive Christians, because *Trajan* and *Pliny*, men of great vertue and wisdom were of this opinion. Lastly, that most impious and detestable Doctrine, ( which by a foul calumny you impute to me, who abhor and detest it ) that *men may be saved in any Religion*, follows from this ground unavoidably. For certainly, 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 or to be of none ? Neither can it be damnable to be of a false Religion, unless 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. *James* 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, and by the conduct of some probable opinion, maturely weighed and approved by men of learning, vertue and wisdom : and seeing neither Jews want their *Gamaliels*, nor Pagans their *Antoninus's*, nor any Sect of Christians such professors and maintainers of their several Sects, as are esteemed by the people, which know no better (and that very reasonably) men of vertue, learning, and wisdom, it follows evidently that the embracing their religion proceeds upon such reason as may warrant their action to be prudent, and this ( say you ) is *sufficient for avoiding of sin*, and therefore certainly for avoiding damnation, for *that in humane affairs* and discourse, *evidence and certainty cannot be always* expected. I have 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 always to take the safest way*, is a fair and sure foundation, for a clear 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 self, and of obedience to God, Papists (unless ignorance excuse them) are in a state of sin, as long as they remain in subjection to the *Roman* Church.

* *Bellar. Cont. Barcl. c 7. In 7. c. refutare conitur Barcl. verba illa Romuli Veteres illos imperatores Constantium, Valentem, & cæteros non ideò toleravit Ecclesia quod legitimè successissint, sed quod illos sine populi detrimento coercere non poterat. Et miratur hoc idem scripsisse Bellar. l. 5: de Pontif. c. 7. Sed ut magis miretur, sciat hoc idem sensisse, S. Thom. 2. 2. q. 2. art. 2. ad 1. Ubi dicit Ecclesiam tolerasse ut fideles obedirent Juliano Apostatæ, quia sui novitate nondum habebant vires, compescendi Principes terrenos. Et postea, Sanctus Gregorius dicit, Nullum adversus Juliani persecutionem fuisse remedium præter Lacrimas, quoniam non habebat Ecclesia vires, quibus illius tiranni di resistere posset.*

9. For if the safer way for avoiding sin, be also the safer way for avoiding damnation, then certainly it will not be hard to determine, that 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 lawful to worship

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 prohibit certain Orders of men and women to marry? To celebrate the publick Service of God in a Language which the aſſiſtants generally underſtand not? And you will not chooſe but confeſs 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 do 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 do ſomething which you confeſs 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 commandments of God; and alleadge 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 go about to prove, that there is any neceſſity of doing any of theſe things; that it is unlawful not to worſhip Pictures, not to picture the Trinity, not to invocate Saints and Angels, not to give all men the entire Sacrament, not to adore the Euchariſt, not to prohibit marriage, not to celebrate Divine Service in an unknown tongue: I ſay, you neither do nor can pretend that there is any Law of God which enjoyns us, no nor ſo much as an Evangelical Counſel that adviſes us to do any of theſe things. Now *where no Law is, there can be no ſin, for ſin is the tranſgreſſion of the Law*; It remains therefore that if your Church ſhould forbear to do theſe things, ſhe muſt undoubtedly herein be free from all danger and 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 be more ſafe, and the *Roman* way more dangerous. You will ſay, I know, that *theſe things being by your Church concluded lawful, we are obliged by God, though not to do, yet to approve them: at leaſt in your judgment we are ſo, and therefore our condition is as queſtionable as yours.* I anſw. The Authority of your Church is no common principle agreed upon between us, and therefore from that you are not to diſpute againſt us. We might preſs you with our judgment as well and as juſtly as you do us with yours. Beſides, this very thing that your Church hath determined theſe things lawful, and commanded the approbation of them, is that whereof ſhe is accuſed by us, and we maintain you have done wickedly, or at leaſt very dangerouſly, in ſo determining; becauſe in theſe very determinations, you have forſaken that way which was ſecure from ſin, and have choſen that which you cannot but know to be very queſtionable and doubtful; and conſequently have 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 flie for ſhelter to your Churches determinations, yet when theſe very determinations are accuſed, methinks they ſhould not be alleadged in defence of themſelves. But you will ſay, Your Church is infallible, and therefore her determinations not unlawful. *Anſw.* They that accuſe your Church of error, you may be ſure do queſtion her infallibility: ſhew therefore where it is written, that your Church is infallible, and the diſpute will be ended. But till you do ſo, give me leave rather to conclude thus, Your Church, in many of her determinations, chooſes not that way which is moſt ſecure from ſin, and therefore not the ſafeſt way to ſalvation; than vainly to imagine her infallible, and thereupon to believe; though ſhe teach not the ſecureſt way to avoid ſin, yet ſhe teaches the certaineſt way to obtain ſalvation.

10. In the cloſe of this Number, you ſay as follows, *If it may appear though not certain, yet at leaſt probable, that Proteſtancy unrepented deſtroys ſalvation, and withal*



*withal that there is a ſafer way, it will follow that they are obliged by the law of Charity to that ſafe way.* Anſw. 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 appear*: From whence without all Ifs and Ands, that appears ſufficiently which I ſaid in the beginning of the *Chapter*, that the *four firſt Paragraphs* of this Chapter are wholly ſpent in an unneceſſary introduction, unto that which never by any man in his right wits was denied, That *men, in wiſdom and charity to themſelves, are to take the ſafeſt way to eternal ſalvation.*

11. *Ad §. 5.* In the *fifth* you begin to make ſome ſhew of arguing, and tell us, that *Proteſtants have reaſon to doubt in what caſe they ſtand; from what you have ſaid about the Churches univerſal Infallibility, and of her being Judge of Controverſies*, &c. Anſw. From all that which you have ſaid, they have reaſon only to conclude that you have nothing to ſay. They have as much reaſon to doubt, whether there can be any Motion, from what *Zeno* ſays in *Ariſtotles* Phyſicks, as to doubt, from what you have ſaid, Whether the *Roman* Church may poſſibly err. For this I dare ſay, that not the weakeſt of *Zeno*'s arguments but is ſtronger than the ſtrongeſt of yours, and that you would be more perplext in anſwering any one of them, than I have 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 error in faith deſtroys the nature of faith: It is certain that ſome Proteſtants do err, and therefore they want the ſubſtance of Faith.* The Major of which Syllogiſm I have formerly confuted by unanſwerable arguments out of one of your own beſt Authors, who ſhews 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 have no faith, inaſmuch 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 clear that none of them have 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 clear that none of them have any certainty at all! And this too: Since all Chriſtians pretend the like certainty, it is clear that none of them have any certainty at all! And thirdly this: Since men of all Religions pretend a like certainty, it is clear that none of them have any at all! And laſtly this: Since oft-times they which are abuſed with a ſpecious Paralogiſm, pretend the like certainty with them which demonſtrate, it is clear that none of them have any certainty at all! Certainly, Sir, Zeal and the Devil did ſtrangly blind you, if you did not ſee that theſe horrid impieties were the immediate conſequences of your poſitions, if you did ſee it, and yet would ſet them down, you deſerve a worſe cenſure. Yet ſuch as theſe, are all the arguments wherewith you conceive your ſelf to have prov'd undoubtedly, that *Proteſtants have reaſon at leaſt, to doubt in what caſe they ſtand.* Neither am I afraid to venture my life upon it, that your ſelf ſhall not chooſe ſo much as one out of all the pack, which I will not ſhew before indifferent Judges, 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 be thus put into one; *Proteſtants cannot tell what points in particular be fundamental; therefore they cannot tell whether they or their brethren do not err fundamentally, and whether their difference be not fundamental.* Both which deductions I have formerly ſhewed to be moſt inconſequent; for knowing the Scripture to contain all fundamentals, (though many more points beſides, which makes it difficult to ſay preciſely what is

fundamental, and what not) knowing this, I say, and believing it, what can hinder but that I may be well assured, that I believe all fundamentals, and that all who believe the Scripture sincerely as well as I, do not differ from me in any thing fundamental?

15. In the close of this Section, you say, that *you omit to add that we want the Sacrament of Repentance, instituted for the remission of sins, or at least we must confess 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 doubtful, and all that depends upon it.* Answ. I also omit to answer, 1. That your brother *Rhenanus*, acknowledges the contrary, and 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 shews no less: and now I would know, whether you will acknowledge your Church bound to give 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 be 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 have proved it impossible that they should be so doubtful as yours, according to your own principles; I answer, that experience shews 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 sixth, you say, *you will not repeat, but only put us again in mind, that unless the Roman Church were the true Church there was no visible Church upon earth, a thing so manifest, that Protestants themselves confess*, &c. Answ. Neither will I repeat, but only put you in mind that you have not prov'd that there is any necessity that there should be any true Church in your sense visible; 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 self, that by the *whole world*, they meant only the *greatest part of it*, which is an usual figure of speech, and never intended to deny that besides the Church then reigning and triumphing in this world, there was another militant Church, other Christians visible enough though persecuted and oppressed. Nor thirdly, do 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 shown. For, for ought I know, it was not impossible that it might then be the only visible Church, and 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, profess, that Protestancy unrepented destroys salvation.* From which generality we may except two at least to my knowledge, and those are, *your self*, and *Franciscus de Sancta Clara*, who assures us, that *Ignorance and Repentance may excuse a Protestant from damnation, though dying in his error.* 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 self, you subjoyn, that *these are the men whom we must hold not to err damnably, unless we will destroy our own Church and Salvation.* Whereas, as I have said before, though you were Turks, and Pagans, we might be good Christians. Neither is it necessary



necessary for perpetuating of a Church before *Luther*, that your errors even then should not be *damnable*, but only not *actually damning* to some ignorant souls among you. In vain therefore you do make such tragedies as here you do! In vain you conjure us with *fear and trembling to consider these things*! We have considered them again and again, and looke upon them on both sides, and find neither terror nor truth in them. Let Children and Fools be terrified with bugbears, men of understanding will not regard them.

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 do and must confess the Roman Church free from damnable error*; which will presently be apparent, to any one who considers, that the *seventh and tenth* are nothing but D. *Potter's* words; and that in the *other three*, you obtrude upon us this *Crambe* no few than seven times. May you be pleased to look back to your own Book, and you shall find it so as I have said: and that at least in a hundred other places, you make your advantage of this false imputation: which when you have observ'd, and withal considered that your self plainly intimate, that D. *Potter's* discourses, which here you censure, would be good and concluding, if we did not (as we do not) free you from damnable error; I hope you will acknowledge that my vouchsafing these *Sections* the honour of any farther answer, is a great supererogation in point of civility. Nevertheless partly that I may the more ingratiate my self with you, but especially that I may stop their mouths 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. *Potter's* words, *§. 7. That any small error in faith destroys all faith*, (To omit what hath been said before) I answer here what is proper for this place: that S. *Austin*, 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.) *as Baptism, in the Creed, and 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.* Parallel to which words are these of *Optatus*, *Amongst us and you is one Ecclesiastical conversation, common Lessons, the same Faith, the same Sacraments.* Where, by the way, we may observe, that in the judgment of these Fathers, even Donatists, though Heretiques and Schismatiques, gave true Ordination, the true Sacrament of Matrimony, true Sacramental Absolution, Confirmation, the true Sacrament of the Eucharist, true Extream Unction; 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 says in expres terms, 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.*

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 confess) therefore it is safe for me to be of the *Roman* Church; and he that thinks so, what reason is there why he should not think this as good, Ignorant Protestants 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, *unless 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 terms, but that there might be a true Church after *Luther*, though there were none for some ages before; as since *Columbus* his time, there have been Christians in *America*, though before there were none for many ages. For neither do you shew, neither does it appear, that the generation of Churches is univocal, 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 than the present being of Peripateticks or Stoicks depends upon a perpetual pedegree 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 over-watching and over-ruling it) may preserve the means 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 Jews preserve means to make men Christians, and Papists preserve means to make men Protestants, and Protestants (which you say are a false Church) do, 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 talk vainly, as if you were the only men in the world before *Luther*, yet the world knows that this is but talk, and that there were other Christians besides you, which might have perpetuated the Church though you had not been. 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, unless by it you understand the ignorant members of it, which is a very unusual *Synechdoche*.

21. Whereas you say, *that Catholicks never granted that the Donatists had a true Church or might be saved.* I answer, S. *Austin* himself 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. *Austin* the words of the Catholiques, *that the Donatists had true Baptism*, when he comes to the contrary words of the *Donatists*, adds, *No Church, no salvation.* Answ. You wrong D. *Potter*, who pretends not to cite S, *Austin*'s formal words, but only his sense, which in him is compleat and full for that purpose, whereto it is alledged by D. *Potter*. His words are, *Petilianus dixit, Venite ad Ecclesiam Populi & aufugite Traditores, si perire non vultis: Petilian* saith, *Come to the Church ye people, and flie from the Traditors, if ye will not be damn'd: for that ye may know, that they being guilty, esteem 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 Catholicks from salvation absolutely. And therefore *no Church, no salvation* was not D. *Potter*'s addition. And whereas you say the *Catholiques never yield that among the Donatists there was a true Church and hope of Salvation*: I say, it appears by what I have alledged out of S. *Austin*, that they yielded both these were among the *Donatists*, as much as we yield them to be among the Papists. As for D. *Potter*'s acknowledgement, that *They maintained an error in the matter and nature of it Heretical:* This proves them but Material Heretiques, whom you do not exclude from possibility of Salvation. So that all things considered, this argument must be much more forcible from the Donatists against the Catholiques, than from Papists against Protestants, in regard Protestants grant Papists no more hope of salvation than Papists grant Protestants: whereas the Donatists excluded absolutely all but their own Part from hope of Salvation, so far 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 Heresie, who being in error *quærebant cautâ sollicitudine veritatem, corrigi parati cùm invenerint.*



23. Whereas you say, *That the Argument for the certainty of their Baptism (because it was confessed good by Catholiques, whereas the Baptism 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 we confess there is no damnable error in the Doctrine or practice of the Roman Church:* I answer, No: we confess no such matter, and though you say so a hundred times, no repetition will make it true. We profess plainly, that many damnable errors, plainly repugnant to the precepts of Christ both Ceremonial and Moral, more plainly than 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 remains that as good an Answer as the Catholiques made touching the certainty of their Baptism, 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 affirm 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 Heresie, 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 Schismatical. You see what difficulties you run 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 confess that your Doctrine contains no damnable error, and that yours is so certainly a true Church, that unless yours be true we cannot pretend any:* I answer, there is in this neither truth nor modesty to outface us, that we cannot but confess what indeed we cannot but deny. For my part, if I were upon the rack, I perswade my self I should not confess the one nor the other.

26. Whereas again presently you add, that D. *Potter grants we should be guilty of Schism, 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 says indeed, *that our not doing so frees us from the imputation of Schism*, and from hence you sophistically infer, that he *must grant, If we did so, we were Schismatiques*, and then make your Reader believe, that this is D. *Potter*'s confession, in being indeed your own collection. For as every one that is not a Papist, is not a Jesuit: and yet not every one that is a Papist is a Jesuite: As whosoever comes not into *England*, comes not to *London*, and yet many may come into *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 Schism, and yet they that do 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 says is all one with yours, but refers you to Saint* Austin, *there to read it, as if every one carried with him a Library, or were able to examine the places in Saint* 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 advantageous, so to produce it was not necessary; and therefore he did you more service then he was bound to, in referring you to St. *Austin* for an answer to it.

it. Whereas you say, *he had reason to conceal it, because it makes directly against himself*: I say, it is so far from doing so, that it will serve in proportion to the argument, as fitly as if it had been made for it: for, as Saint *Austin* says, *That Catholiques approve the Doctrine of Donatists, but abhor their Heresie of Re-baptization*: so we say, that we approve those fundamental and simple necessary Truths which you retain, by which some good souls among you may be saved, but abhor your many superstitions and Heresies. And as he says, that as Gold is good, yet ought not to be sought for among a company of Thieves; and Baptism good, but not to be sought for in the Conventicles of Donatists: so say we, that the Truths you retain are good, and as we hope sufficient to bring good ignorant souls among you to salvation, yet are not to be sought for in the Conventicles of Papists, who hold with them a mixture of many vanities, and many impieties. For, *as for our freeing you from damnable Heresie, and yielding you Salvation*, (which stone here again you stumble at) neither he nor any other Protestant is guilty of it; and therefore you must confess that this very answer will serve Protestants against this charm of Papists, as well as Saint *Austin* against the Donatists, and that indeed it was not D. *Potter*, but *You*, that, without a Sarcasm, *had reason to conceal it*.

28. The last piece of D. *Potter*'s book, which you are pleased to take notice of in this *first Part* of yours, is an argument he makes in your behalf, 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 do 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*, and therefore scoff at it, and call it an *argument of his own, a wise argument, a wise demand*: and then ask of him, what he thinks 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.* Answ. I have advised with him, and am to tell you from 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 far from confessing, or giving you any ground to pretend he does confess, *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 extremely dangerous if not certainly damnable to all such as profess it; when either they do, or, if their hearts were upright and not perversely obstinate, might believe the contrary, and that for us who are convinc'd in conscience that she (the* Roman *Church) errs 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 liberal of your Charity towards us, and will needs vie 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 appeal to any indifferent Reader, whether our disavowing to confess 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 clear your self from dishonesty, for imputing to him almost an hundred times, this acknowledgment which he never makes, but very often, and that so plainly that you take notice of it, professeth the contrary!

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 Rhetorical concession of the Doctors for a positive assertion. He says



tion. He says indeed of your errors, *Though of themselves they be not damnable to them which believe as they profess, yet for us to profess what we believe not, were without question damnable.* But to say, *Though your errors be not damnable, we may not profess them*, is not to say your errors are not damnable, but *only though they be not.* As if you should say, though the Church err in points not fundamental; yet you may not separate from it: Or though we do err in believing Christ really present, yet our error frees us from Idolatry: Or, as if a Protestant should say; Though you do not commit Idolatry in adoring the Host, yet being uncertain of the Priests intention to consecrate, at least you expose your self to the danger of it: I presume you would not think it fairly done, if any man should interpret either this last speech as an acknowledgment, that you do not commit Idolatry, or the former as confessions, that you do err in points not fundamental, that you do err in believing the real presence. And therefore you ought not so to have mistaken D. *Potter*'s words, as if he had confessed the errors of your Church not damnable, when he says 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 profess them to be divine truths. Yet this mistake might have been pardonable, had not Doctor *Potter* in many places of his Book, by declaring his judgment touching the quality and malignity of your errors, taken away from you all occasion of error. But now that he says plainly, *That your Church hath many ways played the Harlot, and in that regard deserv'd a Bill of Divorce from Christ, and the detestation of Christians*, page 11. *That for that mass of Errors and Abuses in Judgment 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*, page 20. *That Popery is the contagion or plague of the Church*, page 60. *That we cannot, we dare not communicate with her in her publick Liturgy, which is manifestly polluted with gross Superstition*, page 68. *That they who in former ages died in the Church of* Rome, *died in many sinful errors*, page 78. *That they that have understanding and means to discover their errors and neglect to use them, he dares not flatter them with so easie a censure, as to give them hope of salvation*, page 79. *That the way of the* Roman *Religion is not safe, but very dangerous, if not certainly damnable, to such as profess it, when they believe (or, if their hearts were upright and not perversely obstinate, might believe) the contrary*, page 79. *That your Church is but (in some sense) a true Church: and your errors only to some men not damnable, and that we who are convinc'd in conscience that she errs in many things, are under pain of damnation, to forsake her in those errors.* Seeing I say, he says all this so plainly and so frequently, certainly your charging him falsly with this acknowledgment, 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 self 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 infer, that *as you affirm Protestancy unrepented destroys Salvation*, so D. Potter *pronounces the like heavy doom against Roman Catholiques*: And again, §. 4. of the same Chapter, *We allow Protestants as much charity as D.* Potter *spares us, for whom he makes ignorance the best hope of salvation.* And c. 5. §. 48. you have these words: *It is very strange that you judge us extreamly uncharitable in saying Protestants cannot be saved, while your self 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 profess D. *Potter censures your errors as heavily as you do 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 sin cause of their ignorance: and presently after, when another project comes in your head you make

his

his words softer than oil towards you: you pretend he does and must confess, *That your doctrine contains no damnable error, that your Church is certainly a true Church, that your way to heaven is a safe way*, and all these acknowledgments 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 himself any security or comfort from them. *we confess* (saith he) *the Church of Rome to be (in some sense) a true Church, and her 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 profess: But we believe it not safe, but very dangerous, if not certainly damnable to such as profess it, when they believe (or if their hearts were upright and not perversly obstinate might believe) the contrary.* Observe, I pray you, these restraining terms 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 quarrel with the Doctor, in the end of your Preface, for using in his Book such ambiguous terms 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 pass for a true Church, viz.* in regard we may hope that she retains those truths which are simply, absolutely, and indispensably necessary to Salvation, which may suffice to bring those good souls to heaven, who wanted means of discovering their errors; this is the charitable construction in which you may pass 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, than you to find 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 add here, 1. Whereas you say, that *faith, according to your rigid Calvinists, is either so strong, that once had, it can never be lost; or so more than weak, and so much nothing, that it can 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 seems you wanted matter to make up your Antithesis, and therefore were resolved to speak empty words, rather than lose 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 effectual grace, and indeed hold none to be sufficient, but only that which is effectual. 3. Whereas you say; *They cannot make their calling certain by good works, who do 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 answ. There is no Protestant but believes Faith, Repentance, and universal Obedience, are necessary to the obtaining of Gods favour and eternal happiness. This being granted, the rest is but a speculative Controversie, a Question about words which would quickly vanish, but that men affect not to understand one another. As if a company of Physicians 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



his health; though concerning the proper and specifical 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, and Charity, are necessary to salvation, so that whosoever wants any of them, cannot obtain it, and he which hath them all cannot fail of it, is it not very evident that they are sufficiently agreed for mens directions to eternal salvation? And seeing Charity is a full comprehension of all good works, 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 works*? 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 work but shall have its proper reward, and that there is no possibility of obtaining the eternal reward without good works: and why then may not this Doctrine be a sufficient incitement and provocation unto good works?

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 Justification, Remission of sins, and to Remission of sins they all require Repentance, and Repentance I presume may not be denied the name of a good work; being indeed, if it be rightly understood, and according to the sense of the Word in Scripture, an effectual conversion from all sin to all holiness. But though it be taken for meer Sorrow for sins past, and a bare Purpose of amendment, yet even this is a good work; and therefore Protestants requiring this to Remission of sins, and Remission of sins to Justification, cannot with candor be pretended to believe, that they are justified before any good work.

32. You say, *They believe themselves justified by faith alone, and that by that faith whereby they believe themselves justified*: Some peradventure do so, but withall they believe that that faith which is alone, and unaccompanied with *sincere* and universal obedience, is to be esteemed not faith but presumption, and is at no hand sufficient to justification; that though Charity be not imputed unto justification, yet it is 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 turns hope into presumption and carnal security: though it may justly be feared, that many licentious persons, taking it by halves, have made this wicked use of it. For my part, I do heartily wish, that by publick Authority it were so ordered, that no man should ever preach or print this Doctrine that Faith alone justifies, unless he joyns this together with it, that Universal 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. Chapter of 1. Epist. to the *Corinthians* concerning the absolute necessity of Charity should be, to prevent misprision, read together with them.

33. Whereas you say, that *some Protestants do expresly affirm the former point to be the soul of the Church*, &c. *and therefore they must want the Theological vertue of Hope, and that none can have true hope, while they hope to be saved in their communion.* I answer, They have great reason to believe the Doctrine of Justification, by faith only, a point of great weight and importance, if it be rightly understood: that is, they have reason to esteem it a principal and necessary duty of a Christian, to place his hope of justification and salvation, not in the perfection of his own righteousness (which if it be imperfect will not justifie) 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 fear. If this Doctrine be otherwise expounded than I have here expounded, I will not undertake the justification of it: only I will say (that which I may do 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 works: 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 firm, and a more unshaken assent, than he does that himself is predestinate, and that he is justified by believing himself justified. I never met with any such, who if he saw there were a necessity to do either, would not rather forgo his belief of these Doctrines, than the former: these which he sees disputed and contradicted and opposed with a great multitude of very potent Arguments; than those, which being the express 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 Doctrine, doth very well qualifie their perswasion of the later; and that the former (as also the lives of many of them do sufficiently testifie) are more effectual to temper their hope, and to keep it at a stay of a filial and modest assurance of Gods favour, built upon the conscience of his love and fear, than the later can be to swell and puff 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 and communion. To you and your Church we leave it, to separate Christians from the Church, and to proscribe them from heaven upon trivial and trifling causes. As for our selves, we conceive a charitable judgment of our Brethren and their errors, though untrue, much more pleasing to God than a true judgment, if it be uncharitable; and therefore shall always choose (if we do err) to err on the milder and more merciful part, and rather to retain those in our Communion which deserve to be ejected, than eject those that deserve to be retained.

34. Lastly, whereas you say, that *seeing Protestants differ about the point of Justification, you must needs infer that they want Unity in faith, and consequently all faith, and then that they cannot agree what points are fundamental*; I answer, to the first of these Inferences, that, as well might you infer it upon *Victor* Bishop of *Rome* and *Polycrates*; upon *Stephen* Bishop of *Rome* and St. *Cyprian*: inasmuch as it is undeniably 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 Soul of man you may read in *Aristotle de anima*, and *Cicero's Tusculan Questions*,) notwithstanding their divers opinions touching the nature of the soul, yet all of them had souls, and souls of the same nature: Or as those Physicians who dispute whether the Brain or Heart be the principal part of a man, yet all of them have brains and have hearts, and herein agree sufficiently: So likewise, though some Protestants esteem that Doctrine the soul of the Church, which others do not so highly value, yet this hinders not but that which is indeed the soul 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 and really necessary they may all agree. For no Argument can be more sophistical than this; They differ in some points which they esteem 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 fundamental*: I have said and proved formerly that there is no such necessity as you imagine or pretend, that men should certainly know what is, and what is not fundamental. They that believe all things plainly delivered in Scripture, believe all things fundamental, and are at sufficient Unity in matters of Faith; though they cannot precisely and exactly distinguish between what is fundamental, and what is profitable: nay, though by error they mistake some vain, or perhaps some hurtful opinions for necessary and fundamental Truths. Besides, I have shewed above, that as Protestants do not agree (for you over-reach in saying, they cannot) touching what points are fundamental; so neither do you agree what points are defined, and 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 himself, though alone without a Council, Others in a Council, though divided from the Pope: Others only in the conjunction of Council and Pope: Others not in this neither, but in the acceptation of the present Church Universal: Lastly, others not attributing it to this neither, but only to the perpetual 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 defined and therefore necessary, which the latter, according to their own grounds, have no obligation to do, nay, cannot do so upon any firm and sure and infallible foundation. *C. 5. Sect. 54. & alibi.*



## *THE CONCLUSION.*

AND thus, by God's assistance, and the advantage of a good cause, I am at length, through a passage rather tyring than difficult, arrived at the end of my undertaken Voyage; and have, as I suppose, made appear, to all disinterested and unprejudicate Readers, what in the beginning 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 pleased to give me in your Pamphlet entituled, *A direction to N. N.* yet upon consideration of my Answer, I find that I have proceeded, as if I had had it always before my eyes, and steered my course by it as by a Card and Compass.

For first, *I have not proceeded by a meer 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 clearly 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, do manifestly tend (if they be closely and consequently followed) to the destruction of all Religion, and lead men by the hand to Atheism 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 than mine own to make, if it were possible, such a discovery: and therefore am in good hope, that, though the musick I have made be but dull and flat, and even downright plain-song, even your curious and critical ears shall discover no discord in it; but on the other side, I have charged you frequently, and very justly, with manifest contradiction and retractation of your own assertions, and not seldom of the main grounds you build upon, and the principal conclusions which you endeavour to maintain: which I conceive my self to have made apparent even to the eye, c.2.§.5. c.3.§.88. c.4.§.14. and 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 far 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 do not find that I have cause to differ from him in any matter of moment: particularly, *not concerning the infallibility of God's Church*, which I grant with him to be infallible in fundamentals, because if it should err in fundamentals, it were not the Church: *Nor concerning the supernaturality of Faith*, which I know and believe as well as you, *to be the gift of God*, and *that flesh and bloud revealed it not unto us, but our Father which is in heaven*. But now if it were demanded, What defence you can make for deserting *Charity 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 *Ulysses* 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, clears my Book from this imputation.

And whereas you give me a Caution, *that my grounds destroy not the belief of divers Doctrines which all good Christians believe, yea, and of all verities that cannot be proved by natural reason*: I profess sincerely, that I do 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 never so improbable or incomprehensible to Natural Reason: and if I thought there were, I would deal with it as those Primitive Converts dealt with their curious Books in the *Acts of the Apostles*.

For the Epistle of S. *James*, *and those other Books which were anciently controverted, and are now received by the Church of* England *as Canonical*; I am so far from relying upon any Principles which must (to my apprehension) bring with them the denial of the authority of them, that I my self believe them all to be Canonical.

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, Supernatural, Infallible Faith and Religion*, I assure my self, that if you were ten times more a Spider than you are, you could suck no such poyson from them. My heart, I am sure, is innocent of any such intention: and the Searcher of all hearts knows, 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 Jesus, which I am ready to seal and confirm, not with my Arguments only, but my Bloud!

Now these are the Directions which you have been pleased 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 than I undertook, a just and punctual examination and refutation of your *Second Part*: But (if you will give your consent) I am resolved to suppress it, and that for divers sufficient and reasonable considerations.

First, Because the discussion of the Controversies intreated 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 we cast off the burden of those many lesser disputes which remain behind in the Second. And perhaps we may do God and his Church more service by exactly discussing and fully clearing the truth in these few, than by handling many after a sleight and perfunctory manner.

Secondly, because the addition of the Second Part, whether for your purpose or mine, is clearly unnecessary: there being no understanding man, Papist or Protestant,



testant, but will confess, that (for as much as concerns the main question now in agitation, about the saveableness of Protestants) if the first part of your Book be answered, there needs 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 confessed to be 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 do little else but pursue shadows.

Fourthly, Because your Second Part (setting 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 he might not see the clearness of the reasons brought in defence of the general Doctrine delivered in Charity Mistaken*. All which you are likely enough (if there be occasion) to say again to me; and therefore I am resolved for once even to humour you so far as to keep my discourse within those very lists and limits which your self have prescribed, and to deal with you upon no other Arguments, but only those wherein you conceive your chief advantage and principal strength, and, as it were, your *Samson*'s lock to lie: wherein if I gain the cause clearly from you (as I verily hope by Gods help I shall do) it cannot but redound much to the honour of the truth maintained 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. *Potter*'s arguments: for impertinent cavils, and frivolous exceptions, and injurious calumnies against him for his misalleadging of Authors: For proceeding upon false and ungrounded principles; for making inconsequent and sophistical 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 advantage, I am resolved, if you will give me leave, either wholly to suppress it, or at least to defer the publication of it until I see what exceptions, upon a twelve-months examination (for so long I am well assured you have had it in your hands) you can take at this which is now published, that so if my grounds be discovered false I may give over building on them: or (if it shall be thought fit) build on more securely when it shall appear that nothing material and of moment is or can be 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 Controversie between us to this short Issue. But in case your mind be altered, upon the least intimation you shall give me, that you do but 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 enforced 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 seems to me) not unconsiderable passages of it, which between your first and second Part, as it were between two stools, have been suffered hitherto to fall to the ground, and not been vouchsafed any answer at all.

For after this neglectful fashion you have passed by in silence. First, his discourse, wherein he proves briefly, but very effectually, that *Protestants may be saved, and that the Roman Church, especially the Jesuits, are very uncharitable*, S^r. p. 6, 7, 8, 9. Secondly, the authorities whereby he justifies, That *the ancient Fathers, by*

*by the Roman understood always a particular, and never the Catholick Church*: to which purpose he alleadgeth the words of *Ignatius, Ambrose, Innocentius, Celestine, Nicolaus*, *S.*1. *p.*10. Whereunto you say nothing, neither do you infringe his Observation with any one instance to the contrary.

Thirdly, The greatest and most substantial part of his answers to the Arguments of *Charity Mistaken*, built upon *Deut.*17. *Num.*16. *Mat.*28.20. *Mat.*18.17. and in particular many pregnant and convincing Texts of Scripture, quoted in the Margin of his book, *p.*25. to prove that the Judges of the Synagogue (whose Infallibility yet you make an Argument of yours, and therefore must be more credible than yours) are vainly pretended to have been infallible: but as they were obliged to judge according to the Law, so were obnoxious to deviations from it. *S.*2. *p.*23,24,25,26,27.

Fourthly, His discourse wherein he shews the difference between the Prayers for the dead used by the Ancients, and those now in use in the *Roman* Church.

Fifthly, The Authority of three Ancient, and above twenty modern Doctors of your own Church alleadged by him, to shew that in their opinion even Pagans, and therefore much more erring Christians (if their lives were morally honest) by Gods extraordinary mercy and Christs merit may be saved. *S.*2. *p.*45.

Sixthly, A great part of his discourse whereby he declares that actual and external Communion with the Church is not of absolute necessity to Salvation: nay, that those might be saved whom the Church utterly refused to admit to her Communion. *S.*2. *p.*46,47,48,49.

Seventhly, His discourse concerning the Churches latitude, which hath in it a clear determination of the main Controversie against you: For therein he proves plainly, that all appertain *to the Church, who believe that Jesus* is the Christ the Son *of God, and Saviour of the world with submission to his Doctrine* in mind and will: which he irrefragably demonstrates by many evident Texts of Scripture, containing the substance of his Assertion even in terms. *S.*4. *p.*114,115,116,117.

Eighthly, That wherein he shews by many pertinent examples, that *gross error and true Faith may be lodged together in the* same mind: And that men are not *chargeable with the damnable consequences of their erroneous opinions*, *S.*4. *p.*112.

Ninthly, a very great part of his Chapter touching *the dissentions of the Roman Church*, which he shews (against the pretences of *Charity Mistaken*) *to be no less than ours, for the importance of the matter, and the pursuit of them to be 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 delivered by the Doctors of your Church*: which he proves very consonant to the Doctrine of Hereticks and Infidels, but evidently repugnant to the Word of God. *Ibid. p.*201,202,203,204,205.

Lastly, His discourse wherein he shews that *it is unlawful for the Church of after Ages to add any thing to the Faith of the Apostles*: And many of his Arguments whereby he proves that in the *judgment of the Ancient Church the Apostles Creed was esteemed 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 D. *Potter*'s Book, for reason best known to your self, you have dealt with, as the Priest and Levite in the Gospel did with the wounded *Samaritan*, that is, *only look'd upon them and passed by*: But now at least when you are admonished 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, lest otherwise the world should interpret your obstinate silence a plain confession that you can say nothing.

FINIS.

# THE Apostolical Institution OF EPISCOPACY DEMONSTRATED.

*BY*

WILL. CHILLINGWORTH

*Master of Arts of the*

UNIVERSITY *of* OXFORD.

*LONDON*,

Printed by *Andrew Clark*. M. DC. LXXIV.

# THE Apostolical Institution OF EPISCOPACY DEMONSTRATED.

## SECT. I.

IF we abstract from *Episcopal Government* all accidentals, and consider only what is essential and necessary to it; we shall find in it no more but this: An appointment of one man of eminent sanctity and sufficiency to have the care of all the Churches, within a certain Precinct or Diocess; and furnishing him with authority (not absolute or arbitrary, but regulated and bounded by Laws, and moderated by joyning to him a convenient number of assistants) to the intent that all the Churches under him may be provided of good and able Pastors: and that both of Pastors and people, conformity to Laws, and performance of their duties may be required, under penalties, not left to discretion, but by Law appointed.

## SECT. II.

To this kind of Government, I am not by any particular interest so devoted, as to think it ought to be maintained, either in opposition to Apostolick Institution; or to the much desired reformation of mens lives, and restauration of Primitive Discipline; or to any Law or Precept of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ: for that were to maintain a means contrary to the end; for Obedience to our Saviour, is the end for which Church Government is appointed. But if it may be *demonstrated* (or made much more probable than the contrary) as I verily think it may: I. That it is not repugnant to the government setled in and for the Church by the Apostles. II. That it is as comply able with the Reformation of any evil which we desire to reform either in Church or State, or the introduction of any good which we desire to introduce as any other kind of Government: And, III. That there is *no* Law, *no* Record of our Saviour against it: Then, I hope, it will not be thought an unreasonable Motion, if we humbly desire those that are in Authority, especially the High Court of Parliament, That it may not be sacrificed to Clamour, or over-born by Violence: and though (which God forbid) the greater part of the Multitude should cry, *Crucifie, Crucifie*; yet our Governours would be so full of Justice and Courage, as not to give it up, until they perfectly understand concerning Episcopacy it self, *Quid mali fecit?*

### Sect. III.

I shall speak at this time only of the first of these three points: That Episcopacy is not repugnant to the Government setled in the Church for perpetuity by the Apostles. Whereof I conceive this which follows is as clear a Demonstration, as any thing of this nature is capable of.

*That this Government was received universally in the Church, either in the Apostles time, or presently after, is so evident and unquestionable, that the most learned Adversaries of this Government do themselves confess it.*

### Sect. IV.

*Petrus Molinæus* in his Book, *De munere pastorali*, purposely written in defence of the Presbyterial Government, acknowledgeth: *That presently after the Apostles times, or even in their time (as Ecclesiastical story witnesseth) it was ordained, That in every City one of the Presbytery should be called a Bishop, who should have pre-eminence over his Colleagues; to avoid confusion which oft times ariseth out of equality. And truly, this form of Government all Churches every where received.*

### Sect. V.

*Theodorus Beza* in his Tract, *De triplici Episcopatûs genere*, confesseth in effect the same thing. For, having distinguished Episcopacy into three kinds, *Divine*, *Humane*, and *Satanical*; and attributing to the second (which he calls *Humane*, but we maintain and conceive to be *Apostolical*) not only a priority of Order, but a superiority of Power and Authority over other Presbyters, bounded yet by Laws and Canons provided against Tyranny: he clearly professeth that of this kind of Episcopacy, is to be understood whatsoever we read concerning the Authority of Bishops (or Presidents, as *Justin Martyr* calls them) in *Ignatius*, and other more ancient Writers.

### Sect. VI.

Certainly, from * these two great Defenders of the Presbytery, we should never have had this free acknowledgment, (so prejudicial to their own pretence, and so advantagious to their Adversaries purpose) had not the evidence of clear and undeniable truth enforced them to it. It will not therefore be necessary, to spend any time in confuting that uningenuous assertion of the anonymous Author of the Catalogue of Testimonies, for the equality of Bishops and Presbyters, who affirms, *That their disparity began long after the Apostles times:* But we may safely take for granted that which these two learned Adversaries have confessed; and see, whether upon this foundation laid by them, we may not by unanswerable reason raise this superstructure;

*That seeing Episcopal Government is confessedly so Ancient and so Catholique, it cannot with reason be denied to be Apostolique.*

* To whom two others also from *Geneva* may be added: *Daniel Chamierus* (in Panstratia, tom. 2. lib. 10. cap. 6 Sect. 24.) and *Nicol. Vellius* (Exercitat. 3. in Epist. Ignatii ad Philadelph. cap. 14. & Exercit. 8. in Epist. ad Mariam, cap. 3.) which is fully demonstrated in D. *Hammond's Dissertations against Blondel* (which never were answered, and never will) by the Testimonies of those who wrote in the very next Age after the Apostles.

Sect.



### Sect. VII.

For so great a change, as between Presbyterial Government and Episcopal, could not possibly have prevailed all the world over in a little time. Had Episcopal Government been an aberration from (or a corruption of) the Government left in the Churches by the Apostles, it had been very strange, that it should have been received in any *one* Church so suddenly, or that it should have prevailed in *all* for many Ages after. *Variâsse debuerat error Ecclesiarum: quod autem apud omnes unum est, non est evratum, sed traditum. Had the Churches err'd, they would have varied: What therefore is one and the same amongst all, came not sure by Error, but Tradition.* Thus *Tertullian* argues very probably, from the consent of the Churches of his time, not long after the Apostles, and that in matter of opinion much more subject to unobserv'd alteration. But that in the frame and substance of the necessary Government of the Church, a thing always in use and practice, there should be so suddain a change, as presently after the Apostles times; and so universal, as received in all the Churches; this is clearly *impossible*.

### Sect. VIII.

For, What universal cause can be assigned or feigned of this *universal* Apostasie? You will not imagine that the Apostles, all or any of them, made any decree for this change when they were living; or left order for it in any Will or Testament, when they were dying. This were to grant the question; to wit, That the Apostles, being to leave the Government of the Churches themselves, and either seeing by experience, or foreseeing by the Spirit of God, the distractions and disorders, which would arise from a multitude of equals, substituted Episcopal Government instead of their own. General Councils to make a Law for a general change, for many ages there was none. There was no Christian Emperor, no coercive power over the Church to enforce it. Or, if there had been any, we know no force was equal to the courage of the Christians of those times. Their lives were then at command (for they had not *then* learnt to *fight* for Christ) but their obedience to any thing *against* his Law was not to be commanded (for they had perfectly learnt to *die* for him.) Therefore there was no power then to command this change; or if there had been any, it had been in vain.

### Sect. IX.

What device then shall we study, or to what fountain shall we reduce this strange pretended alteration? Can it enter into our hearts to think, that all the Presbyters and other Christians then, being the Apostles Schollers, could be generally ignorant of the Will of Christ, touching the necessity of a Presbyterial Government? or, dare we adventure to think them so strangely wicked all the world over, as against knowledge and conscience to conspire against it? Imagine the spirit of *Diotrephes* had entred into some, or a great many of the Presbyters, and possessed them with an ambitious desire of a forbidden superiority, was it possible they should attempt and atchieve it once without any opposition or contradiction? and besides, that the contagion of this ambition, should spread it self and prevail without stop or controul; nay, without any noise or notice taken of it, through all the Churches in the world; all the watchmen in the mean time being so fast asleep, and all the dogs so dumb, that not so much as one should open his mouth against it?

### Sect. X.

But let us suppose (though it be a horrible untruth) that the Presbyters and people *then*, were not so good *Christians* as the Presbyterians are *now*; that they were generally so negligent to retain the Government of Christ's

Church commanded by Christ, which we now are so zealous to restore: yet certainly we must not forget nor deny, that they were *men* as we are. And if we look upon them but as meer natural men; yet, knowing by experience, how hard a thing it is, even for Policy arm'd with Power by many attempts and contrivances, and in a long time, to gain upon the liberty of any *one* people; undoubtedly we shall never entertain so wild an imagination, as that, among all the Christian Presbyteries in the world, neither conscience of duty, nor love of liberty, nor averseness from pride and usurpation of others over them, should prevail so much with any one, as to oppose this pretended universal invasion of the Kingdom of Jesus Christ, and the liberty of Christians.

### Sect. XI.

When I shall see therefore all the Fables in the *Metamorphosis* acted and prove Stories; when I shall see all the Democracies and Aristocracies in the world lie down and sleep, and awake into Monarchies: then will I begin to believe that Presbyterial Government, having continued in the Church during the Apostles times, should presently after (against the Apostles doctrine and the will of Christ) be whirl'd about like a Scene in a Masque, and transformed into Episcopacy. In the mean time, while these things remain thus incredible, and, in humane reason, impossible, I hope I shall have leave to conclude thus:

Episcopal Government is acknowledged to have been universally received in the Church, presently after the Apostles times.

Between the Apostles times and this presently after, there was not time enough for, nor possibility of, so great an alteration.

And therefore there was no such alteration as is pretended. And therefore Episcopacy being confessed to be so Ancient and Catholique, must be granted also to be Apostolique, *Quod erat demonstrandum.*

*FINIS.*

NINE

# SERMONS:

The *First* Preached before His *MAJESTY*

# King CHARLES

the *FIRST*:

The other *Eight* upon special and eminent Occasions.

*BY*

## WILL. CHILLINGWORTH

*Master of Arts of the*

UNIVERSITY *of* OXFORD.

*LONDON*,
Printed by *Andrew Clark*. M. DC. LXXIV.

# TO THE READER.

Christian Reader,

THese Sermons were, by the Godly and Learned Author of them, fitted to the Congregations to which he was to speak; and no doubt intended only for the benefit of Hearers, not of Readers. Nevertheless, it was the desire of many that they might be published upon the hope of good that might be done to the Church of God by them. There is need of plain Instructions to incite men to holiness of life, as well as accurate Treatises in Points Controverted, to discern Truth from Error. For which end I dare promise these Sermons will make much, where they find an honest and humble Reader. It was the Author's greatest care (as you may find in the reading of them) To handle the Word of God by manifestation of the truth, commending himself to every mans conscience in the sight of God: as once St. Paul pleaded for himself, 2 Cor. 4. 2. And if that be the property (which they say) of an eloquent and good speaker, Non ex ore, sed ex pectore, To speak from his heart rather than his tongue; then surely this Author was an excellent Orator, one that spake out of sound understanding with true affection.

How great his parts were, and how well improved, as may appear by these his Labours, so they were fully known,

known, *and the loſs of them* ſufficiently bewailed *by thoſe among whom he* lived *and* converſed.

*Many* excellencies *there were in him, for which his* memory remains; *but this above all was his crown*, that he unfeignedly ſought God's glory, and the good of mens ſouls. *It remains, that theſe* Sermons *be* read *by thee with a* care to profit, *and* thanks *to God for the* benefit *thou haſt by them, ſith they are ſuch* talents, *as in the uſe of which he* requires *and* expects *to be* glorified. *Farewel.*

THE



# The Firſt Sermon.

2 Tim. III. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.

*This know alſo, that in the laſt days perilous times ſhall come.*
*For men ſhall be lovers of their own ſelves, covetous, boaſters, proud, blaſphemers, diſobedient to Parents, unthankful, unholly,*
*Wiihout natural affection, truce-breakers, falſe accuſers, incontinent, fierce, deſpiſers of thoſe that are good,*
*Traitors, heady, high-minded, lovers of pleaſures more than lovers of God;*
*Having a form of godlineſs, but denying the power thereof.*

TO a diſcourſe upon theſe words, I cannot think of any fitter Introduction, than that wherewith our Saviour ſometime began a Sermon of his, *This day is this Scripture fulfilled.* And I would to God, there were not great occaſion to fear, that a great part of it may be fulfilled in this place.

Two things are contained in it. Firſt, the real wickedneſs of the generality of the men of the Latter-times, in the four firſt verſes. For by *men ſhall be lovers of themſelves, covetous, boaſters, proud*, &c. I conceive is meant, men generally ſhall be ſo; otherwiſe this were nothing peculiar to the laſt, but common to all times: for in all times ſome, nay, many, have been lovers of themſelves, covetous, boaſters, proud, *&c.* Secondly, we have here the formal and hypocritical godlineſs of the ſame times, in the laſt verſe, *Having a form of godlineſs, but denying the power thereof*; which latter, ordinarily and naturally accompanies the former. For, as the ſhadows are longeſt when the Sun is loweſt, and as Vines and other fruit-trees bear the leſs fruit, when they are ſuffered to luxuriate and ſpend their ſap upon ſuperfluous ſuckers, and abundance of leaves: So commonly, we may obſerve both in Civil converſation, where there is great ſtore of formality, there is little ſincerity: and in Religion, where there is a decay of true and cordial piety, there men entertain and pleaſe themſelves, and vainly hope to pleaſe God with external formalities, and performances, and great ſtore of that righteouſneſs for which Chriſt ſhall judge the world.

It were no difficult matter to ſhew that the truth of St. *Paul*'s Prediction is by experience juſtified in both parts of it; but my purpoſe is to reſtrain my ſelf to the latter, and to endeavour to clear unto you, that that in our times is generally accompliſhed: That almoſt in all places the power of Godlineſs is decayed and vaniſhed; the form and profeſſion of it only remaining: That the ſpirit, and ſoul, and life of Religion, is for the moſt part gone; only the outward body or carcaſs, or rather the picture or ſhadow of it being left behind: this is the Doctrine which at this time I ſhall deliver to you; and the Uſe, which I deſire moſt heartily you ſhould make of it, is this, To take care that you confute ſo far as it concerns your particulars, what I fear I ſhall prove too true in the general.

To come then to our buſineſs, without further complement, let us examine

our ways, and consider impartially, What the Religion of most men is.

We are baptized in our infancy, that is, as I conceive, dedicated and devoted to God's service, by our Parents and the Church, as young *Samuel* was by his Mother *Anna*, and there we take a Solemn Vow, *To forsake the Devil and all his works, the vain pomp and glory of the world, with all the covetous desires of it; to forsake also all the carnal desires of the flesh, and not to follow nor be led by them.* This Vow we take when we be children and understand it not: and, how many are there, who know, and consider, and regard what they have vowed, when they are become men, almost as little as they did being children: Consider the lives, and publick actions of most men of all conditions, in Court, City, and Country, and then deny it, if you can, that those three things which we have renounced in our Baptism; the profits, honours, and pleasures of the World, are not the very Gods which divide the world amongst them, are not served more devoutly, confided in more heartily, loved more affectionately, then the *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, in whose name we are baptized? Deny, if you can, the daily and constant imployment of all men, to be either a violent prosecution of the vain pomp and glory of the world, or of the power, riches, and contemptible profits of it, or of the momentary or unsatisfying pleasures of the flesh, or else of the more diabolical humours of pride, malice, revenge, and such like: And yet with this empty form we please and satisfie our selves, as well as if we were lively born again by the Spirit of God, not knowing or not regarding what St. *Peter* hath taught us, That the *Baptism* which must save us, is, *Not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience unto God.*

1 Pet. 3. 21.

When we are come to years capable of instruction, many, which is lamentable to consider, are so little regarded by themselves or others, that they continue little better than Pagans in a Common-wealth of Christians, and know little more of God or of Christ, then if they had been bred in the Indies. A lamentable case, and which will one day lie heavy upon their account, which might have amended it and did not. But many, I confess, are taught to act over this play of Religion, and learned to say, *Our Father which art in Heaven*; and, *I believe in God the Father Almighty*: but, Where are the men that live so, as if they did believe in earnest, that God is their Almighty Father? Where are they that fear him, and trust him, and depend upon him only, for their whole happiness, and love him, and obey him, as in reason we ought to do to an Almighty Father? Who, if he be our Father, and we be indeed his children, will do for us all the good he can; and if he be Almighty, can do for us all the good he will; and yet, how few are there, who love him with half that affection as Children usually do their Parents, or believe him with half that simplicity, or serve him with half that diligence? And then for the Lords Prayer, the plain truth is, we lie unto God for the most part clean through it, and for want of desiring indeed, what in word we pray for, tell him to his face as many false tales as we make Petitions. For who shews by his endeavours, that he desires heartily that *God's name should be hallowed*; that is, holily and religiously worshipped and adored by all men? That *his Kingdom should be advanced and inlarged? That his blessed will should be universally obeyed?* Who shews by his forsaking sin, that he desires so much as he should do the forgiveness of it? Nay, who doth not revenge, upon all occasions, the affronts, contempts, and injuries put upon him, and so upon the matter curse himself, as often as he says, *Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive them that trespass against us?* How few depend upon God only for their *daily bread, viz.* the good things of this life, as upon the only giver of them, so as neither to get nor keep any of them, by any means which they know or fear to be offensive unto God? How few desire in earnest to *avoid temptation?* Nay, who almost is there, that takes not the Devils Office out of his hand, and is not himself a tempter both to himself and others? Lastly, who almost is there that desires heartily and above all things so much as the thing deserves, to be delivered from the *greatest evil*; Sin, I mean, and the Anger of God? Now, beloved, this is certain; he that imploys not requisite industry, to obtain what he pretends to desire, does not desire indeed, but only pretends to



to do so: He that desires not what he prayes for, prayes with tongue only, and not with his heart, indeed does not pray to God, but play and dally with him. And yet this is all which men generally do, and therefore herein also accomplish this prophesie, *Having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof.*

And this were ill enough, were it in private, but we abuse God Almighty also with our publick and solemn formalities, we make the Church a Stage whereon to act our parts, and play our Pageants; there we make a profession every day of *confessing our sins with humble, lowly, and obedient hearts*, and yet when we have talked after this manner, twenty, thirty, forty years together, our hearts for the most part continue as proud, as impenitent, as disobedient, as they were in the beginning. We make great Protestations, *when we assemble and meet together to render thanks to God Almighty, for the benefits received at his hands*; and if this were to be performed with words, with *Hosanna's*, and *Hallelujahs*, and *Gloria Patri's*, and Psalms, and Hymns, and such like outward matters, peradventure we should do it very sufficiently: but in the mean time with our lives and actions, we provoke the Almighty, and that to his face, with all variety of grievous and bitter provocations; we do daily and hourly such things as we know, and he hath assured us, to be odious unto him, and contrary to his nature; as any thing in the world is to the nature of any man in the world; and all this upon poor, trifling, trivial, no temptations. If a man whom you had dealt well with, should deal so with you; one whom ye had redeemed from the *Turkish* slavery, and instated in some indifferent good inheritance, should make you fine Speeches, entertain you with Panegyricks, and have your praises always in his mouth; but all this while do nothing that pleases you, but upon all occasions, put all affronts and indignities upon you, Would you say, this were a thankful man? Nay, would you not make heaven and earth ring of his unthankfulness, and detest him almost as much for his fair Speeches, as his foul Actions. Beloved, such is our unthankfulness to our God and Creator, to our Lord and Saviour; our tongues ingeminate, and cry aloud *Hosanna, Hosanna*, but the louder voice of our lives and actions is *Crucifie him, Crucifie him:* We Court God Almighty, and complement with him, and profess to esteem his service *perfect freedom*; but if any thing be to be done, much more if any thing be to be suffered for him, here we leave him. We bow the knee before him, and put a Reed in his hand, and a Crown upon his head, and cry, *Hail King of the Jews*: But then with our customary sins, we give him Gall to eat, and Vinegar to drink, we thrust a Spear in his side, nail him to the Cross, and crucifie to our selves the Lord of Glory. This is not the office of a friend to bewail a dead friend with vain lamentation. *Sed quæ voluerit meminisse, quæ mandaverit exequi*, to remember what he desires, and execute what he commands; so said a dying *Roman* to his friend, and so say I to you, To be thankful to God is not to say, God be praised, or, God be thanked, but to remember what he desires, and execute what he commands. To be thankful to God, is certainly to love him, and to love him is to keep his Commandments, so saith our Saviour, *Joh.*19. *If ye love me, keep my Commandments*: If we do so, we may justly pretend to thankfulness; which, believe me, is not a word, nor to be performed with words; But if we do not so, as generally we do not, our talk of thankfulness is nothing else but meer talk; and we accomplish St. *Pauls* Prophesie herein also: Having a form of thankfulness, but not the reality, not the power of it.

If I should reckon up unto you, how many direct lies every wicked man tells to God Almighty, as often as he says Amen, *to this form of Godliness*, which our Church hath prescribed; If I should present unto you all our acting of Piety, and playing of Humiliation, and personating of devotion in the Psalms, the Letanies, the Collects, and generally in the whole Service, I should be infinite: And therefore I have thought good to draw a vail over a great part of our Hypocrisie, and to restrain the remainder of our discourse to the contrariety between our profession and performance, only in two things, I mean, *Faith* and *Repentance*.

And first for *Faith*: We profess, and indeed generally, because it is not safe to

do otherwise, that we believe the Scripture to be true, and that it contains the plain and only way to infinite and eternal happiness: But if we did generally believe what we do profess, if this were the language of our hearts as well as our tongues, How comes it to pass that the Study of it is so generally neglected?

Let a Book that treats of the Philosophers stone, promise never so many mountains of Gold, and even the restoring of the golden Age again, yet were it not marvel, if few should study it; and the reason is, because few would believe it. But if there were a Book extant, and ordinary to be had, as the Bible is, which men did generally believe to contain a plain and easie way for all men to become rich, and to live in health and pleasure, and this worlds happiness, can any man imagine that this Book would be unstudied by any man? And why then should I not believe, That if the Scripture were firmly and heartily believed, the certain and only way to happiness, which is perfect and eternal, it would be studied by all men with all diligence? Seeing therefore most Christians are so cold and negligent in the study of it, prefer all other business, all other pleasures before it; is there not great reason to fear, that many who pretend to believe firmly, believe it not at all, or very weakly and faintly? If the General of an Army, or an Embassadour to some Prince or State, were assured by the King his Master, that the transgressing any point of his Commission, should cost him his life; and the exact performance of it, be recompenced with as high a reward as were in the Kings power to bestow upon him: can it be imagined that any man who believes this, and is in his right mind, can be so supinely and stupidly negligent of this charge, which so much imports him, as to oversee, through want of care, any one necessary Article, or part of his Commission; especially if it be delivered to him in writing, and at his pleasure to peruse it every day? Certainly this absurd negligence is a thing without example, and such as peradventure will never happen to any sober man to the worlds end: And by the same reason, if we were firmly perswaded, that this Book doth indeed contain that charge and commission, which infinitely more concerns us, it were not in reason possible, but that to such a perswasion, our care and diligence about it, should be in some measure answerable: seeing therefore most of us are so strangely careless, so grosly negligent of it, is there not great reason to fear, that though we have *Professors and Protestors* in abundance; yet the faithful, the truly and sincerely faithful, are, in a manner, failed from the children of men. What but this can be the cause that men are so commonly ignorant of so many Articles, and particular Mandates of it, which yet are as manifest in it, as if they were written with the beams of the Sun? For example; how few of our Ladies and Gentlewomen, do or will understand, that a voluptuous
1 Tim. 5. 6. life, is damnable and prohibited to them? Yet St. *Paul* saith so very plainly, *She that liveth in pleasure is dead while she liveth.* I believe this case divinely regards not the Sex, He would say, *He* as well as *She*, if there had been occasion. How few of the Gallants of our time do or will understand, that it is not lawful for them to be as expensive and costly in apparel, as their means, or perhaps, their credit will extend unto? Which is to sacrifice unto vanity, that, which by the Law of Christ, is due unto
1 Tim. 2. 9. Charity; and yet the same St. *Paul* forbids plainly this excess even to women---*Also let women* (he would have said it much rather to the men) *array themselves in comely apparel, with shamefastness and modesty, not with embroidered hair, or gold, or pearls, or costly apparel*; and to make our ignorance the more inexcusable, the very same rule is delivered by St. *Peter* also, 1 *Epist.* 3.3.

How few rich men are or will be perswaded, That the Law of Christ permits them not to heap up riches for ever, nor perpetually to add House to House, and Land to Land, though by lawful means, but requires of them thus much Charity at least, that ever while they are providing for their Wives and Children, they should, out of the increase wherewith God blesseth their industry, allot the Poor a just and free proportion? And when they have provided for them in a convenient manner, (such as they themselves shall judge sufficient and convenient in others) that then they should give over making Purchase after Purchase, but, with the surplussage of their Revenue



Revenue beyond their expence, procure, as much as lies in them, that no Christian remain miserably poor: few rich men, I fear, are or will be thus perswaded, and their dayly actions shew as much; yet undoubtedly, either our Saviour's general command, *of loving our neighbours as our selves*, which can hardly consist with our keeping vainly, or spending vainly, what he wants for his ordinary subsistence, lays upon us a necessity of this high liberality: or his special command concerning this matter, *Quod superest date pauperibus*; *That which remains give to the poor*: or that which St. *John* saith, 1 *Epist.* 3. 17. reacheth home unto it, *Whosoever hath this worlds good, and seeth his brother have need, and shutteth up the bowels of his compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him?* Which is in effect, as if he had said, He that keepeth from any brother in Christ, that which his brother wants, and he wants not, doth but vainly think that he loves God, and therefore vainly hope that God loves him.

Where almost are the men that are or will be perswaded the Gospel of Christ requires of men *Humility*, like to that of *little Children*, and that under the highest pain of damnation? That is, that we should no more over-value our selves, or desire to be highly esteemed by others; no more undervalue, scorn, or despise others; no more affect preeminence over others, than little children do, before we have put that pride into them, which afterwards we charge wholly upon their natural corruption: and yet our blessed Saviour requires nothing more rigidly, nor more plainly, than this high degree of humility; *Verily*, saith he, *I say unto you* (he speaks to his Disciples affecting high places, and demanding, which of them should be greatest) *Except ye be converted and become as little Children, ye shall not enter into the Kingdom of heaven.*

Would it not be strange news to a great many, that not only *Adultery* and *Fornication*, but even *uncleanness* and *Lasciviousness*; not only *Idolatry* and *Witchcraft*, but *Hatred, Variance, Emulations, Wrath*, and *Contentions*; not only *Murthers*, but *Envying*; not *Drunkenness* only, but *revelling*, are things prohibited to Christians, and such as if we forsake them not, we cannot inherite the Kingdom of Heaven? And yet these things, as strange as they may seem, are plainly written; some of them by St. *Peter*, 1 *Ep.* 4. *Chap.* but all of them by St. *Paul*, *Gal.* 5.19. *Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these, adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness*, &c. *of the which I tell you before, as I have told you in times past, that they who do such things, shall not inherit the Kingdom of God.*

If I should tell you, that all *bitterness* and *evil speaking* (nay, such is the modesty and gravity which Christianity requires of us) *foolish talk and jesting*, are things not allowed to Christians, would not many cry out, These are hard and strange sayings, who can hear them? And yet, as strange as they may seem, they have been written well nigh 1600 years, and are yet extant in very legible Characters, in the Epistle to the *Ephesians*, the end of the fourth, and the beginning of the fifth Chap.

To come a little nearer to the business of our times, The chief Actors in this bloudy Tragedy, which is now upon the Stage, who have robbed our Soveraign Lord the King of his Forts, Towns, Treasure, Ammunition, Houses, of the Persons of many of his Subjects, and (as much as lies in them) of the hearts of all of them: Is it credible that they know, and remember, and consider the example of *David* recorded for their instruction? *Whose heart smote him when he had but cut off the hem of Sauls Garment.*

They that make no scruple at all of fighting with his Sacred Majesty, and shooting Muskets and Ordinance at Him (which sure have not the skil to choose a Subject from a King) to the extreme hazard of his Sacred Person, whom by all possible obligations they are bound to defend; do they know, think you, the general rule without exception or limitation, left by the Holy Ghost for our direction in all such cases, *who can lift up his hand against the Lords Anointed, and be innocent?* Or, do they consider his command in the *Proverbs of Solomon, My Son fear God and the King, and meddle not with them that desire change?* Or, his counsel in the Book of *Ecclesiastes*,
1 Sam 26. 9. Prov. 24. 21.

Eccles 8. 2. *Ecclesiastes, I counsel thee to keep the Kings Commandment, and that in regard of the oath of God.* Or because they possibly may pretend that they are exempted from, or unconcerned in, the commands of obedience delivered in the Old Testament, Do they know and remember, the Precept given to all Christians by St. *Peter*, *Submit your selves to every Ordinance of man for the Lords sake, whether it be to the King as Supreme, or unto Governours, as unto them that are sent by him*? Or, that terrible sanction of the same command, *They that resist shall receive to themselves damnation*, left us by S. *Paul* in his *Epistle* to the *Romans*, who then were the miserable Subjects of the worst King, the worst man, nay, I think I may add truly the worst beast in the world; that so all Rebels mouths might be stopt for ever, and left without all colour or pretence whatsoever, to justifie the resistance of Soveraign Power. Undoubtedly, if they did know and consider, and lay close to their hearts, these places of Scripture; or the fearful judgment which befel *Corah*, *Dathan*, and *Abiram*, for this very sin which now they commit, and with a high hand still proceed in, it would be impossible but their hearts would smite them, as *David*'s did, upon an infinitely less occasion, and affright them out of those ways of present confusion, and eternal damnation. And then on the other side, they that maintain the Kings righteous cause with the hazard of their lives and fortunes, but by their oaths and curses, by their drunkenness and debauchery, by their irreligion and profannness, fight more powerfully against their Party, than by all other means they do or can fight for it; are not, I fear, very well acquainted with any part of the Bible: but that strict caution which properly concerns themselves in the Book of *Leviticus*, I much doubt they have scarce ever heard of it, *When thou goest to war with thine Enemies, then take heed there be no wicked thing in thee*; not only no wickedness in the cause thou maintainest, nor no wickedness in the means by which thou maintainest it; but no personal impieties in the persons that maintain it. Beloved, for the former two, we have reason to be full of comfort and confidence; For what is our cause? What is that which you fight, and we pray for? But to deliver the King and all his good Subjects out of the power of their Enemies, who will have no peace but with their slaves and vassals: and for the means by which it is maintained, it is not by lying, it is not by calumnies, it is not by running first our selves, and then forcing the people to universal perjury? But by a just War, because necessary; and by as fair and merciful a War, as if they were not Rebels and Traytors you fight against, but Competitors in a doubtful Title. But now for the third part of the caution, that, to deal ingenuously with you, and to deliver my own soul, if I cannot other mens, that I cannot think of with half so much comfort as the former; but seeing so many *Jonasses* imbarqued in the same ship, the same cause with us, and so many *Achans* entring into Battel with us against the *Canaanites*; seeing Publicans and Sinners on the one side, against Scribes and Pharisees on the other; on the one side Hypocrisie, on the other Prophaneness; no honesty nor justice on the one side, and very little piety on the other: On the one side horrible Oaths, Curses, and Blasphemies; on the other, pestilent Lies, Calumnies, and Perjury: When I see amongst them the Pretence of Reformation, if not the desire pursued by Antichristian, Mahumetan, Devillish means; and amongst us little or no zeal for Reformation of what is indeed amiss, little or no care to remove the cause of God's anger towards us, by just, lawful, and Christian means; I profess plainly, I cannot without trembling consider, what is likely to be the event of these Distractions; I cannot but fear, that the goodness of our cause may sink under the burthen of our sins: And that God in his justice, because we will not suffer his Judgments to archieve their prime scope and intention, which is our amendment and reformation, may either deliver us up to the blind zeal and fury of our Enemies; or else, which I rather fear, make us instruments of his Justice each against other, and of our own just and deserved confusion. This, I profess plainly, is my fear, and I would to God it were the fear of every Souldier of his Majesties Army: but that which encreaseth my fear is, that I see very many of them have very little or none at all: I mean not, that they are fearless towards their Enemies, (that's our joy and



and triumph (but that they shew their courage even against God, and fear not him, whom it is madness not to fear. Now from whence can their not fearing him proceed, but from their not knowing him, their not knowing his will and their own duty? Not knowing how highly it concerns Souldiers, above other professions, to be Religious? and then, if ever, when they are engaged in dangerous adventures, and every moment have their lives in their hands, *when they go to war with their Enemies, then to take heed there be no wicked thing in them.*

You see, Beloved, how many instances and examples I have given you of our gross ignorance of what is necessary and easie for us to know; and to these it were no difficult matter to add more. Now from whence can this ignorance proceed, but from supine negligence? And from whence this negligence, but from our not believing what we pretend to believe? For, did we believe firmly and heartily, that this Book were given us by God for the rule of our Actions, and that obedience to it were the certain and only way to eternal happiness, it were impossible we should be such enemies to our selves, such Traytors to our own souls, as not to search it, at least, with so much diligence, that no necessary point of our duty plainly taught in it, could possibly escape us. But it is certain, and apparent to all the world, that the greatest part of Christians, through gross and wilful negligence, remain utterly ignorant of many necessary points of their duty to God and Man: and therefore it is much to be feared, that this Book, and the Religion of Christ contained in it, among an infinite of professors, labours with great penury of true believers.

It were an easie matter (if the time would permit) to present unto you many other demonstrations of the same conclusion; but to this drawn from our willing ignorance of that which is easie and necessary for us to know, I will content my self to add only one more, taken from our voluntary and presumptuous neglect to do those things which we know and acknowledge to be necessary.

If a man should say unto me, That it concerns him at much as his life is worth, to go presently to such a place, and that he knows but one way to it, and I should see him stand still, or go some other way, Had I any reason to believe that this man believes himself? *Quid verba audiam, cum facta videam*? Saith he in the Comedy; *Protestatio contra factum non valet*, saith the Law; and why should I believe, that that man believes obedience to Christ the only way to present and eternal happiness, whom I see wittingly, and willingly, and constantly, and customarily to disobey him? The time was, that we all knew that the King could reward those that did him service, and punish those that did him dis-service, and then all men were ready to obey his Command, and he was a rare man that durst do any thing to his face that offended him. Beloved, if we did but believe in God, so much as most Subjects do in their King; did we as verily believe, that God could and would make us perfectly happy, if we serve him, though all the world conspire to make us miserable, and that he could and would make us miserable if we serve him not, though all the world should conspire to make us happy, How were it possible that to such a faith our lives should not be conformable? Who was there ever so madly in love with a present peny, as to run the least hazard of the loss of 10000 *l.* a year to gain it, or not readily to part with it upon any probable hope or light perswasion, much more a firm belief that by doing so he should gain 100000 *l.* Now, beloved, the happiness which the servants of Christ are promised in the Scripture we all pretend to believe, that it exceeds the conjunction of all the good things of the world, and much more such a portion as we may possibly enjoy, infinitely more than 10000 *l.* a year, or 100000 *l.* doth a peny; for, 100000 *l.* is but a peny so many times over, and 10000 *l.* a year is worth but a certain number of pence; but between heaven and earth, between finite and infinite, between eternity and a moment, there is utterly no proportion; and therefore seeing we are so apt, upon trifling occasions, to hazard this heaven for this earth, this infinite for this finite, this all for this nothing; is it not much to be feared, that though many of us pretend to much faith, we have indeed very little or none at all? The sum of all which hath been spoken concerning this point

is

is this: Were we firmly perswaded, that obedience to the Gospel of Christ is the true and only way to present and eternal happiness, (without which faith no man living can be justified) then the innate desire of our own happiness could not but make us studious inquirers of the will of Christ, and conscionable performers of it; but there are (as experience shews) very few, who make it their care and business to know the will of Christ; and of those few again, very many who make no conscience at all of doing what they know: therefore though they profess and protest they have faith, yet their protestations are not to be regarded against their actions, but we may safely and reasonably conclude what was to be concluded, That the Doctrine of Christ, amongst an infinite of professors, labours with great scarcity of true, and serious, and hearty believers; and that herein also we accomplish St. *Pauls* Prediction, *Having a form of godliness, but denying*, &c.

But perhaps the truth and reality of our repentance may make some kind of satisfaction to God almighty for our hypocritical dallying with him in all the rest; truly, I should be heartily glad it were so: but I am so far from being of this faith, that herein I fear we are most of all hypocritical, and that the generality of Professors is so far from a real practice of true Repentance, that scarce one in an hundred understands truly what it is.

Some satisfie themselves with a bare confession and acknowledgment either that they are sinners in general, or that they have committed such and such sins in particular; which acknowledgment comes not yet from the heart of a great many, but only from their lips and tongues: For how many are there that do rather complain and murmur that they are sinners, then acknowledge and confess it? And make it, upon the matter, rather their unhappiness and misfortune, than their true fault, that they are so? Such are all they who impute all their commissions of evil to the unavoidable want of *restraining grace*, and all their omission of good to the like want of *effectual exciting grace*. All such as pretend that the Commandments of God are impossible to be kept any better than they are kept; and that the World, the Flesh, and the Devil, are even omnipotent enemies; and that God neither doth, nor will, give sufficient strength to resist and overcome them. All such as lay all their faults upon *Adam*, and say with those rebellious *Israelites* (whom God assures, That they neither had nor should have just reason to say so) *That their Fathers had eaten sowre grapes, and their teeth were set on edge*. Lastly, all such as lay all their sins upon *divine Prescience*, and *Predestination*, saying with their tongues, O what wretched sinners have we been; but in their hearts, How could we help it, we vvere predestinate to it, vve could not do othervvise.

All such as seriously so persvvade themselves, and think to hide their nakedness vvith such fig-leaves as these, can no more be said to acknovvledge themselves guilty of a fault, then a man that vvas born blind or lame, vvith the Stone or Gout, can accuse himself of any fault for being born so; vvell may such a one complain and bemoan himself, and say, O vvretched man that I am, vvho shall deliver me from this unhappiness! but such a complaint is as far from being a true acknovvledgment of any fault, as a bare acknovvledgment of a fault is far from true repentance: for, to confess a fault, is, to acknovvledge, that, freely and vvillingly, vvithout any constraint, or unavoydable necessity, vve have transgressed the Lavv of God, it being *in our power by God's grace*, to have done othervvise. To aggravate this fault is to confess vve have done so, vvhen vve might easily have avoided it, and had no great nor violent temptation to it; to pretend any great difficulty in the matter, is to excuse and extenuate it: but to say, that, all things considered, it vvas absolutely impossible for you to avoid it, is flatly to deny it. Others there are that think they have done enough, if to confession of sin, they add some sorrovv for it; if vvhen the present fit of sin is past, and they are returned to themselves, the sting remaining, breed some remorse of conscience, some complaints against their vvickedness and folly for having done so, and some intentions to forsake it, though vanishing and ineffectual: These heart-drops, this morning devv of sorrovv, though it presently vanish, and they return

to



to their sin again upon the next temptation *as a dog to his vomit*, vvhen the pang is over; yet in the pauses betvveen vvhile they are in their good mood, they conceive themselves to have very true, and very good repentance; so that if they should have the good fortune to be taken away in one of these *Intervalla*, one of these sober moods, they should certainly be saved; which is just as if a man in a Quartane Ague, or the Stone, or Gout, should think himself rid of his disease as oft as he is out of his fit.

But if repentance were no more but so; how could St. *Paul* have truly said, *That godly sorrow worketh repentance*? Every man knows that nothing can work it self. 1 Cor.7. 10. The Architect is not the house which he builds, the Father is not the Son which he begets, the Tradesman is not the work which he makes; and therefore if sorrow, godly sorrow, worketh repentance, certainly sorrow is not repentance: the same St. *Paul* tells us in the same place, *That the sorrow of the world worketh death*; and you will give me leave to conclude from hence, therefore it is not death; and what shall hinder me from concluding thus also, godly sorrow worketh repentance, therefore it is not repentance.

To this purpose it is worth the observing, that when the Scripture speaks of that kind of repentance, which is only sorrow for something done, and wishing it undone, it constantly useth the word Μεταμέλεια, to which forgiveness of sins is no where promised. So it is written of *Judas* the son of perdition, *Mat.* 27.5. Μεταμεληθεὶς ἀπέγξατο, *he repented and went and hanged himself*, and so constantly in other places. But that repentance to which remission of sins and salvation is promised, is perpetually expressed by the word Μετάνοια which signifieth a through change of the heart and soul, of the life and actions, Μετανοεῖτε, ἤγγικε γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν, *Mat.* 3.2. which is rendred in our last Translation, *Repent, for the Kingdom of heaven is at hand*: But much better, because freer from ambiguity in the entrance to our *Common-Prayer-Book*, *Amend your lives, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand*. From whence, by the way, we may observe, That in the judgment of those holy and learned Martyrs, *Repentance, and amendment of life* are all one: And I would to God, the same men, out of the same care of avoiding mistakes, and to take away occasion of cavilling our Liturgy from them that seek it, and out of fear of encouraging carnal men to security in sinning, had been so provident, as to set down in terms, the first sentence taken out of the eighteenth of *Ezekiel*, and not have put in the place of it an ambiguous, and (though not in it self, yet accidentally, by reason of the mistake to which it is subject) I fear very often a pernicious Paraphrase; for whereas thus they make it, *At what time soever a sinner doth repent him of his sins from the bottom of his heart, I will put all his wickedness out of my remembrance, saith the Lord*; The plain truth, if you will hear it, is, the Lord doth not say so, these are not the very words of God, but the paraphrase of men: the words of God are as followeth--*If the wicked turn from all the sins which he hath committed, and keep all my Statutes, and do that which is lawful and right, he shall surely live, he shall not die*; where, I hope, you easily observe that there is no such word as, *At what time soever a sinner doth repent*, &c. and that there is a wide difference between this (as the word *repent* usually sounds in the ears of the people) and turning from all sins, and keeping all Gods Statutes: that indeed, having no more in it but sorrow and good purposes, may be done easily and certainly at the last gasp, and it is very strange that any Christian, who dies in his right senses, and knows the differance between heaven and hell, should fail of the performing it: but this work of turning, keeping, and doing, is (though not impossible, by extraordinary mercy to be performed at last) yet ordinarily a work of time, a long and laborious work (but yet heaven is very well worth it) and if you mean to go through with it, you had need go about it presently. Yet seeing the Composers of our Liturgy thought fit to abreviate, *Turning from all sin, and keeping all God's Statutes, and doing that which is lawful and right*, into this one word, *Repenting*, it is easie ane obvious to collect from hence, as I did before, from the other place, that by Repentance, they understood not only sorrow for sin, but

Zz conversion

conversion from it. The same word Μετάνοια, *Mat.* 12. 42. is used in speaking of the Repentance of the *Ninivites*: And, how real, hearty, and effectual a Conversion that was, you may see *Jonas* 3. from the fifth to the last verse. *The People of* Niniveh *believed God, and put on Sackcloth from the greatest of them to the least of them; for word came to the King of* Niniveh, *and he arose from his Throne, and he cast his Robe from him, and covered him with Sackcloth, and sate in ashes; and he caused it to be proclaimed and published throughout* Niniveh, *by the Decree of the King and of his Nobles, saying: Let neither man nor beast, herd, nor flock, taste any thing, let them not feed, nor drink water; but let man and beast be covered with Sackcloth, and cry mightily unto God; yea, let every one turn from his evil way, and from the violence which is in their hands, who can tell if God will turn and repent, and turn away his fierce anger that we perish not?*

Which words contain an excellent and lively pattern for all true penitents to follow, and whereunto to conform themselves in their humiliation and repentance. And truly, though there be no *Jonas* sent expresly from God to cry unto us, *Yet forty days and Ninivey shall be destroyed*; yet seeing the mouth of Eternal Truth hath taught us, that *a Kingdom divided* is in such danger of ruine and destruction, that morally speaking, if it continue divided it cannot stand; and seeing the strange and miserable condition of our Nation at this time, may give any considerable man just cause to fear, that as in *Rehoboam's* case, so likewise in ours, *The thing is of the Lord*, intending to bring his heavy judgment upon us, for our great sins, and our stupid, and stupendious security in sinning, and to make us instruments of his designed vengeance, one upon another; peradventure it would be a seasonable and necessary motion to be made to our King and his Nobles--- To revive this old *Proclamation* of the King of *Niniveh*, and to send it with authority through his Majesties Dominions, and to try whether it will produce some good effect: *Who can tell if God will turn and repent, and turn away from his fierce anger, that we perish not?* Who can tell, whether he that hath the hearts of King and People in his hand, and turneth them whithersoever he thinketh best, may not upon our repentance take our extremity for his opportunity, and at last open our eyes that we *may see those things that belong to our peace*, and shew us the way of Peace, which hitherto we have not known: but this by the way; For my purpose, I observe, That this Repentance, which, when the sword of God was drawn, and his arm advanced for a blow, staid his hand, and sheathed his sword again, was not a meer sorrow for their sins, and a purpose to leave them; nay, it was not only laying aside their gallantry and bravery, and putting on Sackcloth and sitting in ashes, and crying mightily unto God, of which yet we are come very short: but it was also, and that chiefly, their universal turning from their evil way, which above all the rest was prevalent and effectual with God Almighty: for so it is written, *And God saw their works that they turned from their evil way, and God repented him of the evil that he said he would do, and he did it not.*

In the Gospel of S. *Luke*, chap. 24. The condition of the new Covenant, to which remission of sins is promised, is expressed by the word Μετάνοια,—— *Thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead, and that* (Μετάνοια) *Repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name.* Which place, if ye compare with that in the Gospel of St. *Matthew, Go teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all what soever I shall command you*; It will be no difficulty to collect, that what our Saviour calls in one place Μετάνοια. Repentance, that he calls in another, Observing all that he hath commanded; which, if Repentance were no more but sorrow for sin, and intending to leave it, certainly he never could, nor would, have done: And as little could S. *Paul, Acts* 20. 21. profess, that the whole matter of his preaching was nothing else but Μετάνοιαν εἰς τὸν Θεόν. *Repentance towards God, and Faith in our Lord Jesus Christ*: It being manifest in his Epistles, he preaches, and presses every where, the necessity of mortification, regeneration, new, and sincere obedience, all which are evidently not contained under



under the head of *Faith*; and therefore it is evident he comprized all these under the name of *Repentance*.

In which words moreover it is very considerable, as also in another place, *Heb.* 6. where among the fundamentals of Christianity the first place is given to Μετάνοιαν ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἔργων, I say, it is very considerable, that though the word may not very absolutely be rendred Repentance; yet we shall do much right to the places, and make them much more clear and intelligible, if instead of *Repentance*, we should put *Conversion*, as it is in some of the best *Latine* Translations: So, for example, if instead of *repentance to God*, *Acts* 20. and *repentance from dead works*, in the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, which our *English* tongue will hardly bear; we should read *conversion to God, and conversion from dead works*, every one sees, it would be more perspicuous and more natural; whereas, on the other side, if, instead of repentance, we should substitute sorrow (as every true genuine interpretation may with advantage to the clearness of the sense, be put in place of the word interpreted) and read the place *sorrow towards God*, and *sorrow from dead works*, it is apparent that this reading would be unnatural, and almost ridiculous: which is a great argument, that Μετάνοια, to which forgiveness of sins is promised in the Gospel, is not only sorrow for sin, but conversion from sin.

And yet if it be not so, but that Heaven may be purchased at easier, and cheaper rates: how comes it to pass, that in the New Testament, we are so plainly, and so frequently assured, that without actual, and effectual amendment, and newness of life; without actual, and effectual Mortification, Regeneration, Sanctification; there is no hope, no possibility of Salvation.

*Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire.* So St. *John Baptist* preaches repentance. It is not then the leaves of a fair profession, no nor the blossoms of good purposes and intentions, but the fruit, the fruit only, that can save us from the fire; neither is it enough not to bear ill fruit, unless we bring forth good. *Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire.* Mat. 3. 9.

*Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, but he that doth the will of my Father wich is in Heaven*: So our *Saviour*, Mat. 7. 21. And again, after he had delivered his most divine Precepts in his Sermon on the Mount, (which Sermon contains the substance of the Gospel of Christ:) he closeth up all with saying, *He that heareth these sayings of mine, and doth them not*, (and yet these were the hardest sayings that ever he said) *I will liken him to a foolish man, which built his house upon the sand*, (that is, his hope of Salvation, upon a sandy and false ground) *and when the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that House, it fell and great was the fall of it.*

*They that are Christs have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts*: So St. *Paul, Gal.* 5. 24. They then that have not done so, nor crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts, let them be as sorrowful as they please, let them intend what they please, they as yet are none of Christs, and, good Lord! What a multitude of Christians then are there in the world that do not belong to Christ?

*The works of the flesh*, says the same St. *Paul, are manifest, which are these, Adultery, Fornication, Uncleanness, Lasciviousness, Idolatry, Witchcraft, Hatred, Variance, Emulations, Wrath, Strife, Seditions, Heresies, Envyings, Murthers, Drunkenness, Revelings; of which I tell you before, as I have told you in times past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the Kingdom of God.* He doth not say, they which have done such things shall not be saved, but manifestly to the contrary, ---*Such were some of you, but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified*; but he says; they *which do* such things, and without amendment of life shall continue doing them, shall not be excused by any pretence of sorrow and good purposes, *They shall not inherit the Kingdom of Heaven.* Gal. 5. 19, 20, 21.

And again, in another Epistle, *Know ye not, that the unrighteous shall not inherit the Kingdom of God? Be not deceived, neither Fornicators, nor Idolaters, nor Adulterers, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, nor Thieves, nor Covetous, nor Drunkards, nor Revilers, shall inherit the Kingdom of God.*

*In Christ Jesus* (saith the same S. *Paul* in other places) *nothing availeth but faith: nothing but a new creature: nothing but keeping the Commandments of God*; it is not then a wishing, but a working faith; not wishing you were a new Creature, nor sorrowing you are not, but being a new Creature; not wishing you had kept, nor sorrowing you have not kept, nor purposing vainly to keep, but keeping his Commandments must prevail with him.

*Follow peace with all men, and holiness*, (saith the Divine Author of the Epistle to *Hebrews*) *without which no man shall see the Lord.*

St. *Peter*, in his second Epistle, commends unto us a golden chain of Christian perfections; consisting of these links, *Faith, Vertue, Knowledge, Temperance, Patience, Godliness, Brotherly kindness, Charity*: and then adds, *---He that lacketh these things, is blind, and knoweth not that he was purged from his old sins.* Let his sorrow be never so great, and his desires never so good, yet if he lack these things, he is blind; and *was purged* from his old sins, *but is not.*

Lastly, St. *John*, *He that hath this hope purifieth himself, even as he is pure*; the meaning is not with the same degree of purity, for that is impossible; but with the same kind, the same truth of purity; he that doth not purifie himself may, nay, doth flatter himself, and, without warrant, presume upon God's favour; but *this hope* he hath not: and again, *Little Children, let no man deceive you, he that doth righteousness, is righteous, even as he is righteous*; And thus you see all the divine Writers of the New Testament, with one consent, and with one mouth, proclaim the necessity of real holiness, and labour together to disinchant us, from this vain phansie, That men may be saved by sorrowing for their sin, and intending to leave it, without effectual conversion and reformation of life; which, it may well be feared, hath sent thousands of souls to hell in a golden dream of heaven.

But is not this to preach works as the Papists do? No certainly, it is not; but to preach works as Christ and his Apostles do: it is to preach the necessity of them, which no good Protestant, no good Christian ever denied; but it is not to preach the merit of them, which is the error of the Papists.

But is it not to preach the Law in time of the Gospel? No certainly, it is not: for the Law forgives no sins, but requires exact obedience, and *curseth* every one which from the beginning to the end of his life, *continueth not in all things which are written in the Law to do them*; but the Gospel says, and accordingly I have said unto you, that there is mercy always in store for those *who know the day of their visitation*, and forsake their sins in time of mercy; and that God will pardon their imperfections in the progress of holiness, who miscall not presumptuous and deliberate Sins by the name of Imperfections, but seriously and truly endeavour to be perfect: Only I forewarn you that you must never look to be admitted to the Wedding-Feast of the Kings Son, either in the impure rags of any customary sin, or without the *Wedding Garment* of Christian holiness; only I forewarn you, that whosoever looks to be made partaker of the joys of heaven, must make it the chief, if not the only business of his life, to know the will of God, and to do it; that *great violence* is required by our Saviour for the taking of this Kingdom, that the Race we are to run is a long Race, the building we are to erect is a great building, and will hardly, very hardly be finished in a day; that the work we have to do of mortifying all vices, and acquiring all Christian vertues, is a long work; we may easily defer it too long, we cannot possibly begin it too soon. Only I would perswade you, and I hope I have done it, that that Repentance which is not effectual to true and timely Conversion, will never be available unto eternal Salvation. And if I have proved unto you, that this is indeed the nature of true Repentance, then certainly, I have proved withal, that that Repentance wherewith the generality of Christians content themselves, notwithstanding their great professions what they are, and their glorious protestations of what they intend to be, is not the *power* but the *form*; not the truth, but the shadow of true Repentance; and that herein also we accomplish St. *Pauls* Prediction, *Having a form of godliness*, &c.

And



And now what remains, but that (as I said in the beginning) I should humbly intreat, and earnestly exhort every man that hath heard me this day, to consute in his particular, what I have proved true in the general; To take care that the sin of formality, though it be the sin of our times, may yet not be the sin of our persons; that we satisfie not our selves with the shadows of Religion, without the substance of it, nor with the *Form of Godliness* without the *Power* of it.

To this purpose I shall beseech you to consider, That though sacrificing, burning incense, celebrating of set festivals, praying, fasting, and such like, were, under the Law, the service of God commanded by himself; yet whensoever they proceed not from, nor were joyned with the sincerity of an honest heart, he professeth frequently almost in all the Prophets, not only his scorn and contempt of them all, as fond, empty, and ridiculous; but also his hating, loathing, and detesting of them as abominable and impious.

*The Sacrifice of the wicked is abomination to God*, Prov. 15.8. *What have I to do with the multitude of your Sacrifices? saith the Lord*, Esay the first, *I am full of the burnt offerings of Rams, and of the fat of fed beasts, when ye come to appear before me, who required this at your hands? Bring no more vain Oblations: Incense is an abomination to me, I cannot suffer your New Moons, nor Sabbaths, nor solemn Days, it is iniquity even your solemn Assemblies: My soul hateth your New Moons, and your appointed Feasts, they are a burthen to me, I am weary to bear them; and when you shall stretch out your hands, I will hide mine eyes from you, and though you make many prayers I will not hear, for your hands are full of bloud.*

And again, *Isa.* 66. 3. *He that kills an Oxe is as if he slew a man, he that sacrificeth a Lamb as if he cut off a Dogs neck, he that offereth an Oblation as if he offered Swines-flesh, he that burneth incense as if he blessed an Idol.* And what's the reason of this strange aversion of God from his own Ordinances? It follows in the next words, *They have chosen their own ways and their soul delighteth in their abominations.*

Terrible are the words which he speaketh to the same purpose in the Prophesie of *Amos*, *Chap.* 5. *v.* 21, 22, 23. *I hate, I despise your Feast days, and I will not smell in your solemn Assemblies, though you offer me burnt Offerings, and meat-Offerings, I will not accept them, nor will I regard your peace Offerings.*

Now, Beloved, if this hypocrisie, this resting in outward performances were so odious to God under the Law, a Religion full of Shadows, and Ceremonies; certainly it will be much more odious to do so under the Gospel, a Religion of much more simplicity, and exacting so much the greater sincerity of the heart, even because it disburdens the outward man of the performance of legal Rites and Observances. And therefore if we now under the Gospel, shall think to delude God Almighty, as *Michol* did *Saul*, with an Idol handsomly dress instead of the true *David*; if we shall content and please our selves with being of such or such a Sect or Profession; with going to Church, saying, or hearing of Prayers, receiving of Sacraments, hearing, repeating, or preaching of Sermons, with zeal for Ceremonies, or zeal against them; or, indeed, with any thing besides constant piety towards God, Loyalty and obedience towards our Soveraign, Justice and Charity towards all our Neighbours, Temperance, Chastity, and Sobriety towards our selves, certainly we shall one day find, that we have not mocked God, but our selves; and that our portion among Hypocrites shall be greater than theirs.

In the next place, let me intreat you to consider the fearful judgment which God hath particularly threatned to this very sin of *Drawing nigh unto him with our lips, when our hearts are far from him*: It is the great judgment of being given over to *the Spirit of slumber and security*, the usual forerunner of speedy desolation and destruction, as we may see in the 29 *Chap.* of *Isaiah*, from the 9 to the 14 verse, *Stay your selves and wonder, cry ye out, and cry, They are drunken but not with wine, they stagger but not with strong drink: for the Lord hath poured out upon you the Spirit of deep sleep, and hath closed your eyes. The Prophets, and your Rulers, the Seers hath he covered*: and after, at the 14 verse, *The wisdom of their Wisemen shall perish, and the understanding*

of

*of their Prudent-men shall be hid.* Certainly, this judgment if ever it were upon any people, we have cause to fear it is now upon us. For, if the spirit of *deep sleep* were not upon us, How could we sleep so securely even upon the brink of the pit of perdition? How could we proceed on so confidently in our mirth and jollity, nay, in our crying sins and horrible impieties; now when the hand of God is upon us, and wrath is gone out and even ready to consume us? And if the wisdom of our Wise-men were not perished, How were it possible they should so obstinately refuse the security offered of our Laws, Liberties, and Religion, by the King's Oath, by his Execrations on himself, and his posterity, in case he should violate it; by the Oaths of all his Ministers not to consent to, or be instruments in, such a Violation; by the so much desired *Triennial Parliament*, from which no transgressor can possibly be secure; and instead of all this security, seek for it by a Civil War, the continuance whereof, must bring us to destruction and desolation, or else He hath deceived us by whom we are taught, *That a Kingdom divided against it self cannot stand.*

Now what was the sin which provoked this fearful judgment? What but that which I have laboured to convince you of, and to dissuade you from, even the sin of Hypocrisie; as we may see at the twelfth verse, *Wherefore saith the Lord, for as much as this people draw near me with their mouth, and with their lips do honour me, but have removed their heart far from me; and their fear toward me is taught by the precepts of men: therefore, behold I will proceed to do a marvellous work amongst them; for the wisdom of their Wise-men shall perish*, &c.

Consider, thirdly, what woes, and woes, and woes our Saviour thunders out against the Scribes and Pharisees for their Hypocrisie, *Woe be unto you Scribes, and Pharisees, Hypocrites*; and again and again, *Woe be unto you Scribes, and Pharisees, Hypocrites*: Beloved, if we be Hypocrites as they were, *Tithe Mint and Cummin, and neglect the weighty matters of the Law, judgment, and justice, and mercy*, as they did: *Make long Prayers, and under a pretence devour Widows houses*, as they did: *Wash the outside of the Dish and Platter, while within we are full of ravening and wickedness*; write God's Commandments very large and fair upon our *Phylacteries*, but shut them quite out of our hearts: *Build the Sepulchres of the old Prophets, and kill their successors*: In fine, if we be like *painted Sepulchres*, as they were, *outwardly garnished and beautiful, but within full of dead mens bones and rottenness*; we are then to make accompt that all these woes belong to us, and will one day overtake us.

Consider, lastly, the terrible example of *Ananias* and *Saphira*, and how they were snatcht away in the very act of their sin, and that their fault was (as the Text tells us) that *they lied unto God.* Beloved, we have done so a thousand thousand times: our whole lives (if sincerely examined) would appear, I fear little less but a perpetual Lie; hitherto God hath been merciful to us, and given us time to repent; but let us not proceed still in imitating their fact, lest at length we be made partakers of their fall.

God of his infinite mercy prevent this in every one of us, even for his Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's sake; by whom and with whom, in the unity of the holy Spirit, be all honour and glory to the eternal Father, world without end. *Amen.*

The



# The Second Sermon.

## PSALM XIV. 1.

*The Fool hath said in his heart, There is no God.*

IF you will turn over some few leaves, as far as the 53 *Psalm*, you shall not only find my Text, but this whole Psalm; without any alteration, save only in the fifth verse, and that not at all in the sense neither. What shall we say? Took the holy Spirit of God such especial particular notice of the sayings and deeds of a Fool, that one expression of them would not serve the turn? Or, does the babling and madness of a Fool so much concern us, as that we need to have them urged upon us once and again, and a third time in the third of the *Romans*? Surely not any one of us present here, is this Fool: Nay, if any one of us could but tell where to find such a Fool as this, that would offer to say, though in his heart, *There is no God*; he should not rest in quiet, he should soon perceive we were not of his faction.

2. We, that are able to tell *David* an Article or two of faith, more than ever he was acquainted with! Nay, more: Can we, with any imaginable ground of reason be supposed liable to any suspicion of Atheism, that are able to read to *David* a Lecture out of his own *Psalms*, and explain the meaning of his own Prophesies, much clearer than himself, which held the Pen to the holy Spirit of God? Though we cannot deny, but that in other things there may be found some spice of folly and imperfection in us: but it cannot be imagined, that we who are almost cloyed with the heavenly Manna of God's Word, that can instruct our Teachers, and are able to maintain Opinions and Tenents, the scruples whereof not both the Universities of this Land, nor the whole Clergy, are able to resolve; that it should be possible for us ever to come to that perfection and excellency of Folly and Madness, as to entertain a thought, that *there is no God*: Nay, we are not so uncharitable as to charge a Turk or an Infidel with such an horrible imputation as this.

3. Beloved Christians, be not wise in your own conceits: If you will seriously examine the third of the *Romans* (which I mentioned before) you shall find that St. *Paul*, out of this *Psalm*, and the like words of *Isaiah*, doth conclude the whole Posterity of *Adam* (Christ only excepted) under sin and the curse of God: which inference of his were weak and inconcluding, unless every man of his own nature, were such a one as the Prophet here describes; and the same Apostle in another place expresses, *Even altogether without God in the world*; *i. e.* not maintaining it as an opinion which they would undertake by force of Argument to confirm, That there is no God: For, we read not of above three or four among the Heathens, that were of any fashion, which went thus far? But such as though in their discourse and serious thoughts they do not question a Deity, but would abhor any man that would not liberally allow unto God all his glorious Attributes; yet in their hearts and affections they deny him; they live as if there was no God, having no respect at all to him in all their projects, and therefore indeed, and in God's esteem, become formally, and in strict propriety of speech, very Atheists.

4. That this is most true, and that therefore many, who, because they are Orthodox in

in opinion, have thereupon a great conceit of their faith towards God; yet, being ſtrictly examined, ſhall be found to have built ſuch glorious buildings in ſhew upon Sand; or, which is worſe, to have made *hay and ſtubble* (matter fit only for the fire) foundations of many golden hopes, and glorious preſumptions, muſt be ſhewed at large hereafter.

5. The words now read, are a ſecret confeſſion which the Fool whiſpers to his own heart: He neither can nor dare profeſs this openly, and when he calls his reaſon to counſel about this buſineſs, the queſtion is far otherwiſe ſtated. The words do not run thus, The Fool being convinced by evidence of reaſon and demonſtration, hath concluded, There is no God; no, this is no Heatheniſh Philoſophical Fool, he is quite of another temper: This is a worldly, proud, malicious, projecting wiſe Fool, a Fool that knows it is for his advantage to put God out of his thoughts; and therefore doth forcibly captivate, and willfully hoodwink his underſtanding, and thinks he hath obtained a great victory, if he can contrive any courſe to bring himſelf to that paſs, that no cold melancholy thoughts of God or Hell, may interrupt or reſtrain him from freely wallowing in the luſts and uncleanneſs of his heart, without any remorſe, without any reluctance or griping within him. It is for his Hearts ſake, the love that he bears to the luſts thereof, that makes him an Atheiſt: If it could ſtand with that courſe and trade of life that he is reſolved upon, to entertain contrary thoughts, he would as ſoon work his judgment and thoughts another way. And therefore in his open profeſſion, it ſometimes falls out, that even when he wiſhes there were no God, yet he is a very forward zealous acknowledger in general of God and his glorious Attributes: So that the ſame deſire of a quiet and uninterrupted enjoying the ſcope and freedom of the luſts and affections of his heart, makes him both a reſolute ſecret Atheiſt, and withal wiſe enough to keep his folly to himſelf, and to make none elſe acquainted with his curious art and method of ſuch woful ſelf-deceiving, but his dearly beloved Heart. *The Fool*, &c.

6. The diſcuſſion of theſe words, does not engage me to a dividing or deſcanting upon the whole Pſalm: Let it ſuffice, that we may moſt probably conceive, that *David* in this Pſalm intends the deſcription of the woful eſtate of that Kingdom, after God had taken away his good Spirit from *Saul*; wherein the ſecret Enemies of God did greedily lay hold on that occaſion to vex and deſpite, and, as much as was in their power, to lay waſte the Heritage of God.

7. *The Fool* (who is the perſon that through the whole Pſalm works all the miſchief) in the Original is, *Nabal*: which hath the ſignification of fading, dying, or falling away, as doth a leaf, or flower, *Iſa.* 40. 8. And is a Title given to the fooliſh man, as having loſt the juyce and ſap of wiſdom, reaſon, honeſty, and godlineſs; being fallen from grace, ungrateful, and without the life of God: As a dead carkaſs (which of this word is called *Nebalah*, *Lev.* 11. 40.) and therefore ignoble and of vile eſteem, oppoſed to the Noble-man, *Iſa.* 32. 5. The Apoſtle in the Greek turneth it imprudent, or without underſtanding, *Rom.* 10. 19. from *Deut.* 32. 21.

8. *Hath ſaid in his Heart, There*, &c. *i. e.* Not ſo much perſwadeth himſelf in ſecret, that *there is no God*; But rather expreſſeth ſo in his life, or in his affections, which are called the Heart, in the phraſe of God: proportionable to the ſame expreſſion of *David*, Pſal. 10. 4. *The wicked through the pride of his countenance will not ſeek after God, God is not in all his crafty purpoſes.* If you would have the full ſenſe of my Text more largely expreſſed, turn to *Tit.* 1. 16. where perſons of the ſame mould that the Prophet here complains of, are thus deſcribed, *They profeſs that they know God, but in works they deny him, being abominable, and diſobedient, and to every good work void of judgment.*

Pſal. 10. 4.

Tit. 1. 16.

9. Where are obſervable firſt, the cauſe of this Practical Atheiſm, in theſe laſt words of the verſe, *They were to every good work*, ἀδόκιμοι, and that was Ignorance, or rather Imprudence, Inconſiderance: Implying not a bare want of knowledge; but an abuſing thereof, in not reducing it to practice, in hiding the light which was in them under a buſhel. Secondly, Then we have the manner of the expreſſion of this Atheiſm,



Atheiſm, *viz.* not in words, or in opinion to deny God; but, which is worſe, in the carriage and courſe of our life; to allow him his Attributes, and yet not to fear him, not to ſtand in awe of his power, which he acknowledgeth to be infinite, to diſtruſt his Providence, to ſlight his Promiſes, neglect his Threatnings, which is in effect, as much as in him lieth, to tear and raviſh from him all his glorious Attributes, by living, as if God himſelf were leſs powerful, leſs wiſe than himſelf, improvident, not deſerving ſo much fear of his power, or reſpect to his command, as he would perform to a wretched mortal man, that is a little richer, or in ſome place of Authority above him.

10. I need travel no farther for a diviſion to my own Text: Here we may obſerve likewiſe, Firſt, The cauſe of Atheiſm, and by conſequence, all the abominable impieties that follow in the Pſalm, and that is, Ignorance, Indiſcretion, Inconſiderance, expreſſed in the perſon of *Nabal*, *The Fool:* Secondly, We have the expreſſion of it, not by word of mouth, or writing, but *per motum cordis*, by the inclination of the heart, or affections. 1. 2.

11. In the proſecution of the former part (which may very well take up and ſpend this Hour-glaſs) I ſhall proceed thus: Firſt, I will conſider wherein this folly conſiſts, and that it is not ſo much in an utter ignorance of God and his holy Word, as a not making a good uſe of it when it is known, a ſuffering it to lie dead, to ſwim unprofitably in the brain, without any fruit thereof in the reformation of ones life and converſation? And there I will ſhew you, the extreme folly for a man to ſeek to increaſe his knowledge of his Maſter's will, without a deſire and reſolution to increaſe proportionably in a ſerious active performance thereof. Secondly, I will propoſe to your conſideration the extreme unavoidable danger, and increaſe of guilt, that knowledge without practice brings with it: To both which conſiderations I ſhall ſeverally annex Applications to the Conſciences of you my Hearers, and ſo ſpend out my time. 1.

12. Now I take it for granted, that I have hit right in declaring wherein the folly of *Nabal* in my Text conſiſts, namely, in an unfruitful knowledge, a knowledge that lies fallow, is not exerciſed: which, if it were not allowed me, I would only refer my ſelf for proof unto ſome of *David*'s Pſalms, and almoſt all his Sons Proverbs: I ſhould ſin againſt the plenty of matter in my Text more worth our conſideration, if I ſhould enlarge my ſelf in this point: Only one place of *David* ſhall ſuffice, and that is in *Pſalm* 111. 10. where he repeats that old Divine Proverb made by God himſelf, the Lord knows how long ſince, and by him delivered to man, as *Job* telleth us, *chap.* 28. *ver.* 28. The Pſalmiſts words are theſe, *The fear of God is the beginning of wiſdom, and a good underſtanding have all they that do thereafter.* Pſal. 111. 10.

13. I do not now exclude Ignorance from making up ſome part of this Fool; but becauſe the other piece of extreme deſperate folly is rather the ſin of theſe days, namely, a barren uneffectual knowledge; therefore I ſhall rather inſiſt upon it: Yet, by the way, I ſhall not fail to diſcover to you the danger of the other too.

14. It is a pretty Obſervation, that the Author of the Narration of the *Engliſh* Seminary founded in *Rome*, has concerning the Method and Order the Devil has uſed in aſſailing and diſturbing the peace and quiet of the Church, with Hereſies and Schiſms: He began (ſaith he) with the firſt Article of our Creed, concerning one God the Father Almighty, Creator of Heaven and Earth; againſt which in the firſt 300 years he armed the *Simonians*, *Menandrians*, *Baſilidians*, *Valentinians*, *Marcionites*, *Manichees*, and *Gnoſticks*. After the 300th year he oppoſed the ſecond Article, concerning the Divinity of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, by his beloved Servants the *Noetians*, *Sabellians*, *Paullians*, *Photinians*, and *Arrians*, After the four hundreth year he fought to undermine the fourth, fifth, ſixth, and ſeventh Articles of the Incarnation, Paſſion, Reſurrection, Aſcenſion, and the ſecond coming to Judgment, by the Hereſies of *Neſtorius*, *Theodorus*, *Eutyches*, *Dioſcorus*, *Cnapheus*, *Sergius*, &c.

After the eight hundred and sixtieth, he assailed the eighth Article concerning the Holy Ghost, by the Heresie and Schism of the *Greek* Church: Lastly, since the year one thousand, till these times, his business and craft has especially expressed it self in seeking to subvert the ninth and tenth, concerning the Holy Catholique Church, and forgiveness of sins, by the aid and Ministery of the Pontificians, Anabaptists, Familists, and the like: And with the deceits and snares of these his cunning Ministers hath he entangled the greatest part of the now Christian world.

15. But (our blessed and gracious God be praised for it) we, and some with us, have escaped as a Bird out of the snare of the Fowler, the Net was broken, and we were delivered. The whole Doctrine of Christian Faith is restored to the Primitive lustre and integrity: Nay more, (which is a greater happiness than God ever created to those his chosen good servants which lived in the Infancy of the Church) the profession of a pure unspotted Religion is so far from being dangerous, or infamous, that we have the Sword of the Civil Magistrate, the power and inforcement of the Laws and Statutes, to maintain this our precious Faith without stain and undefiled, against all Heretical and Schismatical oppugners thereof.

16. If ever we forget the goodness and mercy of God in this our deliverance, then let our tongues cleave to the roof of our mouths: Nay, if in our Songs of joyfulness and melody we remember not our escape, wherewith the Lord snatcht us out of *Egypt*, and our victorious passage through a Red-Sea of Blood and Ruine, Thou O Lord wilt not hear our Prayers.

17. It was a seasonable Admonition that the Apostle Saint *Paul* gave to other Gentiles after such a glorious Victory and Deliverance as this of ours, *Be not high-minded, but fear.* Heresie is not the only Engine that Satan is furnished with to assault and infest the Church of Christ, neither is it the most dangerous: He has the cunning to destroy Foundations, and make no use of Heresie in the work neither. You would wonder how it should be possible for the Devil to make an Orthodox Christian, one perfect and studied in all the points of the Creed, and one that can for a need maintain the Truth thereof against all gain-sayers: I say, it would seem strange for the Devil to make such a one to destroy and utterly demolish the very Foundations of his Faith, and yet not at all to alter his opinions neither: Yet, that it is not only a possible contrivance, but too too ordinary and familiar in these times, woful Experience hath made it evident.

Rom. 11. 20.

18. The art and cunning whereby this great work of the Devil's is brought about, is clearly detected by our Saviour in his Exposition of the Parable of the Sower, in these words, *When they have heard, then cometh the Devil, and taketh away the Word out of their Hearts*, i. e. The Devil will give such people leave freely to hear the Word of God preached, to study it, dispute it, to know and be acquainted with all the curious intricate subtilties of it, upon condition that they will promise to resolve not to be a jot the better disposed for it in their lives. He can well suffer it to swim in the Brain, that the Understanding should be enlightned, the fancy affected and pleased with it, so that he may have leave to stop the secret intercourse and passages thence to the Heart: It troubles him not to have the precious seed of the word entertain'd by a man, so that it may be kept up safe in Granaries, and not multiply: so that the heart be not plough'd up, and furrowed for the receiving of it; as long as there is no fruitful Harvest there, all goes well.

Luke 7. 12.

19. He will be so far from hindering such from going to the Church, so that their errant be to learn what they may be able to talk of, and maintain discourse with, that he could wish every day were a Sunday for them, that they might be able by abundance of knowledge, fruitless, and void of practise, to hasten and aggravate their own damnation.

20. Now whom the Devil thus uses, whom he thus baits, nay, contents and satisfies with an empty, speculative, aerial knowledge, a knowledge, only fruitful in increasing their guilt, and torment, who can deny to be sottish, ignorant, easie fools, childishly affected with a knowledge, glorious only in shew, without any substance, or depth at all. And yet this was a temptation strong enough for Paradise; for just so did the Devil entrap *Adam* at the first; so that, in him, we have received one foil already, at this weapon: And he proceeds daily in acting that over again: For what was it which destroyed *Adam*, but the preferring of the Tree of Knowledge, before the Tree of Life?



21. St. *James* speaking of such persons so insnared, seems to take much of the envy and guilt of so cruel a deceit and cousenage as this is, from off the Devil, and to lay it upon themselves: *Be not hearers of the word only, but doers also, deceiving your selves.* He confesses such to be fools, cousened and deceived people; but themselves, saith he, are their own cheaters: wherein lies a strong Emphasis, expressing the extream unhappiness of such poor deceived wretches. If the cunning insinuation of one, that for his own ends pretends friendship to me, draw me into some inconvenience, or danger; the world will think me a fool for being so catch'd, and not being able to dive and pierce into his secret purposes: But this folly is not of so perfect a strain, but that it may deserve both excuse, and pity: But that man that spends his whole life in contriving and plotting, and laying snares for his own soul; if after all this ado he be indeed caught in the pit, that with so much pains he digged only for himself, Would not any man forfeit his discretion, that should either excuse, or pity him? And in such, or worse a case, is he that contents himself with bare hearing and knowing the Word. James 1. 22.

22. Who do you think would undertake to excuse a Pharisee, if he should be condemned for want of spiritual wisdom: one whose profession it was, whose trade and course of life, to be conversant in the Scriptures: who had spent his age in reading the Holy Writ, and teaching others out of it: One that was so curious in having the Scripture always near him, that he wore it continually about him: it was a trimming and ornament to his Apparel; It was always in his eyes; It was guarded about the wrists of his arms, and instead of a lace or fringe at the bottom of his garment. If one after all this curiosity of dressing, sedulity in reading, industry in teaching, should at length, with so good parts, in such good clothes, go down into Hell, and, so die for want of true knowledge; who would adventure to excuse him, who would dare to pity him?

23. Yet not one, or two, but the whole Colledge, the whole faction of them, you shall find in *Matth.* 23. very near their end. No less than eight woes denounced against them by our Saviour himself, (who is not very forward to destroy, he came upon a far other business) and all those woes for their folly and blindness? In the denouncing of every Woe, but one, he styles them *Hypocrites.* (And an Hypocrite, you know, is the veriest fool in the world, for he thinks to cousin and put a cheat upon God, whom yet himself confesses to be Omniscient, and who knoweth all things.) In that single woe, he calls them *blind guides*, elsewhere, *Fools, and blind.* This was our Saviour's judgment of them, and you may rest upon it, that it was upon sufficient grounds. Mat. 23.

24. But their folly and ridiculous madness will yet more appear, if you take notice of the opinion and judgment that these very Pharisees gave of themselves. It is in *John* 7. 48, 49. The occasion of it was this. The great Council of the *Sanhedrin*, seeing so many of the ignorant people, (as they thought) seduced by our Saviour; to remedy any further spreading of so dangerous a contagion, They by common advice send Officers to attach him, and to make him sure enough for preaching: The Officers find him busie instructing the people, and, instead of laying hands on him, themselves are even caught, and almost bereft of their infidelity: When Sermon was done, they return to their Masters, the Rulers and Pharisees, without their Prisoner; and give a good account why they did not fulfil their command, in telling them, they never heard a better Preacher in their lives, *Never man*, say they, *spake like this man.* These wise Magistrates pitying the simplicity and easiness of their Sergeants, answer them thus; *Are ye also deceived? Have any of the Rulers,* Joh. 7. 46. Ver. 47, 48, 49.

*or of the Pharisees believed on him? But this people who know not the Law, are curſed.* Implying, that if the people had been as well read in the Law of God, as their Teachers were, they would have kept themſelves ſafe enough from the enſnaring Sermons of Chriſt: But now they may ſee what difference there is between men utterly unacquainted with Gods Word, and themſelves, how ſubject they are to deſtruction, and to be curſed of God.

25. How is it poſſible for the wit of man, to imagine folly and madneſs of a more perfect ſtrain? Our Saviour Chriſt, who is Truth it ſelf, did not exact Faith from his followers meerly for his Miracles ſake, but ſent them to ſearch the Scri-
Joh.5.39. ptures, *For they*, ſaith he, *teſtifie of me.* And yet theſe wiſe men impute it to their knowledge of the Law, that they were freed from this curſe into which the poor ignorant people fell. How cunningly have theſe fools laid a ſnare for their own lives?

26. Alas, what could the poor people think, when they heard their Doctors and Magiſtrates, (men that were gods to them, that ſate in *Moſes* Chair) condemned of ſuch extream folly and indiſcretion? What will become of us, (might they ſay, if the Phariſees (from whom all that we know, is but a thin thrifty gleaning) have ſo many woes denounced againſt them for want of ſpiritual knowledge?

27. Certain it was, There were many poor ſouls, whom the Phariſees kept out of Heaven for company. Our Saviour tells them ſo much; *Ye neither go into Heaven your ſelves, nor ſuffer others to go in:* But they were ſuch as they had infected with their Leaven: Such as made thoſe rotten ſuperſtructions, which thoſe great Doctors built upon the Word, foundations of their Faith and Hope: And as certain it is, that many there were, upon whom God out of his gracious favour and mercy, had not beſtowed ſuch piercing brains, and enquiring heads, as to make them acquainted with their dangerous Opinions and Traditions. They were ſuch as made better uſe of that little knowledge they had, then to vent it in diſcourſe, or in maintaining Opinions and Tenents againſt the Church. They heard the Word with an humble honeſt heart, ſubmitting themſelves wholly to it, and reſtored their Faith to its proper ſeat, the Heart and Affections, and it was fruitful in their lives and practiſe. The wiſdom of *Solomon* himſelf, as long as he gave himſelf to Idolatry, and Luxury, was folly and madneſs, to the diſcretion and prudence of theſe poor deſpiſed people.

28. Thus you ſee, The Fool, that in my Text, is ſo mad, as to ſay, *There is no God*, may have wit enough to underſtand more; nay, in the opinion of the world, may make a ſilly fool of him, that has laid up in his heart unvaluable treaſures of ſpiritual wiſdom and knowledge. And therefore the *Latin* Tranſlation following St. *Paul*, might more ſignificantly have ſtiled him *Imprudens*, than *Inſipiens*. For the wiſdom which is according to Godlineſs, doth moſt exactly anſwer to that Prudence which moral Philoſophers make a general over-ruling Virtue, to give bounds and limits to all our Actions, and to find out a temper and mean wherein we ought to walk: And therefore a moſt learned Divine of our Church, yet alive, knew very well what he ſaid, when he deſin'd our Faith to be *A ſpiritual Prudence*; implying, that Faith bears the ſame office and ſway in the life and practiſe of a Chriſtian, as Prudence of a moral honeſt man.

29. Now, ſaith *Ariſtotle*, there may be many intemperate, youthful, diſſolute ſpirits, which may have an admirable, piercing, diſcerning judgment in ſpeculative Sciences, as the Mathematicks, Metaphyſicks, and the like; becauſe the dwelling upon ſuch Contemplations, does not at all croſs, or trouble, thoſe rude untamed paſſions and affections of theirs: yea, they may be cunning in the ſpeculative knowledge of Virtues: But all this while they are notwithſtanding utterly invincibly, imprudent; becauſe Prudence requires not only a good diſcerning judgment and apprehenſion, but a ſerenity and calmneſs in the paſſions.

30. Therefore the ſame Philoſopher does worthily reprehend ſome Ancients, who called all Virtues Sciences; and ſaid, that each particular virtue was a ſeveral Art:



Art: requiring only an enlightning or informing of the Reaſon, and Underſtanding, which any, for a little coſt and ſmall pains-taking in frequenting the learned Lectures of Philoſophers, need not doubt but eaſily to obtain.

31. This conceit, of ſo learned a man does very well deſerve our proſecution: And it will not be at all ſwerving from the buſineſs in hand: Therefore I ſhall ſhew you, how the Moraliſt, by the force of natural Reaſon, hath framed to himſelf a Divinity and Religion, reſembling, both in method and many ſubſtantial parts, the glorious learning of a Chriſtian. I told you the forenamed Doctor did very well to call our Faith, or Aſſent to ſupernatural Myſteries, *A ſpiritual Prudence.*

32. Now, beſides moral prudence, nay, before the moraliſt can make any uſe thereof, or exerciſe it in the work of any virtue, there is required another general Virtue, which the Philoſopher calls Univerſal Juſtice, which is nothing elſe, but a ſobriety and temper in the affections, whereby they are ſubdued and captiv'd unto well inform'd Reaſon, So that whatſoever it commands to be done, there is no rebellion, no unwillingneſs in the Paſſions, but they proceed readily to execution, though it be never ſo diſtaſtful to ſenſe.

33. Now how well does this expreſs the nature of Charity: for, what elſe is Love, but a ſweet breathing of the Holy Spirit upon our Paſſions, whereby the Holy Ghoſt does, as it did in the beginning of *Geneſis, incubare aquis*, move by a cheriſhing, quieting virtue, upon the Sea of our Paſſions? Did not the ſame Spirit come to *Eliah* in a ſoft whiſper? He walks not *in Turbine*, in a ſtrong wind to raiſe a Tempeſt in our Affections. Now when we have received this *ipſiſſimam Dei particulam*, (as *Plato* ſaid of the Soul) this ſhred or portion of the Holy Spirit, which is Charity, how evenly and temperately do we behave our ſelves to God, and all the world beſides? How willingly and obediently do we ſubmit our ſelves to the performance of whatſoever Faith, out of God's Word, doth enjoyn us?

34. But yet the Analogy and proportion between theſe two is more evident and obſervable: That Univerſal Juſtice is no particular ſingular virtue, neither hath it any particular ſingular object. (As other virtues have; For example, Temperance, or Abſtinence, which hath to do with ſenſual delights and pleaſures, and none elſe.) But when it is determined to, and faſtens on, the object of a particular virtue, it is converted into, and incorporates with that very virtue: For example, If I do exerciſe this general Habit of obſerving a mean and temper, in things that concern diet, or ſenſual pleaſures, it becomes abſtinence; if upon objects of terror, it becomes Fortitude, or Magnanimity: Juſt ſo is it with Charity. For,

35. Charity is a virtue which never goes alone, and is buſied in ſolitary places, being reſerved and excluded, from the ſociety and communion of other Graces: But it is that which ſeaſons, gives life and efficacy to all the reſt; without which, if it were poſſible for me to enjoy all the Graces that the bountiful hand of God ever ſhowred upon reaſonable Creature; yet, if St. *Paul* ſpeak truth, I ſhould be nothing worth: It is that which fulfils all the Commandments: This is evident to all that ſhall but ſlightly and in haſte read over 1 *Cor.* 13. beginning with verſe 4. and ſo on- 1 Cor.13. 4, &c.
wards: where we may behold almoſt all the virtues that can be named, envrapped in one virtue of Charity; and Love, according to the ſeveral Acts thereof, chang'd and transform'd into ſo many ſeveral Graces. *It ſuffereth long*, and ſo 'tis Longanimity; *It is kind*, and ſo 'tis Courteſie; *It vaunteth not it ſelf*, and ſo 'tis Modeſty; *It is not puffed up*, and ſo 'tis Humility; *It is not eaſily provok'd*, and ſo 'tis Lenity; *It thinketh no evil*, and ſo 'tis Simplicity; *It rejoyceth in the Truth*, and ſo 'tis Verity; *It beareth all things*, and ſo 'tis Fortitude; *It believeth all things*, and ſo 'tis Faith; *It hopeth all things*, and ſo 'tis Confidence; *It endureth all things*, and ſo 'tis Patience; *It never faileth*, and ſo 'tis Perſeverance.

36. You ſee two glorious and divine Virtues, namely Faith and Charity; though not naturally expreſs'd, yet pretty well counterfeited by the Moraliſt. And to make up the Analogy compleat, we have the third Royal Virtue, which is Hope, reaſonably well ſhadow'd out in that which they call *Intentio Finis*: which is nothing

thing elſe but a fore-taſting of the happineſs which they propoſe to themſelves as a ſufficient reward for all their ſevere and melancholick endeavours.

37. What ſhall we ſay, (my beloved Friends) ſhall the Heatheniſh Moraliſt, meerly out of the ſtrength of natural Reaſon, conclude, that the knowledge of what is good and fit to be done, without a practiſe of it upon our affections, and outward actions, to be nothing worth, nay, ridiculous and contemptible? And ſhall we, who have the Oracles of God; nay, the whole perfect will of God fully ſet down in the holy Scriptures, in every page almoſt whereof, we find this urg'd and preſs'd upon us, That to know our Maſters will, without performing it, is fruitleſs unto us; nay, will intend the heat, and add virtue and power to the lake of fire and brimſtone; reſerved for ſuch empty unfruitful Chriſtians: and ſhall we, I ſay, content our ſelves any longer with bare hearing and knowing of the Word, and no more? God forbid, rather let us utterly avoid this holy Temple of God: Let us rather caſt his Word behind our backs, and be as ignorant of his holy Will as ever our fore-fathers were: Let us contrive any courſe to cut off all commerce and entercourſe, all communion and acquaintance with our God, rather than when we profeſs to know him, and willingly to allow him all thoſe glorious Titles and Attributes by which he hath made himſelf known unto us in his Word, in our hearts to deny him, in our lives and practiſes to diſhonour him, and uſe him deſpightfully.

38. It were no hard matter, I think, to perſwade any, but reſolved hardned minds, that Fruit is neceſſary before any admiſſion into heaven, only by propoſing to your conſiderations the form and proceſs of that Judgment, to which you and every man in his own perſon muſt ſubmit. The Authors word may be taken for the truth of what I ſhall tell you: for the ſtory we receive from his mouth that ſhall be Judge of all, and therefore is likely to know what courſe and order himſelf will obſerve.

39. In the general Reſurrection, when ſentence of Abſolution, or condemnation, ſhall be paſs'd upon every one according to his deſerts, Knowledge is on no ſide mentioned: but one, becauſe he hath cloathed the naked, and fed the hungry, and done ſuch like works of Charity, he is taken; and the reſt, that have not done ſo much, are refuſed: Will it avail any one then to ſay, Lord, we confeſs, we have not done theſe works, but we have ſpent many an hour in hearing and talking of thy Word: nay, we have maintain'd to the utmoſt of our power, and to our own great prejudice, many Opinions and Tenents: Alas! we little thought, that any ſpotted imperfect work of ours was requiſite, we were reſolved that for working thou hadſt done enough for us to get us to heaven? Will any ſuch excuſes as theſe ſerve the turn? Far be it from us to think ſo.

Mat. 7. 22. 40. If you will turn to *Matth.* 7. 22. you ſhall find ſtronger and better excuſes then theſe to no purpoſe: *Many ſhall ſay unto me,* (ſaith Chriſt) *Lord, have not we propheſied in thy Name?* Theſe were ſomething more than hearers, they had ſpent their time in preaching and converting ſouls unto Chriſt, (which is a work, if directed to a right end, of the moſt precious and admirable value, that it is poſſible for a creature to perform:) And yet whiles they did not practiſe themſelves what they taught others, they became Caſt-aways. Others there were, *that had caſt out Devils, and done many miracles*; And yet ſo lov'd the unclean ſpirits, that themſelves were poſſeſs'd withal, that they could not endure to part company then, and now were never likely.

41. But have not I all this while miſtaken my Auditory? Were not theſe Inſtructions fitter for the Univerſities? Had it not been more fit and ſeaſonable for me to have inſtructed and catechiz'd mine hearers, rather than to give them cautions and warnings, leſt they ſhould abuſe their knowledge? No ſurely! Inſtructions to make uſe of knowledge in our practiſe and converſation, and not to content our ſelves with meer knowing and hearing, and talking of the myſteries of our Salvation, cannot in the moſt ignorant Congregation be unſeaſonable. Even the Heathen



then which were utter ſtrangers from the knowledge of Gods ways, did notwithſtanding render themſelves inexcuſable, for detaining ſome part of the Truth, as it were, naturally ingrafted in them, in unrighteouſneſs. So, that there is no man in the world, but knows much more than he practiſes, every man hides ſome part, at leaſt, of his Talent in a Napkin, wherefore let every man, even the moſt ignorant that hears me this day, ſearch the moſt inward ſecret corners of his heart for this treaſure of knowledge, and let him take it forth, and put it into the Uſurers hands, and trade thriftily with it, that he may return his Lord his own with increaſe, *Bleſſed is that ſervant whom his Lord when he cometh ſhall find ſo doing: Verily I ſay unto you, he ſhall make him Ruler over all his houſhold.*

42. And thus I have gone through one member of my firſt General, namely, the conſideration, wherein the Imprudence of the Fool in my Text doth conſiſt. In the proſecution whereof, I have diſcovered unto you, how ſeverally Satan plants his Engines for the ſubverſion of the Church: In the Primitive times, when Religion was more ſtirring and active, and Charity in Faſhion, he aſſay'd to corrupt mens underſtandings with Hereſies; and there, by the way, was obſerv'd his order and method, how diſtinctly beginning in thoſe firſt times with the firſt Article he hath orderly ſucceeded to corrupt the next following, and now in theſe laſt days, he's got to even the laſt end of the Creed. But ſince, by the mercy and goodneſs of God, we are delivered and ſtand *firm in the Faith once delivered to the Saints*; he hath raiſed another Engine againſt us that ſtand, and that is, to work, that our Orthodox Opinions do us no good; which he performs by ſnatching the Word out of our Hearts, and making it unfruitful in our Lives: Now thoſe that are thus inveagled and wrought upon, are meerly befool'd by the Devil, or rather by themſelves, for ſo I told you, that Saint *James* ſays: And for an example, I propos'd the learned Phariſees, who for all their learning and knowledge in the Scripture, yet our Saviour denounceth eight ſeveral Woes againſt them for being Fools and blind Guides. So that the Fool in hand was not oppos'd to a Learned man, but to a Prudent man: And therefore a worthy Doctor of our Church did well define Faith to be *A ſpiritual Prudence*, that is, a knowledge fought out only for practiſe. And there I compared Faith with moral Prudence, and the fruit thereof Charity with the virtue of Univerſal Juſtice. Therefore leſt the very Heathen ſhould riſe up in judgment againſt us, for not doing ſo much with the help and advantage of God's Word as they could without it; I did, and do, beſeech you not to content your ſelves with meer knowing and hearing, with only a conceit of Faith without Works, for that was an ancient Hereſie in the *Nicolaitans*, (whom God by name, profeſſeth an Hatred to, as *Euſebius* tells us.) And for an effectual motive, I told you, how at the laſt great Tryal, you ſhall not be catechis'd, How well you can ſay your Creed, or how many Catechiſms without Book, but, how fruitful in works of Charity your Faith hath been. And ſo I come to the ſecond member of the firſt General, namely, the conſideration how dangerous and grievous a burden Knowledge will be, where it is fruitleſs and ineffectual: of which briefly.

Pſal. 111. 10. 43. I will once again repeat that divine ſentence of the Pſalmiſt in Pſal. 111. 10. *The fear of God is the beginning of wiſdom, and a good underſtanding have all they that do thereafter*, i. e. Till a man put his knowledge in practiſe he is ſo far from being a good man, that he is ſcarce a man, hath not the underſtanding of a man till he do, till he fall a work; he was wiſer a great deal before he gained his knowledge: Knowledge alone is a goodly purchaſe in the mean time. It is ſo worthy a purchaſe, that, as it ſhould ſeem by our Saviour's account, till a man have obtained ſome competency in knowledge, he hath gotten no right to the Kingdom of Darkneſs and Hell.

John 9. 39. &c. 44. For certainly, no man can juſtly challenge damnation, but he that is burdened with Sin: Now he that hath no knowledge, but is utterly blind in his underſtanding, hath no ſin, that is, in compariſon; the words are (*John* 9. 39, &c.) *And Jeſus ſaid, for judgment I am come into this world, that they which ſee not might ſee,*

*and*

*and that they which see might be made blind*; Not as if Christ did imprint, or inflict, blindness upon any man, but only occasionally, that is, those which walk in darkness, and love it: when the light comes upon them, and discovers their wandring, they hate it, and turn their eyes from it, and become more perversly and obstinately blind. In the same sense that St. *Paul* saith, (*Rom.* 7.) *Sin taking occasion by the Law becomes more sinful*; whilst sin is not oppos'd, it goes on in its course quietly; but when the Commandment comes and discovers, and rebukes it, it becomes furious and abominable; and much more raging and violent.

Verse 40. 45. There follows, *And some of the Pharisees which were with him, heard these words, and said unto him, Are we blind also?* There is nothing in the world, that a Pharisee can with less patience endure than to hear any intimation given, that he may be suspected of folly: And therefore they were not so sensible or conceited of some wrong received, when our Saviour call'd them *Generation of Vipers*, as they are when their wisdom and discretion are call'd in question. Witness this answer; when no man spake to them, they suspiciously demand, whether Christ in his last words meant them or no. But what answers our Saviour?

Verse 41. 46. *Jesus said unto them, If ye were blind, ye should have no sin; but now ye say, We see, therefore your sin remaineth.* As if he had said, So little shall this supposed knowledge, and wisdom, that ye have, profit you, that you shall curse the time that ever you saw the holy Word of God, and wish that all the Sermons that ever you heard, all the gracious Invitations, and sweet Promises which God by the ministery of his Servants the Prophets, hath sent unto you, had been sentences of some horrible death and torments, from the mouth of a severe Judge. For, your sins, which otherwise had not been so insupportable, now by your abusing the knowledge which God hath given you, by your wilful contempt of those many invitations, which have continually sounded in your ears, are become as a Mountain upon you to crush you into powder: You have hang'd a Mill-stone about your own necks, which shall irrecoverably sink you into the bottomless comfortless pit, whereas otherwise there might have been some hope of escape.

47. And yet for all this, let not any one favour and cherish himself in this conceit, That, he thanks God, he is ignorant enough, that a very little practise will serve his turn, his knowledge is not so much that it should put him to too great a labour in expressing it in the course of his life: For whosoever he be that dares entertain, or give way to such a thought as this is, Let him be sure that if he do not know so much as God requires at his hands, (especially now that God hath sealed up the Scripture-Canon, now that the whole Will of God is revealed) this very ignorance alone will be a thousand weights, to fasten him on the earth, to make him sure for ever ascending to God, in whom there is no darkness at all.

48. For it is not so with an ignorant man, as it is with one that is blind, who, if he will be sure not to tempt God by venturing and rushing forward in paths unknown to him, may live as long and as safe as he that is most quick-sighted: No, Ignorance alone, though it be not active and fruitful in works of darkness, is crime enough. For, with what colour of reason will such a one expect the reward of the Just? Such a one will not doubt, but that the Gates of Heaven are barr'd against the sottish blind ignorant Heathen, to whom God never revealed any part of his Will; yet himself may fare well enough. Is not this a degree beyond madness it self? What? does such a one think, that because he lives among Religious people, and such as are well acquainted with the way to Heaven, that himself shall be sure to go for company? Does he make no doubt of his part in the Resurrection of the Just, because he was born in *England*, or in such a year of our Lord when the Gospel flourished? Nay, shall it not be much more tolerable for the worst of the Heathens then for such a man?

49. For if the Heathen were left without excuse, because they knew not God, or, if they knew him, they did not honour him as God, whereas they were only instructed by the Book of Nature: The very main principle of all Religion, namely, That there



there is a God, was a business of great labour, and required a good understanding to find out; being a Conclusion to be collected and deduced from many experiments of his power, providence, and the like. Shall those hope to escape, that pretend ignorance, after they may, if they refuse it not, have use of all that ever Reason found out; nay, have before their eyes the sum and effect of all the Sermons and Instructions that ever any Prophet or Apostle made since the world began? If after all this, there be any safety to be hoped for from Ignorance, then have the Apostles travelled, Christ preached, nay, died, in vain.

50. But to return to our business in hand. Knowledge, at least in some measure, there must necessarily be, else no hope of Salvation: And with Knowledge, there must of necessity be joyned some proportionable measure of Practise, else a greater and more insupportable burden of woe and destruction. And the reason is evident out of those words of our Saviour, *To whom much is given, of him shall much be required.* We must know, that there is not any good thing in the world wherein we have any propriety; We are only Stewards, and have such things committed to our trust, and one day there will certainly be exacted a strict account. As of our riches, health, education, but much more our knowledge, and especially that knowledge, which is perfected only in practice, such is the wisdom of a Christian.

51. What reason can be imagined why God should take such pains, give such royal and precious graces to his Servants the Prophets and Apostles to enable them to make known his good will and pleasure, and what he commands us, and expects at our hands. Was all this performed, think we, to afford us only matter of Table-talk? Does he exhort and perswade us to hear and discourse? No surely, He gave it us to profit withal, both our selves and others. And therefore where there is a more abundant plenty of knowledg lent us, the Bill of Account must arise proportionably, or for what is wanting in the sum, we remain debtors; and when *once the Creditor catches us by the throat, and casts us into Prison, there is no coming out, till all, even the uttermost Farthing, be discharged*: he might as well have said Never, for it comes all to one end.

52. It will be worth our consideration, and very material, to press this so necessary a point; to take notice of the nature and fashion of the Judgment, which shall befall the Fool in my Text, and such companions of his as are content to enjoy a fruitless ineffectual knowledge, how fit and suitable it is to their offence. You shall find it expressed in *Luk.* 13.25, &c. in these terms, *Many in that day shall begin to say, We have eaten and drunk in thy presence, and thou hast taught in our streets*: This is something more than hearing Sermons, or learning Catechisms by heart. These had heard him preach, nay, were familiarly acquainted with him, and yet in that day will get but a comfortless answer from him in the following verse, *But he shall say, I tell you, I know not whence you are; Depart from me ye workers of Iniquity.* St. *Matthew* hath it more sharply, *I never knew you.* They might else have imputed his not knowing them to the weakness of his memory: But he stops that conceit, and professes, He never knew them, *i.e.* He denies not, but he had often seen them at Sermon when he preached, and, it may be, he had eaten and drunk with them, yet for all this, He never knew them; they were strangers to him, he never acknowledged them to be his flock, and therefore was not bound to take notice of them: But there is one will own them, even Satan, whom before they acknowledged for their Lord, and to his Kingdom they may, nay, they must, go. Luk. 13. 25. Ver. 26.

53. Are not these men right served? Are not they justly and righteously dealt withal? They had eaten and drunk in his presence, it is true; Nay, peradventure, they had eaten him and drunk him in his Sacrament: They had oft heard him preach in their streets, and could for a need repeat a good deal of the substance of his Sermons: But, in very deed, they never knew him, nor one word that ever he spoke: that is, they took no especial notice of him, they did not acknowledge him for their Lord, neither cared they to perform any thing that he commanded. And now he is quit with them, He remembers well enough what kind of people they were,

even his very Enemies and Deriders; and as he never did acknowledge them for his sheep, so neither now will he admit them into his fold. A most righteous, yet withal, a most heavy doom.

54. And here I will briefly end my other member of the First General, namely, how dangerous and heavy a burden Knowledge will be, where it is fruitless and ineffectual. Where you have heard how poor and worthless a purchase Knowledge alone is; nay, how without it, a man has scarce any title at all unto Hell, there is no guilt without it; Alone it is a good qualification, a fair towardly disposition towards our ruine. Our Saviour professes that the Pharisees themselves, (A Nation, the very Proverb of perverseness and infidelity) if they had been blind, *i.e.* without knowledge, they had had no sin. Yet for all this, though Knowledge be so dangerous a ware (it is something like Gunpowder; a man when he has it, must take heed how he uses it:) yet this is by no means a sufficient excuse for any one utterly to neglect the purchase of it, at least, in some measure: For it is true, Knowledge not used, or ill used, will aggravate our torment, and adds even fire unto Hell; Yet withal, it is true, that an utter neglect of all Knowledge, especially, in these times of light, when it is to be had at so cheap a rate, will make damnation as sure to a man as the former. Now the reason, why Knowledge, where it is fruitless in practice, will be abundantly fruitful in torment, is taken from that maxim of our Saviour, *To whom much is given, of him shall much be required, i.e.* We being only Stewards of Gods blessings, no proprietaries in them must expect one day to give account of them all, but especially Knowledge, which is a Ware of the chiefest Trade. Now where there are great receipts, and no disbursements, the debt must needs be exceeding great; and when once the Sergeant hath arrested us for it, The Lord knows when we shall pay it. The last thing that I proposed to your thoughts, was the suitableness of the punishment that will attend such an offence: For the Fool, in my Text, when he would give himself leave to think, knew well enough that there was a God, and that all his love and service was due to him: But these were melancholick thoughts, and such as would hinder him in the prosecution of his design'd projects, and therefore he put them far from him: So that, in effect, & in Gods account, he was utterly ignorant of him, did not at all know him. Just so shall they be served: Christ knows all the world better than any man knows his own heart: Yet in that great day, he shall prove to be a very stranger, utterly ignorant of the greatest part of the world, though many of them had been his acquaintance here; nay, though through faith, in his power, they had unawares by wonders and miracles, brought many to Heaven, and had been good helpers to destroy the Infernal Kingdom, whereof before they were in Affection, and now for ever must, indeed, be Inhabitants.

55. There remains the other main General, which is, indeed, the substance of the whole Text, namely, the fruit of this folly, and that is, Atheism, not in opinion, but practice: In the prosecution whereof, I shall mainly insist upon this, to demonstrate, by infallible deductions out of Gods Word, that men who profess Religion, and a perfect Knowledge of God, yet whiles they allow him only the Brain, and not (what he only desires) the Heart and Affections, may prove in Gods account, very Atheists. Or, to bring it nearer home, I will shew how that many, the ordinary courses, and the most incontrouled practices of men of this Age do utterly contradict, and formally destroy the very Foundations and Principles of the glorious Religion which they profess. But this will require a much longer time than your patience can allow me: Therefore I will only add some few words of Application, of what hath been spoken, and so conclude.

56. That Jewel which our Saviour so magnifies, (*Mat.* 13.) and so commends the wisdom of the Merchant for selling all, even utterly undoing himself to purchase it, is the Gospel of the Kingdom of Heaven. Which though it be of most precious and inestimable value, worthy the selling of the whole world to buy it, yet is every mans money, every man has riches enough to adventure upon it, so he will but sell all that he has, so he will be content to turn bankrupt for it, and upon no other terms can he have it.

57. That



57. That advice which Christ gave the rich young man, that had a good mind to follow him, *viz.* that he should sell all that he had, and take up his Cross, was not any extraordinary unusual trial, but we have all accepted the same offer upon the very same conditions: We must of necessity sell all, deny and renounce the keeping and possessing of any thing besides this Pearl; We must even sell our selves, deny and renounce our own souls, they are both become Gods own, and we are but borrowers of them: Now if we be not Masters of our goods, nor of our selves, neither then may we do our own actions, we must not think our own thoughts. They were such Fools as this great notorious one in my Text, who in *Psal.* 12. say, *Our tongues are our own, we may say what we list.* We are all bought with a price; yea, all that we have, is bought.

58. yet though we must sell all, and deny our own selves, yet we need not part with our goods, or riches, we need not make away our selves. For example: when our Saviour says, *He that hateth not Father and Mother, and Brethren, and Sisters,* and all the world besides, *for my Names sake, and the Gospels, is not worthy of me;* This speech does not bind me to hate, persecute, and destroy all the kindred I have; no, but rather to love and honour them, to spend, and be spent for them: Yet if those persons, or if it be possible for ought else, to be more dear and precious than they, stand in my way to hinder me from coming to Christ; then it is time for me to hate them, then I must trample them under my feet. So that a man is no more bound to sell his Goods, that is, to throw them away, than he is to hate his Parents; Only neither of them may by any means offend us, or annoy us, in our journey to Christ.

59. Now to brag this home to our purpose. Can any face be so impudent, as to profess he hath already sold all, himself to boot, and is ready to part with them when God shall call for them, who contents himself only with knowing and hearing Stories of him, and reserves his heart to his own use, which is all that God requires? Can he with any reason in the world be said to sell all for the Gospel of Christ, that sees Christ himself every day almost hungry, and does not feed him; naked, and does not cloth him; in prison, and does not visit him; For inasmuch as they do not these offices of Charity to his beloved little ones, they deny them to him. Will he be found to be worthy of Christ, that for his sake will not renounce one delightful sin, which a Heathen would easily have done, only for the empty reward of fame? That for his sake will not forgive his Brother some small injury received; nay, perhaps some great kindness offered as a seasonable reproof, or loving dissuasion, from sinning? That for his sake will not undergo the least trouble in furthering his own Salvation?

60. Far from us (beloved Christians) be so barren a Profession, a Profession having only the vizzard and *form of Godliness, but denying the power thereof.* No, let us with thankful hearts, and tongues, recount and consider, what God hath done for our souls, how he hath given us his Word, abundantly sufficient to instruct us. How he hath spoke the word, and great is the multitude of Preachers. Yet withal, let us consider, that it is in our power to turn these unvaluable Treasures of Gods favours into horrible curses. Let us consider how God hath sent out his Word, and it will not return unto him empty, it will be effectual one way or other, it will perform some great work in us. God doth but expect what entertainment it finds upon earth, and will proportion a reward accordingly: on them which detain the truth in unrighteousness he will rain snares, fire, and brimstone: But to such as with meek hearts, and due reverence *receive it into good ground,* and express the power thereof in their lives, there remaineth an exceeding eternal weight of Joy and Glory. *Let us therefore walk as children of the light;* and not content our selves with a bare empty Profession of Religion: *Let him that* but *nameth the Name of the Lord, depart from Iniquity.* Brethren, consider what I say, and the Lord give you understanding in all things. *To God,* &c.

# The Third Sermon.

## PSALM XIV. 1.

*The Fool hath said in his heart, There is no God.*

I Will not be ashamed to be so far my own Plagiary, as for your sakes, that you may be the better able to go along with me in what remains of this Text, briefly to discover unto you, how far I have already, in another Auditory, proceeded in it.

1. 2. First therefore, I conceived (by attending to the course and series of the Psalm, and by comparing this place with many others in Holy Scripture in different Language, expressing the same sense) That this Fool, in my Text, was not a man utterly ignorant and devoid of the knowledge of God, and his Word; For he is supposed by the Psalmist, to be a man living within the pale of the Church, and outwardly professing the true Religion and Worship of God: And thereupon, Secondly, That his Atheism was no Heathenish, Philosophical Atheism, no Problematical maintaining an opinion, That *there is no God*, For even among the very Heathens, we read not of above three or four, of any account, which have proceeded to this excelling degree and height of Impiety.

2. 3. But this Person (whether *Doeg* the *Edomite*, or whosoever he were) is such a one, as though, in his Profession, and even serious thoughts, he do not question a Deity, but would be a mortal Enemy to any one, who should dare to deprive and rob Almighty God of any of his glorious Attributes: Notwithstanding in his Heart, (that is, in the phrase of the Scripture) in the propension and inclination of his Affections, and by consequence, in the course and practice of his life, he denies and renounces God: He accounts the spending a little time in thinking and meditating on the Providence, or Mercy, or severity of God, to be an employment very ungainful and disadvantageous to him, a business likely to trouble and spoil many of his ungodly projects, and to hinder him in his fortunes: And for this reason, he will put God far away from him; He will not suffer him to be (as the Psalmist saith, Psal. 10. 4.) *in all his crafty purposes*.

Psal. 10. 4.

4. I yet willingly confess, that this, *Saying in the Heart, There is no God*, may reasonably be interpreted to be a secret whispering suggestion, an inward perswasion, by fits, which a wretched worldling may have, that, since he has thrived so well by his carelessness in observing Gods Word, and obstinate opposing himself to his will, it may be possible there is indeed no God at all; or, if there be, that he will not vouchsafe to descend so low, as to take notice what is done here on earth, or to observe how each particular person behaves himself in this life. Now, because I will not set up one of these Expositions against the other, I will hereafter, as occasion shall offer it self, make use of them both.

1. 5. Having therefore conceived the sense of the Text to be such as I have now told you; In the words I observed two General Parts. First, the cause of Atheism, and, by consequence, all the abominations following through the whole Psalm, intimated in the person *Nabal*, i. e. *The Fool*, which is, Folly; *i. e.* Ignorance, or rather, Incogitancy, Inconsideration. Secondly, The effect of this Folly, which, is Atheism,

2.



Atheism, and that seated not in the Brain, but in the Heart or Affections. I have already gone through the former part, namely, the cause of Atheism, which is Folly: in the prosecution whereof, I endeavour to discovered, wherein this Folly doth consist. And that is not so much in an utter ignorance of God, and his Holy Word, as a not making a good use of it, when it is known, a suffering it to lie dead, to swim unprofitably in the Brain, without any fruit thereof in the reformation of a mans life and conversation. And there I shewed, first, what extreme folly it was for a man to 1. seek to encrease the knowledge of his Masters will, without a resolution to encrease proportionably in a serious active performance thereof. And secondly, the extreme unavoidable danger and encrease of guilt, which knowledge, without practice, brings with it. To both which Considerations, I severally annexed Applications to the Consciences of them that heard me, and should have proceeded to ——

6. The Second General Part: which is the effect and fruit of the folly, or inconsideration of *Nabal*, (*the Fool*) in my Text, which is Atheism practical, not of the Understanding, but the Will and Affections. But, the time being spent in the prosecution of the former General Part, I was forced to reserve this Second General, to be the employment of another Hour.

7. Only thus much, I then made promise of, (which debt I purpose now to discharge to you) namely, To demonstrate by infallible deductions out of Gods Word, that many, who profess Religion, and a perfect knowledge of Gods Word, yet whiles they allow him only the Brain, and not (what he almost only requires) the Heart, and Affections, may prove in Gods account very Atheists. Or to bring it nearer home, I promised to shew, how that many the ordinary courses, and most incontrouled practices of men of this Age, do utterly contradict, and formally destroy the very Foundations and Principles of that glorious Religion which they profess. Of these, *&c.*

8. At the first sight, indeed, a man would think, that of all the places in Holy Scripture, and of all the Ages which have been since the world began, That this Text, and these times, should suit worst together, For first, if a man would strive with all the earnestness, and even spite, he could, in all the abominable odious colours to describe the worst of all humane creatures, even the Idolatrous, self-devouring *Indians*, What more horrible expression could he imagine to himself, then to call them Fools, and such *Fools, who say in their Heart, There is no God*. Again, if we shall enquire and ask the former Ages, if ever the world was so stored, and even oppressed with knowledge: They will tell us, That the Light was never a burden, nor Knowledge a vice before now: Never till now did all sorts and conditions of men pretend to be able to state the most intricate profound questions of our Religion. Never till now was *Moses* his wish fulfilled, *I would to God, that all the people of the Lord were Prophets*: though in a sense which would scarce have pleased him.

9. These things considered, were it not fit (think you) that I should renounce my Text, or travel to find out a nation whom it may concern, and who have need to hear Atheists condemned? I would to God, (my Beloved Brethren) that whatsoever I shall speak against that fearful sin of Atheism, may prove vain unprofitable words, words which may return empty, having found none to fasten upon: I would to God, that I might strive now, as one that beateth the air, so that you, (even you, who know so much) were innocent. But *David* found this a Doctrine fit to be pressed in his days, which were none of the worst neither: Yea, he hath a second time, (in *Psal.* 53.) almost *in terminis terminantibus*, repeated whatsoever he here speaks of the Atheist: We find not such an example through the whole Scripture, (except it be in a History, or where the quotation is mentioned. Therefore surely it may be pertinent, and sometimes useful even in the Church to have Atheism discovered, to have this Doctrine preached and re-preached: it was so in *David*'s times: and it shall go hard, but we shall shew, that we our selves, (though never so wise and learned and knowing in our own opinion:) yet that we also ought not to take it to heart, if sometimes we be suspected and challenged of Atheism:

10. That

10. That Temptation which the Devil found hard enough for himself, even when he was an Angel of Light, namely, *Ero similis Altissimo*; *I shall be like the most Highest*: Now that it is his Office, and employment, to become a Tempter, He has since scarce ever varied: At the first exercise of his Trade, with his first customers, *Adam* and *Eve*, he begun with it, *Ye shall be as Gods, knowing Good and Evil.* And if we shall unpartially examine our own thoughts, we shall find almost in every suggestion, at least, some degree and tincture of Atheism: either we do exalt and Deifie our own selves, or else we do dishonour, and, in a manner, degrade Almighty God, deposing him from that soveraignty and sway which he ought to exercise in our Hearts and Consciences.

11. This, I say, is true in some measure, in all temptations, in all sins whatsoever, there is some quantity of Atheism, though the sins be but of an ordinary size and rank: But this is not that which I would now stand upon: It concerns me to shew, that though men be never so Orthodox in their Opinions, though they pretend to never so much zeal of the Truth, which they profess, yet unless that Divine Truth be powerful and perswasive enough to the performance and practice of such Duties, as bear a natural resemblance and proportion unto it: They that make such a Profession of Gods truth, do but flatter themselves, they only think they believe, but indeed, and in truth, there is no such thing as Faith in them. For, we must know, that there is no Divine Truth so utterly speculative, but that there naturally and infallibly flows and results from it (as necessarily as warmth from light) a Duty to be practised and put in execution: Insomuch, that it is impossible for a man to be truly perswaded of the one, but he shall infallibly be perswaded to the other: So
1 Joh. 2. 4. that *he which saith, He knoweth God, and keepeth not his Commandments, is a Liar, and the Truth is not in him.* And this I shall endeavour to confirm by Induction, examining the truth and reality of our assent to the chief Fundamental Points of our Religion, by our practices answerable thereto, and concluding, that where the latter is not to be found, it is but a vain perswasion and phantastical illusion for a man to think he hath the former.

12. But in the first place, that we may be the better able, and without interruption proceed in this design'd course, I will first remove an Objection, which may seem
*Object.* to prevail against that which hath been spoken, to this effect: *The Devils* (as St. *James*
Jam. 2. 19. saith) *believe and tremble*: They do indeed assent unto the Truth of all the mysteries of our Salvation: In the place of St. *James*, they acknowledge One God: In *Mat.* 8. 28. they acknowledge the second Article of our Faith, allowing Christ to be the Son of God. And the like may be said of the others following; And yet if we examine their practise: How absolutely contradicting and warring is it with their profession? Therefore, it may seem, that where there is a firm assent to Divine Truths, there may consist with it a contrary repugnant practice.

*Sol.* 13. For answer therefore we must know, that the Assent which the Devil gives to the Revelations of God, is extremely different from that belief which is exacted of us Christians, and which every one of us, (though never so vicious and irreligious) would gladly perswade our selves that we allow unto Gods Word: For though, for example, the Devils acknowledge the Precepts and Commandments of God to be Holy, and Just, and Good, and most fit to be observed; As likewise that to those who sincerely, and without Hypocrisie, shall perform these Commandments of God,
Heb. 11. 1. the Promises of God shall be *Yea and Amen*, they shall infallibly attain those joys which exceed mans understanding to comprehend: Yet, these things to them are only as a Tale which is told; or rather they are to them occasion of horrour and gnashing of Teeth, that there should be such glorious comfortable things, which do nothing concern them, and of malice and hatred to those who have an interest in them, and are in a fair possibility of attaining unto them: And therefore no marvel if such a Faith as this be barren and unfruitful of Good Works. Whereas *our Faith* (saith St. *Paul*) *is the substance of things hoped for*, of things which concern us, we do not only acknowledge, that the Precepts of God are good, but also necessarily to be



be performed by us: and that the Promises of God are not only desirable in themselves, but also that being such, they were revealed for our sakes, and are infallibly destined unto us, when we shall have performed such conditions as may by the assistance of God be executed by us, even with ease and pleasure: Now wheresoever such perswasions as these are, it is impossible (even if the Devils themselves could be supposed capable of them) but that there should accompany them earnest and serious endeavours not to come short of the Glory of God. This difficulty therefore being dissolved, I shall pursue the examination of our belief of the Foundations of our Religion, by the fruits and issues of it in the practices of our lives.

14. We will begin with some of Gods Attributes: Whosoever thou art, that professest thy self a Christian, thou believest, that God whom thou servest is present every where, both in Heaven and Earth, insomuch, that it is altogether impossible for thee to exclude him from thy company; wheresoever thou goest, he will pursue thee: Though thou shouldst cloath thy self with darkness, as it were with a garment, the darkness would be to him as the Noon-day: And though it were possible for thee to deceive the eyes and observation of Men and Angels, yea, even of thine own Conscience, yet to him thou wouldst be open and transparent; Τυμνὸς ἢ τετραχηλισμένος, as it were, Dissected, and having thy very Entrails exposed to his sight.

15. Thou canst hide therefore nothing which thou doest from his eyes, he taketh notice of every word which thou speakest, he hears even the very whispering of thy thoughts: And all this, thou sayest, thou acknowledgest. Out of thy own mouth shalt thou be condemned, thou wicked Servant: Darest thou then make thy Master a witness of thy Rebellion and Disobedience? When thou art about the fulfilling of any of thine ungodly lusts, thou retirest thy self from company, and art afraid of the faces of men; thou abhorrest the light, and yet darest out-face him whose Eyes are ten thousand times brighter than the Sun. Thou wouldst not have the confidence to commit filthiness, if thy friend were in company: And yet what injury is done to him by it? What Commandment of his doest thou transgress in it? Or if thou didst, What power, or authority, has he over thee to punish thee? Thou wouldst be ashamed to commit such a sin, if thy Servant were by, one whom thou art so far from being afraid of, that himself, his words, almost his very thoughts, are in thy power: Nay, if a Child were in company, thou wouldst not have the face to do it.

16. Thou canst not deny, but respect to a Friend, to a Servant, even to a Child, will with-hold thee from such practices, and yet withal confessest, that Almighty God, whom thou professest, to serve, to fear, and to love, that he all the while looks upon thee, and observes thee; his Eyes are never removed from thee, and which is worse, though thou mayst endeavour to forget, and blot such actions out of thy remembrance; yet it is impossible he should ever forget them: He keeps a Register of all thy sins, which no time shall ever be able to deface: And what will it then profit thee to live a close concealed sinner from the world, or to gain amongst men the reputation of a devout religious Christian, when in the mean time thine own Heart and Conscience shall condemn thee; nay, when Almighty *God, who is greater than thy heart, and knoweth all things*, when he shall be able to object unto thee all thy close ungodly projects, all thy bosome private lusts; Yea, when that conceit (wherein thou didst so much please thy self) of being able to delude and blind the observation of the World shall nothing avail thee, but whatsoever mischiefs thou hast contrived in thy Closet; whatsoever abominations thou hast practised in thy Bed; all these, with each aggravating Circumstance, shall be discovered in the presence of all men, and Angels, and Devils; when Satan, whom before thou madest an Instrument and Baud unto thy lusts, to whose counsels and suggestions thou before wouldst only hearken, shall be the most forward and eager to appeach thee.

17. When thou art brought to such an exigent as this (which, without a timely unfeigned repentance, as sure as there is a God in Heaven, thou shalt at last be brought to) what will then thy Orthodox opinions do thee good? What will it

then

then profit thee, to say, Thou never didst maintain any impious dishonourable Tenents concerning God, or any of his glorious Attributes? Yea, how happy hadst thou been, if worse than the most ignorant heathenish Atheist, no thought or consideration of God had entred into thy heart? For this professing thy self a Christian rightly instructed in the knowledge of God, will prove heavier to thee than a thousand millstones hanged about thy neck, to sink thee into the bottom of that comfortless Lake of fire and brimstone? For, for example: What a strange Plea would it be, for a Murderer to say, I confess I have committed such or such a murder; but all the excuse which I can alleadge for my self, is, that I was well studied in the Laws which forbad murder, and I knew that my Judge who tied me to the observance of this Law, upon pain of death, was present, and observed me when I committed the Fact. Surely it would be more tollerable for him to say, I never heard of any such Law or Judge; or if I have been told of such things, I gave but little heed to the report, I did not at all believe it. For though this Plea will be very insufficient to acquit the Malefactor; yet it will be much more advantageous than the former: for what were that, but to flout the Judge to his face, and to pretend a respectful worthy opinion of him, for this end, that his contempt and negligence in performing his Commandments, may be more extreme and inexcusable; and by consequence, without all hope or expectation of pardon. I need make no application of the example, the Similitude doth sufficiently apply it self.

18. Therefore if I were to advise any man who is resolved by his practice to contradict that opinion which he saith he hath of God; or, that is not resolved to live with that reverence and awfulness due to the Majesty of Almighty God, in whose presence he always is; I would counsel him not to believe himself, when he professes the Omnipresence, or Omniscience of God; For without all contradiction, though by living in a Nation where every one with whom he converses, professeth so much, he may have learned to say, There is a God, and that this God is every where present; and takes particular notice of whatsoever is done in heaven and earth: yet if this Notion were firmly rooted in his soul, as a matter of Religion, as a business upon which depends the everlasting welfare of his soul and body; it is altogether impossible for him to continue in an habitual practice of such things as are evidently repugnant and destructive to such a conceit. For tell me, Would any man in his right senses, when he shall see another drink down a poyson which he knows will suddenly prove mortal unto him; I say, will any man be so mad as to believe such a one, though he should, with all the most earnest protestations that can be imagined, professe that he is not weary of his life, but intends to prolong it as long as God and Nature will give him leave?

19. The Case is altogether in each point and circumstance the same: For he which saith, He believeth or assenteth to any doctrine, as a fundamental Point of his Religion, intends thus much by it, that he has bound himself in certain bonds unto Almighty God (for so the very name of Religion doth import) to expect no benefit at all from him, but upon condition of believing such divine Truths as it shall please him to reveal unto him, namely, as means and helps of a devout religious life and worship of him: For God reveals nothing of himself to any man for this end, to satisfie his curiosity, or to afford him matter of discourse or news; but to instruct him how he may behave himself here in this life, that he may attain those promises which shall be fulfilled to those who sincerely and devoutly serve and obey him.

20. Therefore he that shall say, I believe such a Truth revealed by God, and yet lives as if he had never heard of such a thing; yea, as if he had been perswaded of the contrary; is as much to be believed, as if he should say, I will drink a deadly poyson to quench my thirst, or will stab my self to the heart, for Physick, to let out superfluous bloud: So that that man who is not resolved to break off his wicked courses by repentance, and conversion unto God; that lives as if the Devil only were every where, and he resolved to please and delight him with his ungodly life; let not such a one use himself to say, I believe that God is always present with me, and a Spectator



Spectator of my actions; for thereby, he shall only add a lie to the rest of his sins, and fewel to the Lake of fire and brimstone: He shall never perswade God to believe him, that he was of such an opinion; but that whatsoever his tongue said, and his fancy now and then apprehended, yet in his conscience he was always a constant resolved Atheist, and *in his heart he said, There is no God.*

21. In the second place, thou acknowledgest, that God whom thou professest obedience to, is infinitely Righteous; insomuch that it is impossible that he should not hate and abhor unrighteousness in whomsoever he finds it: Yea, so natural and essential is his Justice unto him, that he should deny himself, if he should accept any mans person, if he should not be avenged on sin, if he should not most severely punish it. Thou canst not be ignorant how many Vows and Protestations he hath made almost every where through the holy Scripture, of his hatred and indignation against sin, insomuch, that heaven and earth may pass away, but not one jot or tittle of those Curses and Plagues shall fall to the ground, which he hath denounced against impenitent sinners.

22. And shall not thy own mouth here once again condemn thee, O thou wicked servant? Darest thou then every hour wilfully, and even contentedly do such things, as must certainly procure his anger and indignation against thee for ever? Wilt thou, for the sinful pleasure of a few minutes, put thy self in such a condition, that God must of necessity be angry with thee? that he must cease to be God, unless he hate and abhor thee? Certainly, if thou wouldst descend into thine own heart, if thou wouldst give thy self leave carefully and unpartially to examine thy thoughts, thou wouldst find that thy tongue has given thy soul the lie, when it hath told thee, that *God* is immutably just and righteous; and yet for all that, that thou art resolved to run on in such courses, as must of necessity pull down his heavy displeasure against thee.

23. At least, thou wilt find in thy heart earnest desires and wishes, that God were not so righteous as Preachers tell thee he is! Oh, thinkest thou in thy heart, that God were such an unrighteous person as I am! Oh, that he could be content to wink at me, when I am about the fulfilling of my ungodly desires! Alas, what harm is it to him, what inconvenience accrews to him by it, if I enjoy the sinful pleasures of this life? Or if he will needs be angry, Oh that it were not in his power to revenge himself upon me! Oh that his power were not so unlimited as (they say) it is!

24. I know men will be apt to flatter themselves, though they be never so vicious, and to think that they are extremely wronged, to have such imputations laid upon them. They will be ready to answer me, in the words of *Hazael* to the Prophet *Elisha*, when he told him what horrible Massacres he should commit among the *Israelites*, when he should have the Crown of *Syria* set on his head: *what dost thou think us dogs, that we should do such things as these?* We are so far from robbing God of his Justice, that we would be mortal enemies to any that dare proceed to that height of impiety: Nay, we would be content to sacrifice our own lives, rather than be brought to deny that, or any other of his glorious Attributes.

25. Truly, I am so charitably minded, as to think that there is none so wicked, but would confidently make this defence for himself; yea, and believes he is in earnest when he speaks so. But this will not serve the turn: For, *God seeth not as man sees*, he judgeth not as man judgeth, but he judgeth righteous judgment. For instance, in that great example which our Saviour gives of the fashion and course of judgment, according to which he purposes to proceed in the last day; He accuses the wicked, and condemns them for neglect of visiting, and feeding, and cloathing Him. The Apology which they make for themselves, as having never seen him in that exigence, would not be taken: For, though I am perswaded they there spake nothing but what they verily thought, namely, that if ever they had seen Christ himself in such want and necessity, they would not have been so hard-hearted to him, as they were to his poor servants: yet Christ will not allow of that excuse, but accounts of their uncharitableness to afflicted Christians, as directed to himself.

26. So likewise in the Case in hand. Though I believe it would be hard to per-

ſwade even the moſt licentious profeſſed ſinner, that he believes not indeed the Juſtice and Righteouſneſs of God; yet he ſhall find at laſt, and that miſerably to his coſt, that God who knows his heart much better than himſelf, for all his profeſſions, will yet eſteem him an Atheiſt; and will prove evidently and convincingly unto him, that ſince that knowledge which he pretended to have of Gods Righteouſneſs, had been ſo fruitleſs and ſuperficial, that notwithſtanding ſuch a conceit, he proceeded ſtill on in his ungodly courſes; that therefore he did but delude himſelf all the while with phantaſtical ungrounded illuſions; ſo that whatſoever imagination ſwim in his brain, yet in the language of his heart, that is, in the propenſion and ſway of his affections, he ſaid, *There is no God*.—Now what hath been ſaid of the Omnipreſence, Infinite Knowledge, and Juſtice of God, may by the ſame reaſon and proportion, be ſpoken of the reſt of his glorious Attributes. But the ſtraitneſs of time will force me to leave the reſt untouched: I will proceed therefore to make the like collections from one or two Articles more of the Creed.

27. Thou believeſt that after this life (which cannot laſt very long, it will, and that ſhortly, have an end) there remain but two ways for all men of what ſtate and condition ſoever that ever were, to be diſpoſed of, either into life and glory everlaſting, or elſe into pains and torments infinite and inſupportable. And by conſequence, that thy ſoul is an immortal ſubſtance, which ſhall for ever continue ſomewhere: and according to thy behaviour here, during that ſhort meaſure of time which thou liveſt upon the earth, it muſt expect a reward proportionable thereto. If thou canſt perſwade thy ſelf to walk worthy of that calling whereunto thou art called in Jeſus Chriſt: If thou wilt not forſwear and renounce that glorious profeſſion which thou madeſt in thy Baptiſm: If thou canſt be content to ſubmit thy ſelf to the eaſie yoke of Chriſt, propoſe to thy ſelf what reward thou canſt imagine, give thy thoughts ſcope and licence to be exceſſive and overflowing in their deſires; if thou art not ſatisfied to the uttermoſt, infinitely above what thou art now able to comprehend, Tell God he is a Liar, and has deceived thee. Oh what unſpeakable joys ſhall hereafter expect thee? Oh with what a burden and weight of glory ſhalt thou even be oppreſſed?

28. But on the other ſide; If notwithſtanding ſuch ineſtimable bleſſings as are now ſet before thine eyes, thou art yet reſolved to content thy ſelf with ſuch vain trifling pleaſures as thou canſt meet with in this life, which yet thou canſt not attain to, but with as much pains, and anxiety, and care, as, if rightly applied, would have been ſufficient to have procured heaven for thee! What ſhall I ſay unto thee? Only this, *Thou haſt thy reward: Remember that thou haſt already received thy good things.* What a terrible affrighting ſpeech is this? It may be thou haſt fed and glutted thy luſts with ſome pleaſures of this life; it may be thou haſt ſatisfied in ſome ſmall meaſure thy ambition with honour and preferment; and yet it may be, for all thy cares and travels, thou haſt not been able to attain to any of thoſe things as thou didſt deſire; whether thou haſt or haſt not, it is all one, there is little to chuſe, but howſoever, *Remember that thou haſt received thy good things*; Remember, *thou haſt thy reward.* Do not hereafter preſume to offer to pretend to any the leaſt good from God. It may be hereafter thou mayeſt come to ſuch want, as to ſtand in need of a cup of cold water; nay, it may be thou wouldſt think thy ſelf happy, if any body would afford thee but one drop of water to refreſh thy tongue. But in vain: for, *Son, Remember thou haſt already received thy good things.* Thou never ſaweſt beggar ſo utterly wretched and deſtitute, but he might almoſt every where have filled himſelf with water, and have thanked no body for it: and yet though thou ſhouldſt even conſume thy ſelf with intreating, and crying for it, yet none ſhall be found to give it thee, even thy liberal good father *Abraham* will deny it to thee.

29. Surely there cannot be found ſo impudent, ſo unreaſonable a ſinner, as to profeſs he is fully perſwaded of theſe things, and that he hath a deſire, and even ſome hope, that God will be ſo merciful to him, as to preſerve him, that none of thoſe things happen unto him, and yet reſolve to follow the devices of his own heart; To ſay, He



He acknowledgeth that the joys which are reſerved for penitent believers, are ſo exceſſively glorious, that the afflictions of this life are not worthy of them, much leſs the vain pleaſures thereof; and yet withal, rather than not enjoy the *pleaſures of ſin for a ſeaſon*, to make himſelf uncapable of thoſe great bleſſings. Such a generation of men I find in holy Scripture, and God himſelf takes notice of them, who ſay, *we ſhall have peace, though we walk in the imaginations of our heart:* But withal, I can ſcarce meet with God ſo impatient through the whole Bible, as he is with people of ſuch a temper as this, *Surely the Lord will be avenged on ſuch a nation as this, and will make his fierce wrath to ſmoak againſt them.*

30. Therefore, whomſoever thou art that haſt taken up thy reſolution, to walk in the imagination of thine own heart; at leaſt, take ſo much pity of thy ſelf, do not thou thy ſelf add violence and heat to the wrath of God, which ſhall ſmoak againſt thee, by pretending to a belief of Heaven or Hell, or by ſeeming to profeſs, that all the while that thou art buſie in the proſecution of thine ungodly luſts, notwithſtanding that, all that time, this opinion hath never left thee, *That God will bring thee to Judgment*; That even that very body of thine, which thou mad'ſt a manſion for the Devil, an inſtrument for any wickedneſs that he would ſuggeſt unto thee, yet that that body ſhould be raiſed up; that to thy extreme horror and aſtoniſhment, God would take ſuch particular care of that very body of thine, that whereſoever it were loſt, he would recover it, though diſperſed to the four winds of heaven, and build it up again (thou ſayeſt thou knowſt for what uſe) even to be a mark againſt which he will empty his quivers, and ſhoot out all the Darts of his fiery indignation, in the puniſhing of whom he will expreſs his Almighty Power.

31. But I cannot allow my ſelf any longer time to proſecute the former part of my Propoſition, *viz.* to ſhew how much men deceive themſelves, who think they indeed believe the fundamental Points of their Faith, when by their practice and courſe of life, they live in an habitual exerciſe of ſuch ſins, as are utterly repugnant and deſtructive to ſuch a belief: And this, I think, I have performed; but yet only in general terms, not deſcending to a view of ſome more eminent and particular ſins and enormities: For that, therefore, which remains of the time that your patience will allow me, I will ſpend it in acquitting my ſelf of the other part of my promiſe, namely, in inſtancing in ſome extraordinary incontrouled practiſes of theſe times; and, diſcovering how utterly they do deſtroy the very grounds and foundations of our Religion, and how impoſſible it is they ſhould conſiſt with a true ſincere profeſſion of Chriſtianity.

32. As firſt, for example; How ordinarily do we meet with this practice, for men which are above others in wealth and power, to employ both theſe to their utmoſt abilities, for the maintaining of an unjuſt cauſe againſt a poor inferiour Adverſary: I am ſure, this is no news to you, you do not ſtartle at the hearing of ſuch a crime as this: And yet, if it be well conſidered, what can be imagined more monſtrous and abominable? For, give me leave to ſuppoſe, or put the caſe, that ſome one of this company were guilty of this ſin, 1.

33. If I ſhould ask him, Whence, and from whom he had his riches or power? Whom he would acknowledge for his Benefactor? I make no queſtion, but he would give me a good religious Anſwer, and ſay, That *he would not ſacrifice to his Net, nor burn incenſe to his Drag*; but that God, who gave a bleſſing to his cares and endeavours, had advanced him to ſuch a place and fortunes in the world. Again, if I ſhould ask him, In what eſteem and value (he thought that) God holds his faithful ſervants? or, Whether he would take it well, to have them oppreſſed and trampled on by others more potent than themſelves? He muſt needs anſwer again, That God is no Accepter of perſons, neither riches nor poverty are a means to procure His favour, but that in all conditions of men, *He that loveth righteouſneſs, and hateth iniquity, ſhall be accepted by him.*

34. If theſe be his Anſwers (as, without all contradiction, unleſs he will profeſs himſelf an Atheiſt, ſuch muſt be the effect of them;) Then, let him conſider, in

what a woful condition he has concluded himself to be in, and, what reason he has to thank God for his honour or riches? Does he think, that God has furnished him with strength and weapons for this end, that thereby he might be able to make war with himself, that he might have the power to overrun and lay waste those whom God loveth as the apple of his own eye? Can he imagine, that God has been so beneficial and liberal to him, in preferring him to a rank and degree above others not inferiour to him in the riches and treasures of God's grace, and therefore as dear unto him as himself; for this end, that thereby he may prove a more able, and fit instrument for the Devil to wreak his malice and hatred upon those whom God loves?

35. Therefore, if there be ere such a person in this Auditory (yet I hope there is not) but and if there be! What shall I say unto him? Let him consider, what a hard task he has undertaken to war against God? Let him consider, what a strange reckoning he is likely to make unto God, when he shall at last (as undoubtedly he will) require of him an account of his Stewardship? Behold, Lord, thou hast given me five Talents, and what have I done with them? Why, loe, I have made them ten Talents. But how, by what courses? Why, I have unjustly and injuriously robbed and wrung from my fellow servants, those few Talents which thou gavest them: I have gained thus much by my violent maintaining of a cause which thou hatedst, and which my self could not deny but to be most unjust: This is surely a sore evil under the Sun. But, since, I hope, it little concerns any one here, to have such a crime as this dissected curiously and purposely insisted upon, it shall suffice me to say, That they who are guilty of it, are far from knowing of what spirit they are, when they say, they are Christians, since even a very Heathen would abhor to countenance or entertain such a vice as this.

2. 36. In the second place, *How can ye believe* (saith Christ) *who seek honour one of another, and not that honour which is of God*? If these words of Christ be true, That they who too earnestly desire applause and reputation among men, neglecting, in the mean time, seriously to endeavour the attaining to the honour which is of God; that is, obedience and submission to his Commands, which is that wherein a Christian ought especially to place his honour and reputation: If such men as these, do in vain, and without all ground of reason, reckon themselves in the number of true believers: Again, if the chief badge and κατ' ἐξοχὴν, whereby Christ would have his servants to be distinguished from the world, be a willingness to suffer injuries, a desire rather to have the other cheek stricken, and to have the Cloak go the same way with the Coat, than to revenge one blow with another, or to go to Law for a matter of no great moment, for recovering of that which a man might well enough lose, without endangering his Estate.

37. If these things, I say, be true; Suppose Christ (according to the Vision of Ezek.9.5, 6. *Ezekiel*) should command his Angels utterly *to slay through all Jerusalem*, that is, the Church, *old and young, maids, and little children, and women, excepting only those upon whom his mark and badge were to be found*; what destruction and desolation would there be? How would the Sanctuary of God be defiled, and his Courts be filled with the slain? How would many (who now pass, both in their own and other mens opinions, for good Christians enough) be taken for *Mahomets* servants whose Religion it is, by fury and murther, to gain Proselites to their abominable profession: Suppose our Garments should be presented to God with the same question that *Jacob*'s Sons sent their Brother *Joseph*'s, *Num hæc est tunica filii tui? Is this thy Sons Coat*? Would they not rather be taken for the skins of savage Beasts, so unlike are they to that Garment of Humility and Patience which our Saviour wore, and which he bequeathed us in his Legacy.

38. We are so far from seeking that Honour which is of God, from endeavouring to attain unto, or so much as countenance such virtues, which God hath often professed, that he will exalt and glorifie; such is humility, and patiently bearing of injuries, that we place our honour and reputation in the contrary; that is counted noble



noble and generous in the worlds opinion, which is odious and abominable in the sight of God: If thy Brother offend or injure thee, forgive him, saith Christ; if he proceed, forgive him; What? Untill seven times? I, until seventy times seven times. But how is this Doctrine received now in the world? What counsel would men, and those none of the worst sort, give thee in such a case? How would the sobrest, discreetest, well-bred Christians advise thee? Why thus: If thy Brother or thy Neighbor have offered thee an injury or an affront! forgive him? By no means, of all things in the world take heed of that, thou art utterly undone in thy reputation then, if thou dost forgive him: What is to be done then? Why, let not thy heart rest, let all other business rest, let all other business and employment be laid aside, till thou hast his bloud: what, a mans bloud for an injurious passionate speech, for a disdainful look? Nay, this is not all. That thou may'st gain amongst men the reputation of a discreet well-tempered murderer, be sure thou killest him not in passion, when thy bloud is hot and boyling with the provocation; but proceed with as much temper and setledness of reason, with as much discretion, and preparedness as thou wouldst to the Communion: After some several days meditation, invite him mildly, and affably, into some retired place, and there let it be put to the trial, whether thy life or his must answer the injury.

39. Oh most horrible Christianity! That it should be a most sure setled way for a man to run into danger and disgrace with the world, if he shall dare to perform a Commandment of Christ's which is as necessarily to be observed by him, if he have any hope of attaining heaven, as meat and drink is for the sustaining of his life? That ever it should enter into the heart of a Christian to walk so exactly and curiously contrary to the ways of God; that whereas he every day and hour, sees himself contemned and despised by thee who art his servant, his creature, upon whom he might (without any possible imputation of unrighteousness) pour down the Vials of his fierce wrath and indignation? yet he, notwithstanding, is patient and long-suffering towards thee, hoping that his long suffering may lead thee to repentance, and earnestly desiring and soliciting thee by his Ministers to be reconciled unto him: Yet, that thou, for all this, for a blow in anger; it may be, for a word or less, shouldst take upon thee to send his soul, or thine, or, it may be, both, clogg'd and press'd with all your sins unrepented of (for thou canst not be so wild as to think, thou canst repent of thy sins, and yet resolve upon such a business) to expect your sentence before the judgment seat of God: wilfully and irrecoverably to deprive your selves of all those blessed means which God had contrived for your salvation, the power of his Word, the efficacy and virtue of his Sacraments; all which you shall utterly exclude your selves from, and leave your selves in such a state, that it shall not be in Gods power to do you any good. *Oh consider this all ye that fight against God, lest he tear you in pieces, and there be none to deliver you.*

40. In the third place: There is another great evil under the Sun, and that is, 3. When men are not content to dishonour Almighty God, and their glorious Religion, by unworthy scandalous Practises; but, to make themselves innocent, they will entitle God to their abominations: Of this nature are those, who are curious and inquisitive into Scripture, great students in it for this end, That they may furnish them with some places, which being violently wrested, and injuriously handled, may serve, at least in their opinion, to patronize and warrant their ungodly irreligious courses. The time will come, saith Christ to his Disciples, *when they who hate and persecute you, shall think they do God good service.* And the time is come, when men think they can give no greater, nor more approved testimony of their Religion, and zeal of God's Truth, than by hating and abhorring, by reviling and traducing their Brethren, if they differ from them in any, though the most ordinary, innocent Opinions: If men accord not altogether with them, if they run not on furiously with them in all their Tenets, they are enemies unto God and his Truth, and they can find Scripture enough to warrant them to disgrace and revile such, to raise any scandalous dishonourable reports of them, and to poyson utterly their reputation with the World.

An

*An Application to the Communion.*

I Have hitherto, as carefully as ſo ſhort a time would permit (and yet, it may be, with greater earneſtneſs than you could have been content I ſhould) ſearched into the retired corners of our hearts, and there diſcovered a vice, which, it may be, you little expected, namely, *Atheiſm*: A ſtrange vice, I confeſs, to be found in Chriſtian Hearts. I have, likewiſe, exemplified in ſome particular practices of theſe times, moſt exactly contrary to our profeſſion of Chriſtian Religion: If I ſhould endeavour to diſcover all that might be obſerved of this nature, not my hour only, but the day it ſelf would fail me. Notwithſtanding, I am reſolved to make one inſtance more about the buſineſs for which we are met together, namely, The receiving of the bleſſed body and bloud of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt: I ſuppoſe you will all acknowledge with me, that that is a buſineſs of the greateſt conſequence that a Chriſtian is capable of performing: I hope I need not to inſtruct you, how inexcuſably guilty thoſe men render themſelves who come with an unprepared heart, with an unſanctified mouth, to the partaking of theſe heavenly Myſteries: *what art thou* (ſaith God by the Pſalmiſt) *that takeſt my word into thy mouth, when thou hateſt to be reformed*? And if that be ſo great a crime for a man only to talk of God, to make mention of his Name, when the heart is unclean and unreformed; with how much greater reaſon may Chriſt ſay, What art thou that takeſt Me into thy Mouth? What art thou that dareſt devour my fleſh, and ſuck my bloud, that dareſt incorporate my fleſh and bloud into thy ſelf, to make my ſpotleſs body an inſtrument of thy luſts, a Temple for the Devil to inhabite and raign in? To crucifie Chriſt once more, and put him to open ſhame? To crucifie him ſo that no good ſhall follow upon it, to make the bloud of the New Covenant a profane thing? And thus far, if not deeper, is that man guilty, that ſhall dare to come to this heavenly feaſt with ſpotted and unclean affections.

The



# The Fourth Sermon.

Luke IX. 23.

——*Let him deny himſelf.*

GOod reaſon there is, that, according to that exceſs of value and weight, wherewith heavenly and ſpiritual things do ſurmount and preponderate earthly and tranſitory; ſo likewiſe the deſire and proſecution of them ſhould be much more contentiouſly active and earneſt, than that of the other: Yet, if men were but in any proportion ſo circumſpect, and careful in buſineſſes that concern their eternal welfare, as even the moſt fooliſh Worldlings are about Riches, Honour, and ſuch trifles, as are not worthy to take up the mind even of a natural man; We ſhould not have the glorious Profeſſion of Chriſtianity, ſo careleſly and ſleepily undertaken, ſo irreſolutely and fearfully, nay, cowardly maintain'd; I might add, ſo treacherouſly pretended and betray'd to the encompaſſing of baſe and unworthy ends, as now it is.

2. To what may we more juſtly impute this negligent wretchleſs behaviour of Chriſtians, than to an extreme incogitancy, and want of conſideration in us, upon what terms it is, that we have entred into League with God, and to what conſiderable ſtrict Conditions we have in our firſt initiation at our Baptiſm, ſo ſolemnly ſubmitted and engaged our ſelves; without a ſerious reſolute performance whereof, we have promiſed by no means to expect any reward at all from God, but to remain ſtrangers, utterly excluded from the leaſt hope of enjoying any fruit of thoſe many glorious Promiſes which it hath pleaſed our gracious God, ſo liberally to offer and reach out unto us in our bleſſed Saviour Jeſus Chriſt.

3. It was no good ſign, when the precious Seed of the Word was received into the ſtony ground with ſuch a ſudden Joy. Hearers reſembled by that ground, give good heed to the glorious and comfortable Promiſes, which attend Religion, without having reſpect to many troubleſom and melancholick Conditions, which muſt neceſſarily go along too: And therefore, when Perſecution begins, either within them, when they are commanded to ſtrangle a Luſt as dear unto them, and as neceſſary for their employments, as an eye, or right-hand; Or, without them, when that Profeſſion which they have undertaken becomes offenſive or ſcandalous to great men: Then, (as if they had been miſtaken in the Purchaſe, or deceived by the Preacher,) the joy ſo ſuddenly kindled, as ſoon vaniſhes, and they retire themſelves home, expecting a more commodious and gainful bargain.

4. Hereupon it is, that our Saviour in this Chapter ſpends two Parables, One of a King preparing for War, The other of a Builder for a Houſe; whereby to inſtruct his hearers, what they ſhould do before they did offer to undertake his ſervice: The ſum whereof is this; That if they had any ends and projects of their own, if they thought to ſerve themſelves upon him, they were much deceived; that they ſhould deeply, and thought fully conſider of what weight and conſequence the buſineſs was that they were about.

5. There is a Kingdom to be obtained, and a glorious Palace, wherein are to be erected many fair Manſions to raign in: But it is a Kingdom that ſuffers violence, and the

the violent must take it by force; And it is a Building that will exact perchance all the means they have, and their whole lives labour to boot: Wherefore it is good for them to sit down, to send for their friends to counsel, tō question their hearts, whether they have courage and resolution, and to examine their incomes, whether they will bear the charges to muster Souldiers for the Conquest, and Labourers for the Building.

6. If they like these large offers, and have means enough for the employment, and are not unwilling to spare for cost, Let them go on in God's Name: There is no doubt to be made of an end, that shall fully recompence their losses, and satisfie their utmost boldest desires, and fill the whole capacity of their thoughts. But on the other side, unless all these conditions concur, He has so much care of their credit that he would wish them, not to set one foot further in the employment, but to betake themselves home, lest, if they should fail in the business, they should make themselves ridiculous to the world of Scorners: to whom it would be meat and drink to see some glorious fresh ruines of a Building left to the fouls and beasts to inhabit; or to see a fierce invading Army forced to retire themselves home, cool'd and content with their former want and poverty.

*Object.* 7. But might not some poor, low-minded, sinful hearer reply upon our Saviour, and enquire, whence these sums must be raised, and these forces mustered. Alas, what is a wretched mortal man, that he should think of taking Heaven by Composition, much more of forcing and invading it: What is there on Earth to lay in balance against Heaven? Has not the Spirit of God told us, that all is vanity, nay, lighter than vanity, through all *Ecclesiastes?* And again, that men of low condition are vanity, and men of high condition (to wit, such, as because they abound with wealth, think that therefore they are in much better esteem and favour with God than their Brethren) they are worse than vanity, for as it is *Psal. 62.9. They are a Lye*, that is, they are no such things as they take themselves for, they are quite contrary to what they seem. Psal. 62. 9.

*Reply.* 8. The answer hereto is not very difficult: For 'tis true, If we consider our own abilities, such, I mean, as our fore-fathers have left us, it is as impossible for us by any worth in our power, to offer at the purchase of heaven, as to make a new one: yet such is the mercy of God in Jesus Christ, that so glorious a Bargain is already made to our hands, the gain whereof will redound unto us upon very reasonable conditions; Namely, if we can be brought to acknowledge our own beggarly starved estate, and thereby evacuating our selves of all manner of worth and desert in our selves, and relying only upon his mercy which is infinite, submitting likewise our selves to be absolutely at his disposition without any reservation at all.

9. So that the same unvaluable precious Jewel, which cost the rich Merchant in the Parable, all his Estate, and had like to have made a young Gentleman in the Gospel turn bankrupt, may become ours, even the poorest and most despised person's amongst us; if we will be content to part with our *totum nihil*, all whatsoever we are, or have: If we can perswade our selves, to esteem pleasure and profit as dross and dung, when they come in competition with this Pearl: If we can readily and affectionately hate our dearest friends and kindred, even tread our Parents under our feet, when they lie in our way unto Christ: If we can perfectly detest even the most dearest closest lusts and affectionate sins: Finally, if our own souls become contemptible and vile in our own eyes, in respect of that glorious Inheritance so dearly purchased for us: Then are we rich to purchase this Pearl, then are we able and sufficient to go through with this Building, and strong enough to conquer this Kingdom.

10. Now all this (as must be shewed in many more particulars) is properly to deny our selves, which is a condition that our Saviour makes so necessary and inseparable in every one, that purposes to be any thing the better for him, that desires to be found in the number of those that have given up their names unto him, for faith the Text, *Jesus said unto them all, If any man will come after me, let him deny himself.*

Let him— 11. These



11. These few words are not conveniently capable of a division; But taking them in gross, as a Precept or Law delivered by Christ, and which concerns every man, of what state or condition soever, that resolves to accept of him for a Lord and Saviour: We will proceed according to the ordinary Method of expounding a Law: Namely, first, we will in general, consider the nature, meaning, and extent, of this Law; How far the action here injoyned (which is a denying or renouncing) doth reach; and how much is comprehended in the object thereof, Our selves: Secondly, I will restrain this general Duty into several special Cases, which may conveniently be reduced to three, as namely, that by vertue thereof we are bound to evacuate our selves, and utterly deny, 1. Our own Wisdom or Understanding. 2. Our Will and Affections. And lastly, our own Desert and Righteousness. 1. 2.

12. Out of this Commandment, then, considered in gneneral terms only, (for so I shall only handle it in this hours Discourse) as it is contained in these two words ἀπαρνησάσθω ἑαυτὸν, but two such words, so full and swelling with expression, that our Language can scarce at all, or but faintly, express and render the force and vigour of them in twenty; I shall observe unto you this doctrinal Position; namely, *That it is absolutely, and indispensably required of every man that professes Christianity; not only utterly to renounce all manner of things that thwart and oppose Gods will and command, but also resolutely, and without all manner of reservation, to purpose and resolve upon the denial of whatsoever is in our selves, or any thing else, how full of pleasure, profit, or necessity soever, though in themselves indifferent, lawful, or convenient; when they come in competition with what Christ hath enjoyned us.* Which after I have explained and confirmed by comparing this Law with many other Precepts of the same nature in the holy Scripture, I shall apply unto your consciences by two useful inforcements. *One*, taken from the extreme undeniable reasonableness of the thing here commanded. *The other*, from the wonderful love and kindness in the Law-giver, that requires not so much at our hands as himself hath already voluntarily performed, and that for our sakes: For thus, or to this purpose, run the words: *If any man will come after me, let him* do as I have done; *even deny himself, take up his*, indeed my, *Cross daily, and so follow me.* Doctr. 1. 2.

13. I told you, I remember, my Text was a Law, and I repent not of the expression, though I know not how, since our Divinity has been imprisoned and fettered in Theses and distinctions, we have lost this word Law; and men will by no means indure to hear, that Christ came to command us any thing, or that he requires any thing at our hands, he is all taken up in promise: All those Precepts which are found in the Gospel, are nothing, in these mens opinions, but mere promises of what God will work in us, I know not how, *sine nobis*, though indeed they be delivered in fashion, like Precepts.

14. These, and many other such dangerous consequences do and must necessarily arise from that new invented Fatal Necessity; A Doctrine, that fourteen Centuries of Christianity never heard of: If we will enquire after the old and good ways, we shall find the Gospel it self by its own Author called a Law: For thus saith the Psalmist in the Person of Christ: *I will preach the Law, whereof the Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.* And how familiar are such speeches as those, in our Saviour's mouth: *This is my command; a new Commandment I give unto you; Ye shall be my Disciples, if ye do those things which I command you.* Among the ancient Fathers, we find not only that Christ is a Law-giver, but that he hath published Laws which were never heard of before: That he hath enlarged the ancient Precepts, and enjoyned new; and yet now 'tis Socinianism to say but half so much. *Clemens Alexandr.* (3. στρωμ. *in fine*) saith, that Christ is more than a Law-giver, he is both Λόγος καὶ Νόμος, and quotes St. *Peter* for it. Psal. 2. 7.

15. Well then, my Text is a Law, and a preparatory Law; it is the voice of one crying, Prepare the ways of the Lord; let all hills be depressed, and all valleys exalted. It bears indeed the same office in our conversion, or new birth, that

*Ariſtotle* aſſigns to his Privation in reſpect of natural Generation. It hath no poſitive active influence upon the work, but it is *Principium Occaſionale*, a condition or ſtate neceſſarily ſuppoſed or prerequired in the ſubject before the buſineſs be accompliſhed. For, as in Phyſical Generation there can be no ſuperinduction of forms, but the ſubject which expects a ſoul muſt neceſſarily prepare a room or manſion for it, which cannot be, unleſs the ſoul that did before inhabit there, be diſpoſſeſſed. So, it likewiſe comes to paſs in our Regeneration; there is no receiving of Chriſt, to dwell and live with us, unleſs we turn all our other gueſts out of doors. The Devil, you know, would not take poſſeſſion of a houſe, till it was ſwept and garniſhed: and, Dares any man imagine, that a heart defiled, full of all uncleanneſs, a decayed ruinous ſoul, an earthly ſenſual mind, is a Tabernacle fit to entertain the Son of God? Were it reaſonable to invite Chriſt to ſup in ſuch a Manſion, much more to reſt and inhabit there?

16. In the ordinary Sacrifices of the Old Law, God was content to ſhare part of them with his Servants the Prieſts, and challenged only the inwards as his own due. And proportionably in the ſpiritual ſacrifices, his claim was, *My Son, give me thy heart:* He was tender then in exacting all his due. It was only a temptation, we know, when God required of *Abraham*, that his only Son *Iſaac* ſhould be offered *in holocauſtum*, for a whole burnt Sacrifice, to be utterly conſumed, ſo that no part nor relicks ſhould remain of ſo beloved a Sacrifice. Yet even in thoſe old times, there were whole burnt-offerings; whereby (beſides that one oblation of Chriſt) was prefigured likewiſe our giving up our whole ſelves, ſouls and bodies, as a living reaſonable Sacrifice unto God. And therefore our Saviour Chriſt (who came to fulfil the Law, not only by his obedience thereto, but alſo by his perfect and compleat expreſſion of its force and meaning) doth in plain terms reſolutely and peremptorily exact from all them that purpoſe to follow him, a full perfect reſignation of themſelves to his diſpoſing, without all manner of condition or reſervation.

17. This was a Doctrine never heard of in the world before compleatly delivered. Never did any Prophet or Scribe urge or inforce ſo much upon Gods people, as is herein contained. Yet in the Evangelical Law, we have it preciſely, and accurately preſſed; inſomuch, that the holy Spirit of God has taken up almoſt all the Metaphors that can poſſibly be imagined, the more forcibly to urge this ſo neceſſary a Doctrine.

18. We are commanded ſo perfectly, and wholly, to devote our ſelves to Gods ſervice; ſo earneſtly, and reſolutely, to undertake his Commands, that we muſt determine to undervalue, and deſpiſe all earthly and tranſitory things beſides; nay, from the bottom of our hearts we muſt hate and deteſt all things (how gainful, or delightful, or neceſſary ſoever they ſeem) if they do in any meaſure hinder, or oppugn us in our journey to Chriſt.

19. We muſt not ſo much as look upon Chriſt, or glance our eyes upon his glorious mercy, expreſſed in ſuffering and ſatisfying for us (for St. *Luke* calls this Θεωρίαν) but we muſt reſolve to keep them there fixed, and not deign to think any creature to be a ſpectacle worthy our looking on; ἀφορῶντες εἰς Ἰησοῦν, (ſaith S. *Paul*) we have no Engliſh term that can fully expreſs the force of this word; for it is not only as we have it tranſlated, *looking unto Chriſt*, but taking off our ſpeculations from other objects, and faſtning them upon Chriſt, the Author and Finiſher of our Faith. Heb. 12. 11.

20. When we have been once acquainted, though but imperfectly, with this ſaving knowledge, we muſt ſtrait bring our underſtandings into captivity, unto the obedience thereof; and whatſoever other ſpeculations we have, how delightful ſoever they be unto us, yet rather than they ſhould over-leaven us, and (as Knowledge without charity is apt to do) puff us up, we muſt with much greater care and induſtry, ſtudy to forget them, and reſolve with St. *Paul, to know nothing, ſave Jeſus Chriſt and him crucified.*

21. When



21. When we have had notice of that ineſtimable Jewel, the Kingdom of Heaven (ſo called by our Saviour in the Parable) expoſed to ſale, though our eſtate be never ſo great, our Wares never ſo rich and glorious, yet we muſt reſolvedly part with all we have; utterly undo our ſelves, and turn Bankrupts, for the purchaſing of it. Hence are thoſe commands, *Sell all thou haſt.* And, leſt a man ſhould think, that when the Land is ſold, he may keep the Money in his Purſe, there follows, *And give to the poor.* And ſuch care is taken by the Holy Ghoſt in thoſe expreſſions, leſt any evaſions ſhould be admitted; leſt it ſhould happen that ſuch a Merchant ſhould find no Chapman to buy his Wares, nor (which is ſcarce poſſible) hands to receive his money, when he would beſtow it; it is further ſaid, *Forſake all, leave all*; by all means quit thy ſelf of thy own Riches, run away from thy Poſſeſſions. And if there be any thing yet more dear unto thee than thy Poſſeſſions, as neceſſary as thy Cloaths; *Deſpolia teipſum, Put off the old man, with his luſts and affections*; and though he ſtick never ſo cloſe, tear it from thee, ſhake off the ſin that hangeth ſo faſt on.

22. And yet the Holy Ghoſt proceeds further in a more forcible expreſſion: For many Heathens have been found, that could perſwade themſelves to prefer Fame obtained by a Philoſophical auſtere life, before Riches, or Honours, but *every man loveth and cheriſheth his fleſh*: Therefore, if there be a luſt ſo incorporated into thee, that it becomes as uſeful and neceſſary as thy right hand, or eye, yet thou muſt reſolve to be thine own executioner, to deform, and maim thy ſelf; for what will it profit thee, to go a proper perſonable man into hell. Nay, if thy whole body begin to tyrannize over thee, thou muſt fight and war with it, and never leave, till thou haſt brought it into Captivity. Then muſt thou uſe it like a ſlave, with ſhort and coarſe diet, and ſtore of correction, as St. *Paul* did, Ὑπωπιάζω μου τὸ σῶμα καὶ δουλαγωγῶ. Nay more, ſaith he, Ἐγὼ τὰ στίγματα τοῦ κυρίου ἐν τῷ σώματί μου βαστάζω. Such hatred he bore to that body of ſin, which did always accompany him, that not content to over-maſter it, he did ignominiouſly ſtigmatize and brand it with the marks of ſlavery.

23. Yet this is not all: If it be rebellious and incorrigible, thou muſt even diſpatch it, put it to death, and that no ordinary one, it muſt be a ſervile, flaviſh, cruel death; *Crucifie the fleſh, with the luſts and affections thereof.* A man would think that this were ſufficient, and that we might here reſt from further tyrannizing over our ſelves: but there is no ſuch matter; *If any man hate not Father, and Mother, and Brethren, and Siſters, and all the world beſides, even his own ſoul, for my Name ſake and the Goſpels, ſaith Chriſt, he cannot be my Diſciple.* And now we are at the heighth, never till now, did I tell you the full meaning of my Text; how far every man is ingaged by vertue of this Precept, *Let him deny himſelf.*

24. The ſtrength and vigour of this Phraſe (which expreſſes as much indeed, as all the former laid together) we ſhall the better underſtand, ſaith St. *Chryſoſtom*, if we conſider what it is to deny another: If a Father, in extreme diſpleaſure, do ſo caſt off his Son, that he denies him to be his Son, he becomes worſe than a ſtranger; for he will not ſo much as admit him to enjoy the benefit that common humanity teacheth every man to ſhew to another; he will not endure him in his ſight, leſs will he vouchſafe to expoſtulate with him; nay, he will rejoyce when he hears of ſome misfortune that hath befaln him, and be beholding to any man that will revenge his injuries upon him.

25. Thus muſt every one do, who enters into league or friendſhip with God; He muſt work himſelf out of his own acquaintance; He muſt be a ſtranger, (or, if God will have him) an enemy to all the world, and eſpecially to himſelf; though he flow with wealth, yet he muſt live as being poor, *as having nothing*, (ſaith St. *Paul.*) If affliction, or perſecution, come upon him in Gods behalf, he muſt with all joy entertain them. Whatſoever God enjoyns him, though otherwiſe never ſo diſtaſteful to him, it muſt be his meat and drink to perform it. There is

nothing must lay a necessity upon him, but only God; and, To serve him, he must account the only *Unum necessarium*.

26. Will you see an example of such obedience, and that in the Old Law. An extraordinary one you shall find in *Exod.* 32. 29. which depends upon a story which went before, the sum whereof was this: *Moses*, in revenge of that horrible Idolatry which was committed during his absence upon the Mount, commands the Sons of *Levi* to consecrate every man himself unto the Lord, upon his Son, and upon his Brother, and upon his Neighbour, by destroying any man, whoever he were, that came in their way: which they resolutely performed. And this obedience of theirs, was so acceptable to God, that at *Moses* death they obtained the blessing of Urim and Thummim above all the Tribes, with this Elogy: *He said unto his Father, and to his Mother, I have not seen them, neither did he acknowledge his Brethren, nor knew his own Children, for they have observed thy word, and kept thy Covenant.* By which obedience, the Children wiped out, as it were, the Fact of their Father *Levi*, who had before abused his Sword unto injustice, for which he lost the blessing, that else he should have had, *Gen.* 49.

Exod. 32. 29.

27. But will not here be room for that earnest Objection, which the Disciples, in great anxiety of mind, made to our Saviour, when he was pressing a Doctrine of the same nature with this we have in hand, *who then can be saved?* If there be required at our hands, so absolute and peremptory a resignation of our selves to Gods disposal, that we must root out of our hearts all manner of love of our selves, or any other creature, then Christ hath destroyed the whole Second Table of the Law. For, at the best, we are but to love our neighbours as our selves: If therefore our first Lesson must be to learn to contemn and despise, nay, even hate our own souls; Why do we not with the Levites, so commended even now, consecrate every man himself to the Lord upon our Kindred and Neighbours, destroying all about us? Besides, how dare we presume to be rich, or retain those possessions, which, as it seems, God hath bought from us? If our goods be not our own, if our souls be not our own, *Men and brethren, what shall we do?* Into what a strait are we fain? We are commanded to love our Brethren as our own souls, and we are commanded to hate our own souls, We are enjoyned to give God thanks for those blessings which here we are enjoyned to cast away. We are counselled, even by our Saviour, to be perfect as our Heavenly Father is perfect, and yet we must deny our selves; Whereas the Spirit of God hath told us, That it is impossible that God should deny Himself.

28. For answer: This Law must be read and understood, (as the Schools say) *cum grano salis*: For though it be most true, that by vertue of this Precept, we are obliged to an utter evacuation of the love and desire of any thing, and of all manner of confidence in our selves, or any other creature: Yet this must be understood, not absolutely, but when such things come in competition with our Love or Obedience to God: For otherwise, we are most necessarily bound, to love our selves and others, to study and care for our own good, and the welfare of our Brethren, even to lay down our lives for them. So, that we are not bound to destroy the love of our selves, but only when it is a hinderance to our fulfilling of what God commands us.

29. We therefore, who have given up our Names unto Christ, must expect to enjoy the fruits of his Obedience, by treading in the same steps which he hath left unto us. As shall be shewed hereafter more plentifully.

30. And yet it is not necessary, that we should exactly and curiously apply our selves to the Rule of his Obedience: For, whereas he voluntarily undertook the form and fashion of a Servant, and being Lord of Heaven and Earth, despised and neglected the riches and glory of this world: We notwithstanding are not tied to such hard conditions, but may flow and abound with wealth and honour; neither need we to deny our souls any pleasure under the Sun, but liberally enjoy it as the gift of God, as long as thereby we withdraw not our Obedience and Allegiance from God.

31. *Peccatum*



31. *Peccatum non est appetitus malarum rerum sed desertio meliorum,* (saith St. *Augustine* quoted by *Lombard*, 2. *Sent.* 42. *dist.*) *i. e.* Sin does not consist in desiring or lusting after things which in their own natures are evil and inconvenient, but in preferring a low inconstant changeable good, before another more worthy and of greater excellency and perfection: Whilest therefore, God has that estimation and value in our thoughts that he deserves, whilest there is nothing in our selves, or any other creature, which we prefer before him, whilest we conspire not with our lusts to depose him from bearing a Soveraign sway in our hearts and Consciences, whilest we have no other God before Him, not committing Idolatry to Wealth, Honour, Learning, and the like. It shall be lawful, in the second place, to love our selves: So that we fulfill this Commandment, when we do not Deifie our selves, whilest we sacrifice not to our own wisdom, nor burn incense to the pride of our hearts, *&c.*

32. Conceive then the meaning of this Law to be such, as if it had been more fully inlarged on this wise: Let every one that but hears any mention of Christ this day, take into deep consideration, and spend his most serious morning thoughts, in pondering and weighing, whether those benefits, which Christ hath promised to communicate to every one that shall be joyned and married to him by a lively faith, be worthy his acceptation: Let him oppose to them all the pleasures and profits which he can promise, or but fancy, to himself under the Sun.

33. If after a due comparing of these things together, he have so much wisdom as to acknowledge, that an eternal weight of joy and glory, an everlasting serenity and calmness be to be preferred before a transitory, unquiet, restless, unsatisfying, pleasure: And seeing both these are offered, and set before him; or rather seeing such is the extreme mercy of our God, that whereas the goods of this life, are not allowed, nor so much as offered equally and universally to all, (For not many have ground to hope for much wealth, Not many wise, not many learned, saith St. *Paul.*) Yet to every man, whom God hath called to the acknowledgment of the Gospel; these inestimable benefits are offered and presented *bona fide*, without any impossible condition, so that (let the Disputers of this Age say what they will) it shall be found, that those who have failed and come short of these glories offered, may thank themselves for it, and impute it to an actual voluntary misprision and undervaluing of these riches of Gods mercies which they might have procured, and not to any fatal over-ruling power, that did enforce and necessitate and drive them to their destruction.

34. These things considered, if you are indeed convinced, that light is to be preferred before darkness; It is impossible, but that you should likewise acknowledge, that it were meer madness for a man to imagine to himself any the most vanishing faint expectation of those glorious Promises, whilest he is busie and careful, by all means, to avoid those, indeed, thorny and unpleasant paths that lead unto them, whilest he promiseth to himself rest and impunity, though he walk in the Imagination of his own heart; Surely the Lord will be avenged on such a person, and will make his fierce wrath to smoak against him.

35. Therefore resolve upon something, If the Lord be God follow him, serve him, conform your selves to the form of new obedience, which he hath prescribed: But if *Baal* be God, if Mammon be God, if your selves be Gods, follow the devices of your own hearts; But by no means expect any reward at all from God for dishonouring him, or preferring a base unworthy lust before his commands. Loe 'tis the Lord of Glory who is Salvation and the way too, it is he that hath professed, that there is no possible way of attaining unto him, but by treading in the same steps which he hath left us. A way which he found full of thorns, full of difficulties, but hath left it to us, even strewed with Roses in comparison.

36. The greatest and most terrible Enemies which we can fashion to our selves, are those three, which St. *Paul* hath mustered together, and ordered them just Roman-wise, the strongest in the Rear, 1. *Death*, and 2. the sting of that, *Sin*; and 3. the

the poyson of that sting, *The Law*. But over all these, we are more than Conquerours; for it follows, *Thanks be unto God, which hath* (mark, hath already) *given us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ*. At the first, indeed, till the paths were worn, and made smooth, there were some difficulties; for what could the Primitive Christians expect, having all the world their Enemies, but reproaches, exiles, deportations, even horrible torments and death.

37. But we (blessed be our gracious God) are so far from being annoyed with such difficulties and pressures in the way, that all those are to be feared and expected by them, that dare deny the Profession of our glorious Religion. What therefore, if the Lord had commanded some great thing of us, even as much as he did of his Beloved Servants, the Apostles, and Primitive Christians, would we not have done it? How much more, when he says only; *Be not ashamed of me*; now, when you dare not be ashamed of me; now, that it is almost death to be ashamed of me: Deny not me before this generation, who would hate and persecute you to the death, if you should deny me. Crucifie unto you the unclean affections, the incendiary lusts of your hearts, which the Heathens have performed for the poor empty reward of Fame: Prefer not riches nor honours before me, which is no more than many Philosophers have done for those vulgar changeable Gods which themselves have contemned.

38. Having therefore (beloved Christians) such Promises to encourage us, such as the poor Heathens never dream'd of, and yet, for all that, travelled more earnestly after an airy phantastical happiness of their own, than we (to our extreme shame be it spoken) do after the true one: Having such advantages, even above the blessed Apostles and ancient Martyrs, Let us walk as becometh the children of God, having our eyes fastened upon the Lord our Salvation, and conforming our selves freely and unconstrainedly to whatsoever it shall please him to prescribe unto us: Not admitting our own carnal reason and worldly wisdom into counsel about his Worship, nor believing any thing which he has proposed unto us in his Word, but for the authority of him that spoke it, not accepting the persons of men; not perswading our selves to the belief of horrible and unworthy Opinions of God, because men, affected by us, have so delivered. It was a grievous complaint, that God made by the Prophet *Isaiah, Cap.29.13. Their fear towards me is taught by the Commandments of men.* Isa.29. 13.

39. Again, we must subdue our Affections to be ruled and squared according to the good Will of God, rejoycing to see our most beloved sins discovered and rebuked, and even crucified by the powerful Word and Spirit of God. Lastly, We must be ready for Christ his sake, to root out of our hearts, that extravagant immoderate Love of our own selves, that private affection, as *Basil* calleth it; resolving rather to undergo a shameful horrible death, than to maintain any inordinate base desire, or to take part with our filthy lusts against our Saviour, who hath so dearly redeemed us.

40. Thus have you heard in general terms largely, and, I fear, tediously, delivered the sum and effect of this Doctrine of Self-denial, (for the restraining of it to particular Cases, I have reserved to another hour:) Now I will according to my promise, as earnestly as I can, inforce this necessary duty upon you, from the two Circumstances before-mentioned, *viz.* 1. From the greater reasonableness in the thing commanded; And 2. Extreme Love and Kindness of the Law-giver, that hath in his own person, given us a perfect example directing us how we should fulfill his command.

41. For the first, namely, the reasonableness of the thing commanded: To omit, how all creatures, in acknowledgment of that duty which they owe to God their Creator, do willingly submit themselves to his disposition, denying their own specifical private natures for the general good of the world. For example; The Elements are subject to alterations and deportations, to be destroyed and revived, to be Instruments of Gods favour, and again, of his wrath: Surely, Man above all the World



World beside, (not excepting that glorious heavenly Host of Angels) is by a more indissoluble Adamantine chain obliged and bound to his Maker; *For, to which of the Angels said he at any time, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee?*

42. Again, when a great portion of those glorious Spirits had mutinously rebelled against God, and Man following the example of their prevarication, had with them plung'd himself irrecoverably into extreme unavoidable destruction; In that necessity, God had no respect to those heavenly Spirits, which were by nature much more admirable and perfect than we; for he did in no wise (saith the Apostle) take upon him the nature of Angels, but he took on him the seed of *Abraham*, and therein performed the glorious work of our Redemption.

43. Surely, after this great Love, than which (I dare not say, God cannot, but) I may well say, he will never shew a greater, we, his unworthy creatures, are bound to express some greater measure of thankful obedience than we were for our Creation. And, yet even then, the least that could be expected from us, was a full perfect resignation of our selves, to the disposition of that God that gave us our being. Therefore now, after a work that has cost God all that pains and study in inventing and contriving, and so much sorrow and labour in performing; Certainly, after all this, it is no great thing, if the Lord should require our whole selves, souls and bodies, for a whole burnt-offering a Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving: If he should require from us our whole substance, whole Rivers of Oyl, and all the Cattel feeding on a Thousand Hills.

44. Yet now he is content, that less thanks shall satisfie, than was due before ever he performed that glorious work: Nay he hath after all this taken off and subducted from that debt which we owed him for our Creation. For whereas then one actual offence against this Law, did necessarily draw along with it inevitable destruction; yet now, our gracious God perceiving that we are but dust, accepts of our imperfect sinful obedience; nay, sometimes of the inward desire and willingness to perform, where there is not power to put it in execution. Nothing then can be more reasonable, than that a Christian should be commanded, not to prefer the fulfilling of his own will before Gods Will, nor to suffer that his carnal desires, should have greater power and sway with him, than the command of such a God; or, Lastly, not to withdraw his Allegiance and Obedience due to his Redeemer, and place them upon a creature, but equal, or may be, inferiour to himself.

45. Secondly, Consider the wonderful love and kindness of the Law-giver, that hath already tasted unto us; tasted, nay, hath drunk the dregs of this unpleasant bitter potion. He by whom all things were made, even the Eternal Almighty Word: He which thought it no robbery to be equal with God, became his own creature, and submitted himself to be trod upon, reviled, hated, despised by the worst of all creatures, cruel, ungodly, and perverse sinners: He of whose fulness we have all received, did utterly evacuate and empty himself of his Glory and Majesty, denying to himself such things, which he would not, even to the most despised creatures. For, saith he, *The Foxes have holes, and the Birds of the air have neasts, but the Son of Man hath not whereon to lay his head. Ye know* (saith St. *Paul*, 2 Cor.8.9) *the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though he was rich, he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be made rich.* So poor he was, that he was forced to borrow Tribute money of a Fish, and was fain to strain himself to a Miracle to get the Fish to bring it. So poor, that he was forced to borrow a young Colt of strangers, never known to him; *Say* (saith he) *the Lord hath need of him.* A strange unheard of speech! The Lord that created the world, and can as easily annihilate it, Yet he hath need, and hath need of a Colt, the Foal of an Ass. Time would fail me, for I suppose the World it self would not contain the Books that might be written of his dangers, his temptations, his fastings, his travels, his disgraces, torments, and death; all performed, without any end proposed to himself besides our good and happiness. 2 Cor.8. 9.

46. *It behoved him* (saith St. *Paul*) *to be made like his Brethren in all things, that he might be a merciful and faithful High-Priest in things pertaining to God, to* Heb.2. 17,18.

*make*

*make reconciliation for the sins of the People*; *For in that he himself hath suffered being tempted, he is able to succour them which are tempted.* Which of you (my Beloved friends) when he does seriously meditate on this place, will not be forced to sit down, even ravished and astonished at the excessive and superabundant Mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ: That he which was the God that created us, in whom we live, move, and have our being; and, being more intrinsecal to us than our own Natures (as the Schools do boldly express) doth know our most hidden thoughts, long before they are, that he, notwithstanding, should descend to submit himself to the same infirmities and temptations with us, to this end, that by bettering and adding to that knowledge which he had before of our wants and miseries, to wit, by perfecting and increasing his former speculative knowledge by a new acquired experimental knowledge, he might be better acquainted with what we want, and thereby more inclined to Mercy and Commiseration, and more powerful to succour us being tempted.

47. See, behold (beloved Christians) how for our sakes he hath enlarged, as it were, three of his glorious incomprehensible Attributes, 1. His Omniscience, by knowing that personally and experimentally, which he did before only know contemplatively. 2. His Mercy, in that this his Knowledge, doth more incite his Goodness. And 3. his Omnipotent Power, for (saith the Text) in that he himself hath suffered, being tempted, he is (thereby) able to succour them which are tempted. There seems likewise to be an access to his Glory by this his great Humility; For
Heb. 5.5. saith the Text in *Heb.* 5.5. *Christ glorified not himself to be an High Priest.*

48. Woe unto us, my beloved friends, if such mercies as these be neglected and sleighted by us: Woe unto us, if a Commandment proceeding from such a Lawgiver have not greater force upon us, than any Obligation whatsoever.

*Use* 1. 49. And if these things be so, then (in the first place) How miserably are those deceived, that think they have sufficiently observed this Commandment when they deny to themselves some one delightful insinuating affection, some one enormous crying sin, to which they see others wilfully and scandalously devoted; yet in the mean time, reserve to themselves many a bosom, private, beloved Lust.

50. You that know the story of *Ananias* and *Saphira*, may remember with what a fearful name the Holy Spirit hath branded their sin; it is called no less than Lying to the Holy Ghost: It comes near both in name and condition to that fearful sin for which Christ did not die, and for which God could yet never find mercy enough to forgive.

51. Yet, consider what this sin was: They voluntarily sold all the means they had, that the money, being equally divided, might supply the necessity of those that wanted. Notwithstanding, to make sure work for some certain estate whereupon they might rely, they subducted some part of the money, and laid the rest at the Apostles feet.

52. St. *Peter* told them, that their Land was in their own power; neither did any constraint lie upon them, to enforce them to sell all: But since they had professed themselves among the number of them, which were willing to cloath, and cherish, and feed Christ, in the persons of their new-converted Brethren: It was horrible theft, and desperate lying against God, to diminish one peny of the sum.

53. Now, that you may know how much this concerns you: Which of you (Beloved Christians) hath not solemnly, and publickly, sworn and vowed to Almighty God at your Baptisme, not to prefer the vain pomp and vanities of this world, much less, the abominable crimes thereof, above your Saviour, into whose name you were baptized?

54. Are not you then most shamefully perjured, when you are so far from renouncing the vanities of this World for Christ his sake, that you will not be withdrawn from the crimes of it? When the base lust of an Harlot, or the furious excess of Wine, or that untempting, undelightful, and therefore more unpardonable sin of Swearing, and Blasphemy, shall be of sufficient force with you every



every hour, not only to withdraw all manner of respect, and obedience from Christ, but even to make you crucifie him again, and to put him to open shame.

55. And do not please your selves in this conceit, that because God does not exact of you now the forfeiture of your vow and promise, as he did of *Ananias* and his Wife, that therefore your case is much better than theirs: For, let me tell you, as our Saviour on such an occasion told the Jews, *Think you that you are less sinners than they whose blood* Pilate *mingled with the sacrifices, or those upon whom the Tower of Siloe fell?* So let me say unto you: Think you, that because God shewed so terrible an example upon *Ananias* and *Saphira*, for their lying to the Holy Ghost, by taking them away suddenly by a fearful death; and hath not yet shewed the like upon you, that your sin comes much short of theirs, and that you may notwithstanding escape? *I tell you nay, but except ye repent, ye shall likewise perish.* Alas, what a trifle was that judgment which befel them, to those plagues which are reserved for wilful obstinate sinners.

56. I beseech you therefore, Brethren, even by the bowels of Jesus Christ, that you would consider what it is you do, when you allow your selves in the practise of any one habitual sin; it is no less then a wilful wiping off the water wherewith you were Baptized; it is no less then an abjuring of Christ: nay, it is no less than a devoting and sacrificing your selves to Devils.

57. In the second place, Where will those appear, that are so far from de- *Use* 2.
nying all for Christ, that, for his sake, they will not leave one delightful profitable sin; they will rather deny Christ himself, than the least troublesome pleasure, running into all excess of riot: nay, they will sell Christ cheaper than *Judas* did; they will sell him, and take no money for him. What else do those that spend their time in idle vain Lying, in fruitless Oaths, in unnecessary Blasphemy? They can be content to see Christ himself almost every day naked, and do not cloath him; hungry, and do not feed him; in prison and do not visit him; for inasmuch as they perform not these works of Charity to his beloved little ones, they deny them to Him. Will they be found worthy of Christ; that for his sake will not do so much as a Heathen hath done in an humour, or for the unprofitable reward of fame? that, for his sake, will not forgive their brother some small injury received; nay, perhaps some great kindness offered, as a seasonable correction, or loving dissuasion from sin; that, for his sake, will not take the least pains in furthering their own salvation?

58. Lastly, What will become of me, and you, (beloved Fathers and Bre- *Use* 3.
thren of the Clergy?) We to whom God hath entrusted the exercise and managing of three or four of his glorious Attributes: for to us is committed the Gospel of Christ, which is the wisdom of God hidden from the world. And to us is committed the Gospel of Christ, which is the power of God to salvation, and which worketh mightily in them which believe, even according to the mighty working whereby he raised Christ from the dead. And to us is committed the Gospel of Christ, even the Dispensation of the riches of his glorious Mercy, and compassions.

59. What then will become of us, if we, notwithstanding these great ingagements, these inestimable prerogatives, shall turn this Wisdom of God into foolishness, by exalting and deifying our own carnal wisdom; if we shall weaken and make void this Almighty Power, by the violent opposition of our sinful lusts and affections; finally, if we shall be too sparing and niggardly in the Dispensing of these his Mercies; if we shall render his goodness suspected to our hearers, as if those frequent and plentiful offers of pity and compassion, were only empty histrionical expressions, and not professions of a mind, heartily and sincerely inclined unto us.

60. I will tell you what will become of us; and I ſhall the better do it, by telling you firſt, what an exceſſive weight of Glory, we eſpecially, ſhall loſe by it: *They that be wiſe* (ſaith *Daniel*) *ſhall ſhine as the brightneſs of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteouſneſs, as the ſtars for ever and ever.* Not as thoſe vulgar ordinary ſtars, that have light enough only to make them viſible; but like thoſe more noble lights, which are able to caſt a ſhadow through the whole Creation, even like the Sun in his full ſtrength. And the preferment we are likely to gain, is very anſwerable to our loſs, we ſhall be glorious ſhining firebrands, of the firſt magnitude, in whoſe fearful horrible deſtruction, God will ſhew what he is able to do.

THE



# The Fifth Sermon.

## ROM. VIII. 34.

*Who is he that condemneth? it is Chriſt that died, Yea rather that is riſen again.*

IF I durſt appear in this place with any ends and projects of mine own; If whilſt I preach unto you Jeſus Chriſt, I could think it worth my labour to loſe a thought about the purchaſing of a vain, fruitleſs reputation, and opinion amongſt my hearers; ſurely, I ſhould by no means omit ſo commodious and tempting an opportunity, as this argument of Chriſt's Reſurrection may ſuggeſt unto me. It being a buſineſs, in the effecting whereof, above all the works which God ever made ſince he began to work, he moſt eſpecially glorified almoſt all his divine Attributes: It being a deliverance, even of God himſelf, from deſtruction and rottenneſs.

2. It is an argument ſo pleaſing to S. *Paul*, that in many places, he ſeems to magnifie it even to the undervaluing, and diſparagement of whatſoever Chriſt before either did or ſuffered. In a Sermon of his (*Act.* 13.) preached at *Antioch*, he makes it the complement and fulfilling of whatſoever God before had promiſed to the Fathers, and of all the Propheſies which, ſince the beginning of the world, had been delivered by God's Meſſengers. To make which good, the Apoſtle himſelf in that place (whereas he needed not to ſtrain ſo far; there were then extant Propheſies enow purpoſely and preciſely declaring the glory and power of Chriſt's Reſurrection) he notwithſtanding, as it would ſeem, miſtakes that famous Propheſie of Chriſt's Birth in thoſe words of the ſecond Pſalm: *Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee;* and ſeemingly miſapplies them to his Reſurrection. Why, was he then indeed the Carpenter's ſon? was it a confeſſion, and not humility, that he call'd himſelf the Son of man? Were the torments of his Paſſion and Death (as himſelf ſeems to intimate, *John* 16. 21.) only the pangs and throws of his new birth? Acts. 13. Pſal. 2.

3. By no means: He was even in the extremeſt degree, and loweſt point of his humiliation: yea, when himſelf in that laſt terrible Agony, did ſeem to call it in queſtion; yet then alſo he was indeed the only begotten eternal Son of God: or, if he had not, moſt miſerable and deſperate had been our caſe. But by his Reſurrection, he did declare, unqueſtionably and without all contradiction, unto the world, his Glory and Majeſty: or, to ſpeak in S. *Paul*'s words, *Rom.* 1. *He was mightily declared to be the Son of God, by his Reſurrection from the dead.*

4. But we now celebrate a Feaſt, a ſeaſon of Joy and exultation, which we uſe not to do upon the memory of Gods moſt wonderful acts and exploits, though never ſo much expreſſing the glory of his Majeſty and Power; unleſs they have been beneficial unto us, unleſs they have very nearly concern'd our ſafety and happineſs.

5. And ſurely this great deliverance of Chriſt from the dominion and power of Hell and the Grave; when God called his Son the third time out of *Egypt:*

this victory of his, did in a high degree import us, and advance our welfare; it had some more then ordinary influence upon our salvation; otherwise, this season dedicated to the memory thereof, would not have been so acceptable to the Primitive Christians, to make them (as it were in revenge and faction against the late melancholly time of Fasting and Repentance) for its sake, to set up an Anti-Lent, and to appoint other forty days of Feasting and Triumph, which was more (as *Tertullian* boasteth) then all the solemn Holy-days of the Heathen joyned together. Yea, so scrupulous were they in the celebration of this Feast, (quite opposite to the solemn peevishness of some Christians of our times) that for the whole space between Easter and Pentecost, as it is thought, they quite intermitted the works and exercise of their vocations: they would not suffer one Fasting-day to appear; they left off their severity and discipline, their *Vigilia*, and *Stationes*; Nay, they would not, all that time, so much as *De geniculis adorare* (in the witty barbarous expression of the same Father, in his Book *De Corona Militis*) they would not shew so much faint-heartedness and dejection, as to kneel at Prayers.

6. Therefore, instead of saying fine things of the fashion and contrivance of this business of Christ's Resurrection; instead of raising matter of wonder and astonishment out of the glory and power of it; I will endeavour (being to conclude the solemn celebration of this Feast) by way of Use and Application, to discover the issue and fruit thereof in respect of us; not only the convenience, but the extream necessity, and the strict coherence, which our Salvation has, not only upon the Satisfaction and Death, but upon the Resurrection and Life of our Blessed Saviour.

7. Now we find many things ascribed to Christ's Life and Death in Holy Scripture, only as to Patterns and exemplary causes, being duties which the consideration of Christ's Death and Resurrection, ought proportionably to exact from us: As, If Christ be dead, Then count your selves also dead unto Sin; If risen again, then count your selves alive unto Righteousness. For how it should come to pass, that so much of our holiness as makes up mortification, and no more, should be ascribed to Christs Death, as a proper effect and fruit thereof: And the rest, which is newness of life and obedience, should be imputed to his Resurrection, I shall never be able to comprehend.

8. The benefits therefore which accrue unto us by Christ, I suppose may be divided either into those which flow from the merit of his Death, or from the power and influence of his Life. In the former, are comprehended all whatsoever Christ hath done for us: In the later, whatsoever he doth or will work in us. And both being extremely necessary, It shall be this hours employment, to shew with what good reason we celebrate a Feast at this time, that we should not terminate our contemplation only on the great love and bowels of compassions on Good-Friday expressed unto us; but also, and with better reason, on the Joy and comfort, which with great reason we may collect from this business of Easter; even that lively hope whereunto we are regenerated by the Resurrection of Christ: And to joyn with St. *Paul* in his wonder and amazement, at the consideration of the infinite mercy and power of God; and thereupon his boasting and challenging, securely, all manner of adversaries: *Who is he that shall lay any thing to the charge of Gods elect? It is God that justifieth: who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again.*

9. In which words are comprehended the great dependence and combination, which our non-condemnation or salvation has; not only with the death and satisfaction of Christ, but also rather, even with advantage on his Resurrection. Now, because they are so few, they cannot conveniently be divided, I will out of them raise this
*Doctr.* Doctrinal Proposition, namely, *That Christ's Resurrection and exaltation, is fully as necessary and effectual to procure and perfect our salvation, if not more, then even the all-sufficient Sacrifice upon the Cross.*

10. Which, that I may more fully and distinctly confirm unto you, I will divide into



into two Propositions, which if sufficiently maintain'd, doth necessarily infer the Doctrine. The first whereof is this: *That the purpose of Christ, who satisfied for our sins, and the Covenant which he made with God, who accepted of this satisfaction, was not, that remission of sins should immediately ensue upon his death, but only upon performance of the Conditions of the new Covenant made in Christ's Blood, which are, unfeigned Repentance for Sin, and a serious Conversion unto God by Faith.* The second, *That by the Dominion and Power of Christ, which at his Resurrection, and not before, he received, as a reward of his great humility; we are not only enabled to the performance of the conditions of this new Covenant, and, by consequence, made capable of an Actual application of his satisfaction; but also, by the same power, we shall hereafter be raised up, and exalted to everlasting Happiness.* Of these two Propositions therefore in the order proposed, very briefly, and even too too plainly. And first of the first, namely, *That the purpose of Christ, who,* &c. *Prop.* 1. *Prop.* 2. *Prop.* 1.

11. I confess, it would be no hard matter for a Disputant, meeting with an adversary that would be content to be swayed and governed by Reason alone; to molest, and even fright him from the truth of this Doctrine. For, if we shall consider not only the excessive unspeakable Torments which Christ suffered for us, but especially the infinite Majesty and Glory of the Person, who willingly submitted himself to that Curse: what less reward can be expected, than the present deliverance and salvation, not only of a few selected men, but even of many worlds of Men and Angels.

12. But it is not for us, Beloved Christians, to set our price and value upon Christ's precious Blood, to say, Thus much it is worth, and no more. As there have not wanted men on the other side, who have dared to affirm, That Christ's Blood, according to exact estimation, did amount to a certain value, by the worth and cost whereof, such a set number as shall be saved, were redeem'd and purchas'd. And if one besides should be delivered, it were more than the price of the Blood came to. What a fearful dangerous curiosity is this? Is it not a piece of *Judas* his sin, to set our own estimation and value, to make a bargain, and sale of Christ's Death; to set up a kind of shambles to sell his Flesh and Blood in?

13. But leaving these vain phantastical Calculations to their chief Professours, the Schoolmen, who are so unreasonably addicted to this dreaming Learning, that nothing can escape their Compass and Ballance. For, to omit their curious descriptions and Maps of the dimensions and situation of Heaven and Hell; the Figure, Borders, Illands of both; They have undertaken to discover the exact proportionable increase of the graces of the Saints, especially of the Blessed Virgin; whose good actions they have found to increase just *in Octupla ratione*: so that, for example, her twentieth good action, did exceed the first in virtue and intention of Grace, as much as the whole earth doth exceed a grain of mustard-seed.

14. Is not this (beloved Friends) a learning and wisdom to be pitied? Is not this that disease which S. *Paul* discovers (1 *Tim.* 6.) the effect whereof is to make men sick about vain questions, and oppositions of science, falsly so called? Therefore leaving these vain Speculations, as likewise others about the business in hand, no less curious, and much more dangerous, yet securely stated in these days, almost in every Pamphlet and Synopsis. As namely, Whether God could have contrived any course for mans salvation, beside that which he prosecuted? Whether, without accepting any satisfaction to his Justice, he could freely and absolutely have remitted our sins?

15. For what use or profit can be made of these Questions, though with never so great subtilty and curiosity stated? Besides, we find that God had professed unto *Adam*, that his death, together with the destruction of all mankind, should be the reward of the breach of his Covenant. By which means Gods Justice being interested in the business, the very grounds and foundation of this later question are destroyed, the doubt and scrue whereof must needs have been blasphemous: namely, Whether God could have been unjust? Nay more, it makes the sending of Christ into the world, together with his obedience to the death, even that accursed death of the Cross, to be a matter of no necessary importance; to be only a great Complement,

plement, whereby God shews unto mankind, that, though he could easily have remitted their sins without any satisfaction (for whatsoever is possible to God is easie) notwithstanding, that they should see, He would strain himself even farther for them, was very requisite; and withal, to shew his abomination of sin, he was content, that all this ado, all these pompous Tragical businesses should be performed.

16. But what saith the Scripture? If there had been a Law which could have given life, Christ should have died without cause. And thereupon our Apostle (in Rom. 3. 25.) saith, that *God hath set forth his Son to be a propitiation through faith in his Blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins, that are past through the forbearance of God. To declare, I say, at this time his righteousness, that he might be Just.* ——That is, left by the forbearance of God, who since the foundation of the world had shewed no sufficient example of his hatred and indignation unto sin; as also to shew there was a reason sufficient to move him to remit the sins of many his chosen servants before Christ: He hath now at last evidently expressed unto the world his righteousness; to wit, his ἐνδείκνυσιν, and ἀνταποδοσίαν, by condemning sin, and revenging himself upon it, in the person of his beloved innocent Son.

17. And lest all this stir should seem to have been kept only to give us satisfaction, and to create in us a great opinion and conceit of his righteousness; The Apostle clearly saith, He did all this to *declare at this time his righteousness, that he might be Just.* Which otherwise it seems he could not have been. But I am resolved to quit my self abruptly, and even sullenly, of those questions, and betake my self more closely to the matter in hand.

18. What therefore is the effect and fruit which accrews even to the elect of God, by virtue of Christs satisfaction, humiliation, and death, precisely considered, and excluding the power and virtue of his Resurrection, and glorious life? Why, Reconciliation to God, Justification or remission of sins, and finally, Salvation both of body and soul. But is there any remission of sins without Faith? Shall we not only exclude Works from Justification, but Faith also? God forbid. For so we should not only contradict the grounds of Gods holy Word, but also rase and destroy the very foundations of the second Covenant.

19. For answer: We must consider our Reconciliation under a two-fold state (according to the Distinction of the Reverend and Learned Dr. *Davenant* Bishop of *Salisbury*.) 1, Either as it is *Applicabilis*, not yet actually conferr'd, Or, 2. as *Applicata*, particularly sealed and confirm'd to us by a lively Faith. For the understanding of which, we must know, that in Christ's death, there was not only an abolishing of the old Covenant of Works; the Hand-writing which was against us, *which Christ nailed unto his Cross* (as S. *Paul* saith, *Col.* 1.) delivering us from the curse and obligation thereof: But also, there was a new gracious Covenant, or (which is a word expressing greater comfort to us) a new Will or Testament made, wherein Christ hath bequeathed unto us many glorious Legacies, which we shall undoubtedly receive, when we shall have performed the Conditions, when we shall be found qualified so as he requires of us.

20. Till which Conditions be performed by the power of Gods Spirit assisting
1. us; all that we obtain by the death of Christ is this: That, first, whereas God, by reason of sin, was implacably angry with us, would by no means accept of any reconciliation with us, would hearken to no conditions: Now by virtue of Christ's death and satisfaction, he is graciously pleased to admit of Composition; the former averse tion, and inexorableness is taken away; or, to speak more significantly in
2. S. *Paul's* language (*Ephes.* 2.16.) *Enmity is slain.* Secondly, that whereas before we were liable to be tried before the throne of his exact severe rigorous Justice, and bound to the performance of Conditions, by reason of our own contracted weakness become intolerable, nay, impossible unto us: we are released of that obligation, and though not utterly freed from all manner of conditions, yet tied to such as are not only possible, but, by the help of his Spirit which inwardly disposeth and co-operateth with us, with ease and pleasure to be performed. Besides which, we have a throne



throne of Equity and grace to appear before. Mercy is exalted above, even against Justice; it rejoyceth against Judgment; it is become the higher Court, and hath the priviledges of a Superiour Court, that Appeals may be made from the Inferiour Court of Justice, to that of Mercy and Favour. Nay more, whereas before we were 3.
justly delivered into the power of Satan, now being reconciled to God by the Blood of Christ, we are (as it is in *Col.* 1. 13.) delivered from the power of darkness, and translated into the Kingdom of his dear Son.

21. All this, and more (if it were the business of this time to be punctual in discovering all) hath Christ wrought for us, being aliens and strangers, yea, enemies afar of, without God in the world. Yet for all this, that Christ hath merited thus much for us, and more; notwithstanding, take away the power of Christ's Resurrection, and Life; take away the influence of his Holy Spirit, whereby we are regenerated and made new Creatures; and we are yet in the Gall of bitterness, and Bond of iniquity. For though (as it is, *Heb.* 10. 19.) we have παρρησίαν, *i. liberty*, and free leave, to enter into the Holiest by the Blood of Jesus, though there be a way made open: yet walk we cannot, we are not able to set forwards into it, as long as we are bound and fettered with our sins: though there be an access to the throne of Grace, yet it is only for them which are sanctified.

22. And therefore what dangerous consequences do attend that Doctrine which teacheth, That immediately upon the death of Christ, all our sins are actually forgiven us, and we effectually reconciled. But because another employment is required by this time, I will, out of many, make use of two Reasons only to destroy that Doctrine; whereof the one is taken from the nature of the second Covenant: the other, from the necessity of Christ's Resurrection.

23. For the first: If we, that is, the Elect of God (for I am resolved to have to do with none else at this time) be effectually reconciled to God, by virtue of Christs death, having obtain'd a full perfect remission of all our sins, why are we frighted; or to say truly, injured with new Covenants? why are we, seeing our Debts are paid to the utmost farthing, the Creditor's demands exactly satisfied, the Obligation cancell'd; why then are we made believe that we are not quite out of danger; nay, that unless we our selves out of our own stock pay some charges and duties extraordinarily, and by the Bye inforced upon us. All the former payments, how valuable soever, shall become fruitless, and we to remain accomptable for the whole debt?

24. But it may be (and that seems most likely) there is no such thing indeed as a new Covenant: Promises and Threatnings are only a pretty kind of Rhetorical device, which God is pleased to use, sometimes to allure us, and win our hearts to do that which shall please him; other times to startle, and affright us, when we are about something contrary to his command. And to say the truth, This must of necessity be the issue of the former Doctrine: For how is it possible to make these things hold together; We are already perfectly reconciled to God by the death of his Son, without any consideration had to our personal Faith and Repentance; And yet, unless we do earnestly repent us of our sins, and with a lively Faith adhere to Gods promises, we shall never be reconciled unto God! Or these, All our sins are already remitted, and that only for the virtue of Christ's satisfaction: And yet unless we believe, our sins shall never be forgiven us!

25. So that by this reckoning, we must be forced to purge the Gospel of those troublesome dangerous terms of Covenants, and Conditions, of those fruitless affrighting Conjunctions, *Si Credideris, Si non pœnitentiam egeris.* Or (which is all one) soften them into a sense utterly repugnant and warring against the natural force and signification of the words; on this wise: Where the Scripture saith, If thou repentest not, thy sins shall not be forgiven thee; Thou art not to conceive, that forgiveness of thy sins is a work yet to be done: or that it has any dependance upon any thing in thee: But this great blessing shall be hid from thine eyes, thou shalt never come to the knowledge of it, and thereby shalt live here a discontented pen-

sive

sive, suspicious life: Again, If thou believest, thou shalt be saved, that is, Thou shalt obtain a comfortable assurance of Hope, nay, an infallible faith of thy future Salvation: though that was intended thee, without any consideration of thy faith.

26. So that the Gospel of Christ, is not the power of God unto Salvation: for, How can the Word be an Instrument of that, which was long ago absolutely perform'd and purchased? And therefore Christ his preaching, his miracles, and tears, The Apostles Travels and Persecutions, The sending of the Holy Spirit, Baptism, Eucharist, Imposition of hands, Absolution, and many more blessed means of our Salvation, were not instituted for this end, to make us capable of Remission of our Sins (for that (it seems) was already not only meritoriously, but effectually procured, and without all manner of Conditions infallibly destin'd to God's Elect;) but only for this end, That whilst they live here, to their thinking, in danger and hazard, (but they are fools for thinking so) they may now and then be a little cheared and comforted with apprehending what Christ hath done for them, and to what a comfortable state and Inheritance he hath destin'd them. Thus the Covenant which God hath sworn shall be everlasting, is by the improvidence and ignorance of some men rendred unprofitable, yea, utterly abrogated: But (*Ne quid inclementius dicam*) we have not so learned Christ.

27. The second Reason destroying the former Doctrine, I told you should be taken from the necessity of Christ's Resurrection. For if the immediate effect of Christ's Death, be the purchasing of a perfect Reconciliation with God, and full remission of Sins for us the Elect of God; Then (I will not say, what Benefit, but) what necessity is there of Christ's Resurrection in respect of us? For, by this accompt, after the *Consummatum est*, upon the Cross, when the satisfaction was perfected, and our debts paid: Though Christ had afterwards miscarried, though he had been detain'd by death, though his Soul had been left in Hell, and he had seen corruption; Notwithstanding we should stand upon good terms with God, unless we shall conceive of Him worse than of the most oppressing Usurer, that when a debt is discharg'd, and the Bond cancell'd, will notwithstanding not release the Prisoner, unless the undertaker come in Person, or by main force deliver him.

28. I confess, that to see a friend that had ventur'd so far for us, as our Saviour did, that to do us good had put himself in such extreme danger. I say, to see such a one to be utterly cast away, without all hopes and possibility of being able to pay him our thanks, would be a spectacle, which would grieve and pierce our very souls, it would be a renting to our bowels. But this is only Charity and Gratitude, or good nature in us, which would procure this grief; not that it stands upon our safety, his preservation being a matter only of convenience, not extreme necessity to us.

29. We all do worthily condemn and detest, that blasphemous Heresie of the Socinians, who exclude the meritorious death and sufferings of Christ, from having any necessary influence into our Justification, or Salvation, making it of no greater virtue than the sufferings of the blessed Martyrs, who by their death, set their Seal and Testimony to the Truth of the Gospel, which freely offers forgiveness of sins to all penitent believers. Now the same injury which these Hereticks do to the merit of Christ's Death, in proportion the former Doctrine fastens upon his Resurrection, and new life, by taking from it the chief and proper effect thereof, which is an actual vindication of us from the power of sin, into the glorious liberty of the Sons of God, by the power of Christ's Spirit plentifully by him diffused and shed abroad in our hearts, and making the chief virtue thereof to consist in affording us only matter of comfort and hope, that God will deal no otherwise with us, than he hath dealt with Christ, and after a life full of disturbance and misery, revive us to glory and immortality with his Son for evermore: whereas S. *Paul* hath another kind of conceit of Christ's Resurrection: for, saith he, in *Heb.* 5. 9. Christ being made perfect, (*i.e.* glorified, *chap.* 2. 10.) becomes Author of eternal Salvation to all that obey him: *And if Christ be not risen, your faith is vain, you are yet in your sins*; and *if Christ be not risen, neither shall we ever be raised*, but be utterly irrecoverably condemned to everlasting rottenness.

30. And



30. And thus I am unawares fallen upon my second Proposition, namely, *That by the Dominion and Power of Christ, which at his Resurrection, and not before, he received as a reward of his great Humility, we are not only enabled to the performance of the Conditions of this New Covenant, and, by consequence, made capable of an actual application of his Satisfaction; But also by the same power, we shall hereafter be raised up, and exalted unto everlasting happiness.* *Propos.*

31. Though by the virtue of the Incarnation of our Saviour, the Humane Nature was raised to a state and condition of unspeakable glory: Notwithstanding, if in this place, as well as before, we shall be content to submit our Reason to Scripture, we shall find, that according to a Covenant made between Christ and his Father, he was content not to challenge to himself any right of Dominion and Rule over us, till he had perfectly deserv'd and earn'd it by a former voluntary submission and humiliation of himself.

32. The conditions on Christ's part we find most exactly performed by him, wholly resigning and prostrating his own will to the will and disposition of his Father. At his private passion, which immediately went before his Attachment, whne he was sacrificed, and even crucified, alone in the Garden, without the assistance and malice of a trayterous Disciple, of the chief Priests or Romans: Though he retain'd that innocent fear of death and shame which is natural to Man, which forced him to cry out, *Father, if it be possible, let this Cup pass from me*: Notwithstanding, though he could not hate his own life, yet, to shew he preferr'd the fulfilling of his Fathers will before it, he adds, *Nevertheless, not my will, but thy will be done*: By which words he resigns the whole power and faculty of his will into his Fathers hands. In the words of another Evangelist, he saith, *Not what I will, but what thou wilt*: Where he resigns and submits the Act and Exercise of his Will. And lastly, to make all compleat in the expression of a third Evangelist, he saith, *Not as I will, but as thou wilt*: Where he subjects not only the faculty and the exercise of his will to the performance of what God shall command him, but is willing and desirous to do it after what manner and fashion soever God shall be pleased. It is not possible for the understanding of man to add or conceive a degree beyond this. Luke 22. 42. Mark 14. 36. Mat. 26. 39.

33. In the next place we shall see, How God the Father is as good as his word to his Son: But, first, give me leave to complain to you of that Tyranny, which custom, partiality, or something worse, has laid upon our Understandings: And that is this, That whereseever any former Protestant Writer hath suspected a Doctrine as not beneficial, but rather dangerous, to some conclusion, which he is resolved to maintain against the Papists, we their Scholars are oblig'd to make good their jealousies and (may be) groundless suspicions.

34. To omit many examples, I will produce only these few: It lies upon us to maintain, that S. *John*'s Baptism, was one and the same Sacrament with that of Christs, contrary to expres words of Scripture, and something else: That Christ is a Mediator *Secundam Divinam Naturam*: which borders, I fear, upon an old dangerous Heresie. As likewise, (which especially concerns this place) That Christ merited nothing to himself by his Passion, neither was the Exaltation of his Humane Nature to the Dominion and Rule over all Creatures a reward of his Humility, but a preferment due to his Person, though by special dispensation the exercise thereof was deferr'd for a time, but should have been confer'd upon him as fully as he now enjoys it, though he had never suffered.

35. But Scripture teacheth us, That *Christ was to be made perfect by sufferings*: That, *Because he had drunk of the Brook by the way, Therefore he should lift up his head*: That, *For the joy which was set before him*, (that is, having an eye to the glorious reward and fruit of his suffering) *he endured the Cross, and despised the shame*, and therefore is set up at the right hand of Glory. *Because being found in fashion as a Man, he humbled himself, and became obedient to the death, even the death of the* Phil. 2. 8, 9.

*Cross*, Διὸ, *Therefore*, for this reason, *God hath highly exalted him, and given him a Name, which is above every Name*, &c. Nay, St. *Paul* makes the obtaining a Rule
Rom. 14. 9. and Dominion over mankind, a main end of his death, (for in *Rom.* 14. 9. he saith) Εἰς τοῦτο, *For this end, Christ both died and rose again, that he might be Lord both of the dead and of the living.* By his death, meriting this Dominion; by his Resurrection, receiving it. But I will forbear controversie, because I desire to seek out no adversary, especially in my preaching, but only the Devil and Sin.

36. This therefore I think, we shall agree upon, That it was the purpose and immutable decree of God, that after the fall and misery of man, whatsoever good should befal us toward our restitution and repairing to our lost happiness, should be convey'd unto us by our own nature, *That the Seed of the Woman should break the Serpent's head*; That is, not only in St. *John*'s phrase, destroy the works of the Devil, but also in St. *Paul*'s, destroy his kingdom and power, which is Death. So that, *As by Man came Sin and Error, so by Man also should come Grace and Truth. As by Man came Death, so by Man also should come the Resurrection from the dead*; By man also, life and immortality should be brought to light.

37. Now that these great projects and intendments might be brought about, and that the Humane nature might be furnish'd with ability to discharge this Province, and to go through with this great undertaking: God the Father, for the merit of
Eph. 1. 20 Christ's great humility, by his Resurrection, *hath highly exalted him far above all Principality and Power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named not on-*
Phil. 2. 9, 10, 11. *ly in this world, but also in that which is to come*: And *hath given him a Name above all Names, that at the Name of Jesus every knee should bow of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess, that Jesus is the Lord to the glory of God the Father.*

38. And thus much Christ himself confesseth, and acknowledgeth presently upon his Resurrection, for then he saith, *All power is given unto me in Heaven and Earth.* It was then only he received the Dominion, whereof his Father *David*'s Kingdom was but a Type and shadow: And as his Father *David* was anointed and deputed by God to the Kingdom, but received not actual possession of it till after many persecutions and afflictions at the hands of his Master *Saul*: In like manner, though our Saviour even in the days of his humility, teacheth us, that the *Father judgeth no man, but resigneth all judgment to the Son*: Notwithstanding these words are to be understood only by way of Anticipation, or Prophesie of what should befal him, after he should have perform'd the work of our Redemption: For while he lived here among men, he professed he was so far from being a King, that he had no sufficient authority given him to be a petty Judge in a case of Inheritance: And that wicked *Pilate* himself had power given him from Heaven to become his Judge: So that, though in the days of his flesh, he was Heir of all things, yet he was only a conditional heir, and therefore till the conditions were performed, and himself seized of the Inheritance, even the Heir himself differed nothing from a Servant.

39. But within three days after his Passion, the case was much altered: For, whereas before he was allowed no Authority, no, not in *Israel*; At his Resurrection, he obtains the Heathen for his Inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the Earth for his Possession. Now it would be a hard undertaking to describe the limits and border's of Christ's Kingdom; as also to define the Polity, whereby it is administred. Therefore, leaving the most glorious part of it, which is in Heaven, undiscovered; we find in Holy Scripture, that according to the several dispositions and qualifications of men here on earth, he hath both a Scepter of righteousness to govern and protect his faithful subjects and servants; and a rod of Iron, to break the wicked in pieces like a potter's vessel. And though the greatest part of the world will acknowledge no subjection to Christ's Kingdom; notwithstanding this does not take away his authority over them, no more than the murmuring, and rebellion of the Israelites did depose *Moses* their Governor. But there will come a time when that Prophetical Parable of his, shall be resolved, and interpreted to their confusion; when he



he shall indeed say, *Where are those my enemies, which would not have me to reign over them? Bring them hither, and slay them before me.*

40. But the most eminent and notorious exercise of Christ's Dominion, is seen in the rule over his Church, which he purchased with his own Blood: Now the first business he took in hand, presently upon his Resurrection, when all power and dominion was given him, was, to give commission and authority to his Ambassadours the Apostles, and Disciples, to make known to the world, that so great salvation which he had wrought at his Passion. Now though the Apostles were sufficiently authorized, by virtue of that Commission which Christ gave them in those words: *As my Father sent me, so send I you*——Notwithstanding they were not to put this authority presently in practise, but to wait for the sending of the Holy Ghost, which Christ before had promised them: That by his virtue and influence they might be furnished with abilities to go through with that great employment of reconciling the world unto God, by subduing mens understandings to the truth and obedience of the Gospel.

41. We read in the Gospel of S. *John*, that, during the life which Christ lived in the flesh, *the Holy Ghost was not sent*: and the reason is added, *Because the Son of man was not yet glorified.* The strength and vigour of which reason, doth excellently illustrate the point in hand. For, the sending of the Holy Ghost, was one of the most glorious acts of Christ's Kingly Office, and the most powerful means of advancing his Kingdom. Therefore, in the days of his humiliation, whilst he lived in the form of a Servant, before he had purchased to himself a Church by his own Blood, his Humane Nature obtain'd no right of dominion and power over mankind. For till we were redeemed from the power and subjection of the Devil, and sin, by the merit of Christ's Death, we were none of Christ's subjects, but servants and slaves, sold under sin and Satan.

42. So that it being necessary, that the Son of man should not only pay a price and ransom for our Redemption by his Death, but also, that the same Son of man, and none else, should actually and powerfully vindicate his elect from the bondage they were in, and effectually apply his merits and satisfaction to their souls and consciences; till he was in S. *Paul*'s words, Διὰ τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφανωμένον, *For the suffering of death, crown'd with glory and honour*; He, according Heb. 11. 9. to his Humane Nature (and that was the only instrument whereby our Salvation was to be wrought) had no power of sending the Holy Ghost.

43. And indeed till Reconciliation was made by his Death, to what purpose should the Holy Ghost be sent? What business or employment could we find for him on earth? You will say, to work grace and new obedience in us. I confess, that is a work worthy the Majesty and goodness of Gods holy Spirit. But yet, suppose all this had been wrought in us; put case, our hearts were sprinkled from an evil conscience, and that we were renewed in the spirits of our minds. Perhaps, all this might procure us a more tolerable cool place and climate in Hell: But without Christ, it would be far from advantaging us toward our salvation: for alas, though we should turn never so holy, never so vertuous and reformed: what satisfaction or recompence could we make for our former sins and iniquities? God knows, it must cost more to redeem a soul, therefore we must let that alone for ever; we must take heed of ever medling in that office, we must let it alone to him (even Jesus Christ) who alone is able to be at that cost.

44. But I might have spared all these suppositions: For, as, excluding Christ, there is no satisfaction, no hope of redemption for us: so, excluding Christ's satisfaction, he hath no power or authority, as man, of sending the Holy Ghost, thereby to work in us an ability of performing the conditions of the second Covenant; and, by consequence, of making us capable of the fruit and benefit of his satisfaction. Therefore, blessed be God the Father, for the great glory which he gave unto Christ; And blessed be our Lord Jesus Christ, for meriting and purchasing that Glory at so dear a rate: And blessed be the Holy Spirit, who, when Christ (who is

*flesh of our flesh, and bone of our bone*) did send him, would be content to come down and dwell among us.

45. We find in Holy Scripture, that our Salvation is ascribed to all the three Persons of the blessed Trinity, though in several respects: To the Father, who accepts of Christs Satisfaction, and offereth pardon of all our sins: To the Son, who merited and procured Reconciliation for his elect faithful servants; And to the Holy Ghost the Comforter, who, being sent by the Son, worketh in us power to perform the conditions of the new Covenant, thereby qualifying us for receiving actual remission of our sins, and a right to that glorious Inheritance purchased for us.

46. And from hence may appear, how full of danger the former Doctrine is, which teacheth, that actual remission of sins is procured to Gods Elect immediately by Christ's death; and how dishonourable it is to the Spirit of Grace, excluding him from having any concurrence or efficacy in our Salvation. For, if this should be true, the powerful working of the Holy Spirit, can in no sense, concern either our Justification, or everlasting happiness. For, how can it be said, that the Holy Spirit doth co-operate to our Salvation, since all our good and happiness was procured by Christ's death; not only before, but without all manner of respect had to our Regeneration and Sanctification, by the power of the blessed Spirit. Therefore by this Doctrine, if we be any thing at all beholding to the Holy Spirit, it is only for this, that he is pleased now and then, by fits, to be a messenger, or intelligencer, to discover unto us, what Christ alone hath purchased for us.

47. But I forbear to enlarge my self further in this point; and indeed I have already done too much wrong to the honour and dignity of this Feast, not only in mixing the business of Good Friday with it, as I did in my former part; but also (as I now have done) in taking in the matter and imployment of Whitsontide too. Suffice it therefore, that the sending of the Holy Ghost, was an especial exercise of that power, which was given Christ at his Resurrection; by the influence and virtue whereof, we do restrain and appropriate the merit of his Death to our own good and benefit.

48. Now I would not be mistaken, as if I said, that the Resurrection of Christ precisely taken for that individual action, whereby he was restored to life and glory, was then effectual and powerful to produce those admirable effects: For, that being a Transient action, past and finished many hundred years since, can very improperly be termed capable of having such effects ascribed to it as have since, and shall to the end of the world be wrought in Gods Elect. Therefore S. *Paul* shall be mine interpreter, in *Rom.* 5. 10. saying, *If when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life*; that is, By that glorious Life which began at his Resurrection. Rom. 5. 10.

49. For, as in the matter of Satisfaction, we ascribe our reconciliation to his Death especially, yet not excluding his former Obedience and Humiliation; but naming that, as being the complement and perfection, terminating whatsoever went before: So likewise, in Christs exaltation, though there were divers degrees, and ascents, and stages of it; yet we especially take notice of his Resurrection, because in that Christ took his rise as it were, and was then *a Bridegroom coming out of his chamber, rejoycing as a Giant to run his race. His goings out indeed were from the Grave, but his Circuit is to the ends of Heaven, and nothing is hid from his heat and virtue.* He illuminates every man that cometh into the world: *He was made*, saith S. *Paul*, *a quickning Spirit*, cherishing, actuating, and informing us with life and motion. By the influence and power of his life, he undergoes, as it were, a second Incarnation, living and dwelling in our hearts by his Grace, and reigning powerfully in our souls by Faith. Psal. 19.

50. And hereby he even shares his Kingdom, his Power, and his Victory with us: For, saith S. *John*, *This is the victory whereby ye overcome the world, even your Faith.* Christ is not content only to destroy in us, the works of darkness; to dispel the clouds of ignorance and error, or to rectifie the crookedness and perverseness of our wills: neither yet to implant in us a heavy, unactive, sleepy harmlessness, a dull



dull lethargick innocence; but withal, indues us, *Justitiâ germinante*, with a fruitful budding righteousness, and works in us, in the expression of St. *Paul*, both ὑπομονὴν τῆς ἐλπίδος, a patient unwearied hope, not hasty nor discontented with expecting; and κόπου τῆς ἀγάπης, a painful, laborious love, and ἔργου τῆς πίστεως, a working, sprightful, victorious Faith, whereby we violently lay hold on the promises. And in this sense, the same Apostle saith, that as *Christ died for our sins, so he rose again for our justification*: that is, one chief end of Christ's Resurrection, in respect of us, was to work in us a lively faith, whereby we might be justified, and acquitted from our sins. 1 Thess. 1. 3. Rom. 4. 24.

51. And yet the power of Christ's Life, leaves us not here neither: Nay, all this is performed only to make us capable of greater blessings yet. For, by our sanctification and new-birth, we are (saith *Tertullian*,) *Restitutioni inauguratî*, destin'd and consecrated to a glorious Resurrection. Hereupon S. *John* calls holiness, the first Resurrection whereby sin is destroy'd: And it is a pawn of the second, whereby Death also shall be swallowed up in victory. By the first, the sting of the Serpent is taken away, which is sin, (as S. *Paul* saith, *The sting of death is sin.*) And when the sting is gone, the Serpent cannot long out-live it; for by the second Resurrection, that also is destroyed. *Tertul. de Res. carnis.*

52. But you will say, How is Death destroyed? Do not all men die? Do not all men see corruption? You may as well ask, How is sin destroyed? For, have not all men sinned, and come short of the glory of God? Nay, do not all men sin, how righteous soever? And, if they were rewarded according to their own demerits, would they not all come short of the glory of God: Most certainly true: Therefore to say the truth, as yet, neither Sin nor Death are destroy'd, but only the Dominion of Sin, and the Victory of the Grave. And thereupon the Apostle contemplating the conquering power of Christ at his Resurrection, saith not, Oh Death, or, Oh Grave, where are you? for a little travel would serve the turn to assoil that question: But, *Oh Death, where is thy sting?* How comes it to pass, that thy poyson is not so keen and mortal, as it hath been; that it is so easily, though not expell'd, yet tempered and corrected by the healing Bezoartical virtue of Grace. And thou, *Oh Grave, where is thy victory?* Though thou hast given thine adversary the foil, though thou hast gotten him under thee, yet thou shalt never be able to detain him long: For, *behold, a little while, and he that shall come, will come, and will not tarry*: He will ransack the most private reserved corners of thy Treasury; and though thou mayest consume and devour our bodies, yet he will force thee to vomit and disgorge them again; he will not leave one portion, one morsel of them in thy stomach and entrails. 1 Cor. 15. 55.

53. I know, the ingenuous and learned *Pareus*, because he would not suffer any portion of the merit of Christ's Death to be extended and meant to the ungodly; or, that He, by the fruit of his Passion, should obtain any power over them, will therefore, consequently, exclude them from the efficacy and power of his Resurrection and Life: He will not allow them to be raised by the power of Christ, but only by the Justice of God to their own condemnation: So that, by his reckoning, the great business and work of the last day, shall not wholly lie upon Christ's hands to perform, but shall be parted and shared between the power of Christ, and the Justice of God.

54. I am confidently perswaded, S. *Paul* in this point was not of his mind, when he saith, *As in Adam all have died, so by Christ shall all* (All, without exception) *be made alive again.* And, *As by man came death, so by Man also cometh the Resurrection of the Dead.* Indeed, I wonder *Pareus* would not likewise find some shift to exclude Christ, as well from being a Judge to condemn the wicked: For with as much reason, and as great ease, he might have given him a Writ of Ease, a discharge from that Office as well as the other.

55. And now I could wish I had said nothing all this while: (and likely enough so could you:) But it grieves me, that the portion of time allowed me, will not suffer

suffer me in any reasonable proportion to contemplate the wonderful mercy and goodness of God; who, to do us good, has given such power to our nature in Christ, to make a new Heaven, and a new Earth, to restore a new Generation of creatures, ten times more glorious and perfect than the first. Only, now tell me, Did not S. *Paul*, with good reason, speaking of the Resurrection of Christ, give it an advantage and pre-eminence, even above his death? Is not the Μᾶλλον δὲ in my Text, the, *Yea rather, verbum* Τελευταῖον, a word of great moment and weight? Since the Resurrection of Christ, actuates and ripens the fruit of Christ's Death, which, without it, would have withered, and been of no help to us. Is not the doctrine of Christ's Resurrection and exaltation, with as good reason made an Article of our Creed; and as necessarily, if not rather, to be lean'd upon, as any of the rest? Nay, hath not S. *Paul* epitomized the whole Creed into that one Article, saying (in
Rom. 10. 9. *Rom. 9.*) *If thou shalt believe in thine heart, that God raised the Lord Jesus from the dead, thou shalt be saved.*

56. And now 'tis time to consider, who are the persons whom the Death, yea rather, the Resurrection of Christ, will protect and warrant from condemnation. In my Text, as we find none to condemn, so likewise, we cannot light upon any to be condemned. In the verse immediately before these words, the Elect of God, are those which are justified, and therefore must not be condemned. And, to say the truth, though we dispute till the worlds end, the event will shew, that the Elect of God, and only they, shall reap the harvest of Christ's sufferings, and bring their sheaves with them. As for the wicked and Reprobates, it shall not be so with them: but why it shall not be so with them, whether, because they have wilfully excluded themselves, or, because God had no mind they should be any thing the better for these things, I will not tell you.

57. In the verses on both sides of my Text, we find, that, We are those that must not be condemn'd: We? which we? why *Paul* and the *Romans*, *Jews* and *Gentiles*. What all *Jews*, and all *Gentiles*? I told you I will not tell: Only thus much let me tell you, we may boldly maintain S. *Paul*'s phrase: nay, it is unsafe, and dangerous to alter it. Why, it is all the comfort we have to live by, it is our glory and crown of rejoycing, that we are those whose salvation Christ did so earnestly and unfeignedly desire, and thirst after; that, to obtain power and authority to bestow it on us, he suffered such torments and blasphemies, that, *Never sorrow was like unto his sorrow, which was done unto him, wherewith the Lord afflicted him in the day of his fierce wrath.*

58. Wherefore, I beseech you (beloved Brethren) even by the bowels of this Jesus Christ, that you would give me leave to advise you, if there be any here fit to be advised by me, if there be any in this company as weak and ignorant as my self: (And though my heart be deceitful above all things; yet as far as I understand mine own heart, If I speak these words out of partiality or faction, let me be excluded from having my part in those merits.) I say, let me desire you, or rather, let our holy Mother the Church, perswade you (in the 17. Article) to receive Gods promises in such wise, as they are generally set forth to us in holy Scriptures?

59. For, consider impartially with your selves, what an unreasonable horrible thing is it, seeing there are so many several frequent expressions of Gods general love and gracious favour unto Mankind, inforc'd and strengthened with such protestations and solemn oaths, that the cunning'st Linguist of you all, cannot with your whole lives, study, conceive, or frame expressions more full and satisfactory. I say then, Is it not desperate madness, for a man to shew such hatred and abomination at these comfortable and gracious professions of God, that he can be content to spend almost his whole age in contriving and hunting after Interpretations, utterly contradicting and destroying the plain apparent sense of those Scriptures: and will be glad and heartily comforted to hear tidings of a new-found out Glose to pervert, and rack, and torment Gods holy Word.

60. On the other side; far be it from us to think, that it is in our power, when we



we list or have a mind to it, to put our selves in the number of Gods elect faithful servants. Or, to imagine, that we have God so sure chain'd and fettered to us by his Promises, that we may dispense now and then for the commission of a delightful, gainful crime: Or, that when we have business for a sin to advantage us in our fortunes, we need not be too scrupulous about it, seeing God is bound, upon our sorrow and contrition, to receive us again into favour. Thou wretched Fool! Dareſt thou make an advantage of Gods goodness, to assist and patronize thy security? 'Tis true, God has promised Remission of sins to a repentant contrite sinner: but has he assur'd thee that he will give thee repentance, whensoever thou pleaseſt to allow thy self leisure to seek it? No: Know, that there is a time (and presuming Security, like sleep, doth hasten and add wings to that time) when there will be found no way for Repentance, though thou seekeſt it with tears. And thus more than I meant for the persons.

61. And now what remains, but that we try an experiment: That we may know in what a comfortable state Christ hath set us; let us consider, and look about us, to see if we can find any enemies that are likely to do us any harm: For which purpose, we shall not meet with a more acurate Spy and Intelligencer than S. *Paul*: who in the remainder of this Chapter, after my Text, hath mustered them together in one Roll. But first, there is one, if he were our adversary, he would be in stead of a thousand enemies unto us, and that is GOD. But him we are sure of in the verse before my Text; for it is he that justifies, therefore surely he will not condemn: Therefore what say you to *Tribulation, or Distress, or Persecution, or Famine, or Nakedness, or Peril, or the Sword*? Why these are not worthy the naming, for over all these we are *more than conquerours*. More than conquerours? what is that? Why they are not only overcome and disarm'd, but they are brought over to our faction; they war on our side.

62. Well, in the next file, there follow adversaries of better fashion; there is Life, and Death, and Angels, and Principalities, and Powers, (who are those? In truth I know not; but be they who they will, they can do us no harm:) No, nor things present, nor things to come, nor heighth, nor depth; (These are adversaries we should scarce have dream'd of.) And to make all sure, in a word, There is no other creature shall ever be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.

63. Yet for all S. *Paul*'s exactness, there remains one enemy behind, and that is a sore one, of prime note; and truly I wonder how the Apostle could miss him. And that is Sin. I would to God S. *Paul* had taken notice of him: For this one enemy is able to do us more harm then all the rest put together: nay, but for sin, all the rest almost were our very good friends. Had we best supply S. *Paul*'s incogitancy, and even adventure to put him in the Catalogue too? Well, let them that have a mind to it, do it; truly, I dare not. And, but that I know *Martin Luther* was a bold spirited man, I should wonder how he durst so confidently have adventured upon it: In his Book, entituled *Captivitatis Babylonicæ* (*cap. de Baptismo*, near the beginning) he hath these words, *Vides quam dives sit homo Christianus sive Baptizatus, qui etiam volens non potest perdere suam salutem quantiscunque peccatis, nisi nolit credere.* I will not translate them to you: and I would they had never been Englished; for by that means, it may be, some of our loudest preachers would have wanted one point of comfortable false doctrine, wherewith they are wont to pleasure their friends and benefactors. Only, let us do thus much for S. *Paul*'s credit, to believe it was not meerly inconsideration in him to leave out sin in this catalogue; that there was some ground of reason for it: For though it may come to pass, by the mercy and goodness of God, that even sin it self shall not pluck us out of his hand, yet it would be something a strange prepostorous Doctrine, for a Preacher of the New Covenant, to proclaim, that we shall undoubtedly obtain the promises of the Covenant, though we never so much break the Conditions.

64. I do confess my self very guilty, and am sorry that I have thus long exercised and

and wearied your patience: And yet, for all that, have not perform'd that task which I fully resolv'd upon, when I adventured upon this subject; and that was, to spend this time in raising your devotions to the contemplation of the glorious mercies of God, expressed to us in Christ's Resurrection and Exaltation. But because other thoughts have carried me away (even against my will) almost all this while, I shall further take leave to wrong and injure your patience, with proposing one consideration more, which ought by no means to be omitted.

65. And that is, to take notice of the person, to whom we have been beholding for these unspeakable mercies; and that is Christ, Christ alone, none else mentioned or thought upon. If *Bellarmine* had been to advise S. *Paul*, if he had been privy to the writing of this Epistle, it is likely he would not have taken it ill, to have had Christ's name in the matter of our Salvation: But he would not have endured the Apostles utter silence of all helps and aids besides: yea, though himself acknowledgeth it to be the safest course, to put our whole confidence, only in the mercy of God; yet, *quia magis honorificum est habere aliquid ex merito*, because it concerns our credit, to put in a little for merit and desert on our side. He would not have us so to disparage our selves, as to make salvation a meer Alms, proceeding meerly out of Courtesie.

66. Nay but, Oh thou man, What art thou that answerest against God? What art thou that justifiest thy self before him? Nay, what art thou that condemnest God, making him a lyar all the Scripture over? the whole project whereof is this, to let us know, how unable, how sick, how dead we are of our selves, and therefore ought most necessarily to have recourse to him for our salvation. As for us (Beloved Christians) if we must needs rejoyce, let us rejoyce in our infirmities, let our
Isa. 63. 1, 2. glory be our shame, and let us lift up our eyes and behold; *who is this that cometh from Edom, with died garments from Bozrah; This* that is *glorious in his apparel, travelling in the greatness of his strength?* And Christ will say, *It is I that speak in righteousness, mighty to save*: But, *wherefore Lord, art thou red in thine apparel, and thy garments like him that treadeth in the wine-fat?* He will answer, *I have trodden the wine-press alone, and of the people there was none with me*: for which reason I am now crown'd with glory, and honour, and immortality! I alone am mighty to save, and besides me there is none other.

Psal. 45. 67. And *good luck have thou with thine honour, Oh Lord: ride on, because of thy word of truth, of meekness, and of righteousness: and thy right hand shall teach thee terrible things*: Terrible things for the King's enemies, for them which would not have thee to rule over them. And good luck have we with thine honour, O Lord: ride on, because of thy word of truth, of meekness, of righteousness, and thy right hand shall teach thee gracious and comfortable things for us thy servants, and sheep of thy pasture; who dare not exalt a weak arm of flesh against thee. Thy right hand shall mightily defend us in the midst of all our enemies. Thy right hand shall find us out, and gather us up, though lost and consum'd in the grave; though scattered before the four winds of heaven: And, thy right hand shall exalt us to glory and immortality for ever with thee in thy heavenly Kingdom: where all the days of our life, yea, all the days of thy glorious endless life, we shall, with Angels and Archangels, say, *Glory, and honour, and power, and immortality, be unto him which sitteth on the throne; and to the Lamb, and to the Holy Spirit, for ever, and for ever.* Amen, Amen.

The



# The Sixth Sermon.

## Luke. XVI. 9.

*Make to your selves friends of the Mammon of unrighteousness, that when ye fail, they may receive you into everlasting habitations.*

THE *Children of this world* (saith Christ) *are wiser in their generation than the Children of Light.* To make which good, our Saviour, in so much of the Chapter as goes before my Text, brings in a Story, or, as they call it, a Parable of a cunning Fellow, yet no great Projector neither, no very subtile Politician; notwithstanding, one who being in an extremity, turned out of his Office for mispending his Masters Goods, had found out a shift, and that by meer cousenage, to procure so much as would serve to keep him, indeed not according to the Port and fashion after which before he had lived; but only to maintain him in meat and drink, out of danger of starving, or, which was more fearful, because more full of trouble or dishonour, hard labour or begging

2. Surely it had been no hard matter for our Saviour, who knew all whatsoever was in man, to have discovered more subtil projects, plots of a finer and more curious contrivance than this fellow's: But this, it seems, would serve his turn well enough for the purpose, for which he made use of it! And to say the truth, there cannot be imagined an example more exactly suiting, more closely applicable to his intent, which was not to discredit and dishearten his followers, by comparing, I, and preferring the cunning of a ordinary fellow, an meer Bayliff, or Steward, before that spiritual heavenly wisdom to which they pretend: Nor, secondly, to instruct them by indirect and unwarrantable courses to provide for themselves hereafter. But chiefly this,

3. To teach us, by objecting to our view, a man who by his own negligence, and carelessness, being brought to an extremity (for there was no necessity he should be brought to these plunges; a little timely care and providence, even ordinary honesty, would easily have warranted and preserved him) had upon the sudden found out a trick of his Office, namely, by proceeding in his old courses of wasting his Master's substance to the enriching of his Fellow-servants, thereby gained their good wills, that for the time following they might preserve him from perishing.

4. Our Saviour, I say, by this example, would teach us, That since God hath plac'd us here in this world as his Stewards, has put into our hands, his Goods, his Riches, to be dispensed for his use and advantage: And such Stewards (we are) who have advantages infinitely more urgent and pressing us to an honest faithful discharge of our Office, than this man in the Parable ever had; As first, We must of necessity fail, and be cashiered of our Office. All the power of Heaven and Earth cannot procure us a perpetuity in it: The case did not stand so with this man, for it was meerly his own fault to deserve discarding; and besides, having deserved that censure, it was his misfortune too, that his Lord should come to the knowledge of it, (for it is no impossible thing, that a Steward should thrive by his Lords loss, and yet nere be called to an account for it.) And secondly, upon our behaviour in this our Office, depends the everlasting welfare of our souls and bodies; we shall for ever be

disposed of, according to the honest, or unfaithful discharge of our place: If ill, Lord what shall become of us? Where shall we appear in that great day of account? I dare not almost tell you the issue of it: But if we have carried our selves as faithful Servants; propose to your selves your own conditions, give your thoughts license and scope to be excessive and over-flowing in their desires, if the whole extension and capacity of your thoughts be not satisfied and filled to the brim with measure pressed down and running over, God himself (which is impossible to imagine) will prove a deceiving unfaithful Master.

5. These things therefore considered, without question, it doth infinitely concern us to consult, and project, what we mean to do with our Riches, to what employment we intend to put those honours, and that power which God hath conferred on us in this life: Whether to receive them as our good things, to go away contented with them as our Rewards, our final rewards, expecting no other good things from God after them: Or, which is our Saviours advice, use them as means, and helps of attaining blessings above all conceivable proportion exceeding them; so dispensing and providently scattering them abroad, that against our time of need, (which sooner or later will undoubtedly come) we may oblige to our selves such friends, so gracious, and prevailing with our Master, who, either by their Prayers & Intercessions, or some other way which we know not, may procure for us admission into our Master's joys, to be no longer Stewards and Servants, but Friends and Sons: Thus by the help and benefit of this *Mammon of unrighteousness* in my Text, *these little things*, even the least blessings that God has to bestow upon us, so called in the verse following, and in the next but one to that, these *things of other men*, as if they were trifles, not worthy the owning if compared with what rewards may be had in exchange for them, purchasing to our selves everlasting and glorious rewards; By the assistance of our Riches (in the expression of St. *Paul*) *laying up for our selves a foundation of good works against the time to come, that we may lay hold on eternal life.*

6. And this I suppose to be the force and meaning of this ἐνταῦθον, or moral of the Parable, which Christ hath closely contrived and pressed into these few words, *Make to your selves friends of the*, &c. In which words I shall observe unto you these three general parts:

1. What we must expect at last, notwithstanding all the Riches and Pomps of this world, *i. e. To fail.* Christ you see makes no question at all of it, he takes it for granted, where he says, *That when ye fail*, as implying, that certainly fail we must.
2. This being supposed, that fail we must, the counsel of Christ comes in very seasonably, namely, to provide for the main, to take order, that though we our selves sink, yet we may procure us friends to support us in our necessities, and that is, *by making to our selves friends of the Mammon*, &c.
3. The comfortable issue and convenience which shall accrew unto us by those friends thus purchased, *i.e.* by them *to be received into everlasting*, &c. Of these in the order proposed.

*Part. 1.* 7. You do not expect, I am sure, that I should go about seriously to perswade you, that you shall not live here for ever; For, whom should I seek to perswade? God forbid I should be so uncharitable, as to think, or, but suspect, that ever I should find occasion to make use of any perswasions for such a purpose. Indeed a very good man (it was the Prophet *David*) once said *in his prosperity, I shall never be removed, Thou Lord of thy goodness hast made my hill so strong*: But was this well said of him, think you? It seems not: For presently to confute this his confidence, *The Lord did but turn his face away from him, and he was troubled.* Yet surely such a speech as this could never be spoken upon better grounds; for this his assurance, it seems, proceeded not out of any presumptuous confidence of his own strength or policy: But only out of consideration of God's especial Providence shew'd in his wonderful preservation from many great and imminent dangers, and in preferring him from a low contemptible fortune to the Rule and Dominion over his People.

Psal. 30. 6. Ver. 7.

8. There



8. There is another fellow in a Parable, who though he came short of *David*, in this his unwarrantable confidence and presumption upon that foundation of Riches and Wealth, which with unwearied anxiety and care he had laid up, notwithstanding was more suddenly and unanswerably confuted: For, he did not promise to himself a perpetuity, only he imagined to himself (as he thought, reasonably) that since he had at last obtained that which he had aimed at, and which had cost him so many years travel, it were fit for him now to enjoy the fruit which he had so dearly bought. And in a joyful contemplation of this his happiness he enters into Dialogue with his soul, *Soul*, saith he, now *take thy rest*, No more shalt thou be vexed, and even consumed with the painful and violent thirst after Riches, thou hast that laid up for thee which shall abundantly satisfie all thy desires. All my business hereafter, shall be to find out ways how to repay unto my soul all those pleasures which herefore I have denied unto my self; I have store sufficient for many years expences safely laid up in my Barns: Yet for all this man's thus pleasing himself with assured promises of many years happiness; If you will but vouchsafe to enquire after him the very next day after he spoke thus, His Garners it is likely you may yet find standing, throng'd and oppressed with the abundance of corn. But for his soul (for whose sake all this ado had been kept) the Lord knows what became of that; it was hurried away, no man can tell whither. Luk. 12.

9. Now the thing that it becomes me to desire at your hands from the consideration of these two Examples, is this, not to require of you to believe that you must once fail (for that I suppose were needless) nor yet to dissuade you from allowing to your selves a reasonable use and moderate lawful pleasures from that abundance of blessings wherewith God hath enriched you beyond all other men. But to beseech you, that this meditation, that certainly you must fail, may be no unwelcom thought to you, that when the time shall come that you must leave these riches and pleasures which God has given you here to enjoy, it may not come upon you as an unexpected misfortune, as a thing you were afraid of, and would willingly be content to avoid.

10. I confess, this were a meditation sufficient to discourage and quite dishearten a man that were resolved to take up his rest in the pleasures and preferments of this world, that were content to sit down satisfied with such a sleight happiness, as this life is able to afford him; for one who would make Riches his strong City, a place of refuge and security, a fortress whereto he would have recourse in all his extremities, and from whence he would expect safety in all dangers and troubles which may assail him: For, what were that, but to withdraw him from his strong holds, and leave him unfortified and exposed to any injury and misfortune! How could I be more injurious to such a man, than to vex and affright him with such sad melancholick thoughts as these, That the time will come, when that strong Castle of his, his Riches, shall be undermined and demolished, when he shall be left naked and defenceless. At which time, if it were possible for him to retain his Riches, which before he made his Bulwark and place of Security, yet he will find them then but Paper-Walls, unable to stand the weakest battery.

11. But I hope better things of you, (Beloved Christians) even things which accompany salvation: And indeed, why should I not? Who can forbid me to hope so? For alas, I know you not. I have no reason to assure my self of the contrary. And then I should be most inexcusably uncharitable, if I should not even rejoyce in this my hope: I see God hath plentifully shower'd down upon you, almost overwhelm'd you with all the blessings of this life. He has moreover given you peaceable times to enjoy them, (Blessed be his holy Name for it, and a thousand blessings be returned into the bosom of his Anointed for his most pious Christian-like care to confirm this peace, and to preserve it from interruption.) God, I say, has given you leisure and opportunity to enjoy and improve these your riches for your everlasting happiness: A comfort which he has denied almost to all other Nations; Nothing abroad but Wars, and rumours of Wars, no joy nor comfort but only in the effusion of precious Christian bloud, nothing but sacking of Towns and Invasions of Countries, God

only knows upon how juſt pretenſions. But which is above all other bleſſings, (indeed without which all the reſt will prove very curſes) God has given you an abundant plentiful uſe of his bleſſed Word and Sacraments, every week, ſeveral times (till now) a worthy and able Clergy to put you in mind, how great an account you are to make to Almighty God of theſe his bleſſings, and what extraordinary Intereſt is expected at your hands.

12. Let me not therefore, I beſeech you, be your Enemy, if I prove troubleſome to any ſlumbring Lethargick Spirit, if I put him in mind, that the time will come, when ſleep ſhall for ever depart from his eyes, and that if his ſlumber laſt till a Trumpet awake him, darkneſs he may find, moſt palpable *Ægyptian*-darkneſs, but not darkneſs commodious to call on and procure ſleep, not very convenient to take ones reſt in. Forgive, I beſeech you, my importunity, if I earneſtly deſire you frequently to repreſent to your minds a time of Failing, and preſently after that a ſevere inexorable Judge, requiring a ſtrict exact account of your behaviour in your Stewardſhip; if I beſeech you, from the conſideration of the fooliſh Virgins, not to put far from you the comming of the Bridegroom, not to frame to your ſelves reaſons and probabilities, why he is not likely to come yet a good while, (for he himſelf has told you, he will come as a Thief in the Night, and therefore when you are thus ſecure and ſlumbering, your ſelves create a night, a fit ſeaſon for him to come unawares upon you.) For, if you be unprovided of Oyl in your Lamps, of good works which may ſhine before men, and the door be once ſhut, Talk not of any new deviſed Faith, and I know not what aſſurance; there is no poſſibility of ever having it opened, but you ſhall be forced to remain expoſed to all dangers, to all manner of miſfortunes, not one ſhall be found to befriend you, and to receive you into everlaſting habitations.

13. And, I pray you, conſider, that if the apprehenſion of theſe things conceiv'd not as preſent, but as to be expected, it may be many years hence, be ſo diſtaſteful and ominous to fleſh and bloud, Who will be able to abide the time, when it ſhall, indeed, overtake him? If now in theſe days of leiſure and forbearance (a ſeaſon which God out of his glorious mercy hath allowed us on purpoſe to ſpend in ſuch thoughts as theſe, in projecting againſt the evil day) the meditation thereof bring ſuch anguiſh and torment along with it; what terrible inſupportable effects will it work in us, when we ſhall find our ſelves ſurprized by it, and caught as in a ſnare? If a man can no ſooner hear ſuch things related, or but ſeriouſly think upon them, though in the height of his jollity, but ſtraight, as if ſome ill news had been told him; as if he had heard ſome ſad tragical ſtory of his own misfortunes, he will preſently recoil from his mirth, pleaſure will become troubleſome and diſtaſteful to him; Oh with what anguiſh and vexation of ſpirit, with what agony of ſoul ſhall they be entertained, when they come in earneſt?

14. Obſerve therefore, I beſeech you, that our Saviour does not bid you, When you fail make to your ſelves friends; No alas, that is not the time to make friends in; Then is the ſeaſon when you are to expect comfort and aſſiſtance from thoſe friends which you have gain'd before, in the time when you were furniſhed with ſuch good things as were likely to oblige men unto you. What title then can be found out equal to expreſs the folly and madneſs of ſuch people; who, as if God had created them on purpoſe for the pleaſures and vanities of this world, make that the whole buſineſs of their lives; and, as if the care of their ſouls everlaſting diſpoſal were but an employment of an hours diſpatch, will not vouchſafe ſo fruitleſly to caſt away any part of the time, when their ſouls are vigorous and healthful, about ſuch a trifling deſign, but deſtine their laſt few hours, when they are unable for any buſineſs elſe, to ſettle for themſelves an eſtate of eternity.

15. But becauſe I have not the leiſure now to proſecute this Argument as fully as it may deſerve; Give me leave, I pray you, in brief, to preſent to your view, a man brought to ſuch an extremity as this; One faſtened and chain'd unto the bed of ſickneſs, one that has already received within himſelf the meſſages of death, *Death beginning*



*beginning* (in the language of the Pſalmiſt) *to gnaw upon him.* Take the pains, I beſeech you, to imagine to your ſelves (and it will require ſome courage but to conſider it) what unquiet buſie thoughts ſhall then poſſeſs him, what terrible affrighting meditations ſhall then be ſuggeſted to him, when he ſhall be forced to apprehend, that now he has but a very ſmall portion of time left him; and yet for all that, all the buſineſs for the diſpatching of which he came into the world, is left undone; the counſel and good intention of God, out of which he gave him his Riches, being utterly defeated, ſcarce one friend made, that will vouchſafe to look upon him now in his neceſſity: but on the contrary, many ſore enemies procur'd, that will be ready to cry for vengeance againſt him: No account to be found of the diſpenſation of thoſe goods which God has given him, but ſuch a one as will ſerve to feed and nouriſh the diſtemper and ſickneſs of his thoughts: ſo much (may be) ſpent in the proſecution and fulfilling of his ungodly luſts, ſo much in gorgeous raiment and delicious feeding, yet all this while ſcarce one poor *Lazarus* obliged. Now all the remedy that is to be had in ſuch an exigence as this, is to have the next Preacher ſent for, who muſt inſtill a little comfortable Divinity into him, to make him ſleep, and ſo his ſoul departs the Lord knows whither. And yet theſe are but the beginings of ſorrows, but what the end and perfection of them will be, I confeſs I have not the courage to tell you.

16. But yet for all this, I know men are apt ſo much to favour themſelves in their ſecurity, they will be ready to produce that famous example of the Thief on the Croſs to confute me, and to teſtifie, that even he that ſhall at the laſt puſh, as it were, have recourſe unto Gods mercy, is not altogether hopeleſs. Beſides, Did not he which came the laſt hour of the day to labour in the Vineyard, receive the ſame wages with them who had ſuffered the toyl and heat of the whole day? For the Thief on the Croſs, there can lie no exception againſt the example. But yet conſider, I pray you, that from the beginning of the world, till the time that the Scripture-Canon was ſealed up, there is not to be found one example more to equal it. Beſides, it was done at the time of Chriſts ſuffering; a ſeaſon wherein God in that one Act of the Redemption of the world, by the death of his Son, expreſſed the very utmoſt of his mercy, and diſcovered unto the world, as it were, in one entire ſum, all the riches and treaſures of his goodneſs. If therefore at ſuch a time, he was pleaſed to work a Miracle of mercy upon one, who probably having ſpent his whole life in ungodly forbidden courſes, had not, till then, light upon any extraordinary opportunities and means, able to break in pieces, and melt his flinty obdurate heart; Can this example then be any advantage to you, who every day, almoſt, have more than ſufficient means and offers of Grace, and are continually threatned with the danger of deferring your repentance, and of prolonging the time of making up your accounts; ſince you neither do, nor muſt, know the day nor hour, when God will expect them at your hands? *Obj.* 1. 2.

17. As concerning the man which was called the laſt hour of the day to labour in the Vineyard: I pray you take notice, that this man was a Labourer, and though he took pains but for a ſhort time, yet labour he did: whereas, he that ſhall defer his repentance and amendment of life, till his laſt hour, if he indeed prove ſorry for his ſins, yet labour he cannot; the beſt that he can do, is to make offers and reſolutions to work the good work of God, if it ſhall pleaſe him to ſpare him life: But that thoſe reſolutions of his ſhall be accepted with God, inſtead of real very labour indeed, I find no commiſſion to aſſure you. But I confeſs, it is ſomething unſeaſonably done of me, to ſtand, ſo long at leaſt, upon ſuch ſullen melancholick meditations as theſe are; eſpecially now in the midſt of this ſolemn glorious Feaſt: Therefore I am reſolved even abruptly to break through them, and to haſten to my ſecond General, which is the Counſel which our Saviour gives us upon this conſideration, that neceſſarily we muſt fail, namely, to provide, and ſeriouſly project againſt that time, by all the means that we can make, to oblige to our ſelves friends in that extremity; expreſſed in theſe words, *Make to your ſelves friends of the Mammon of unrighteouſneſs.* 2.

18. *Mammon*

*Part. II.* 18. *Mammon of unrighteousness*? What is that? Shall I deal freely and honestly with you? Indeed I will: for, woe unto me, if I should dare to come into this place to flatter you: and woe unto me, if I should dare to come into this place to vent my spleen against any. Then all this, for which there is such a doe kept, not only here, but all the world over; such making of friends, nay, such undermining of friends, so many dangers sought out and despised: This is the Mammon of unrighteousness. An untoward name, I confess, for a thing so much set by, so carefully and ambitiously courted, so infatiably thirsted after. But yet a name of Christs devising, He has afforded this Idol, Riches, no better a title; and therefore I must, and dare call them so, any where.

19. But may it not be lawful to enquire after; or, give some guesses, at least, at the Reasons which might move our Saviour to put so disgraceful a name upon Riches? Without question, it is not only lawful to be so curious, but also very useful and expedient. A main Reason (I have heard) is, because ordinarily, Riches leave a tincture and infection in the persons who have any thing to do with them. It is a hard thing, almost impossible, for a man any ways to meddle with them without sin: ordinarily, they are got with sin, they are possessed with sin, they are spent with sin. A man (saith *Siracides*) cannot hasten to be rich without sin: and when he has once got them, how unwilling will he be to let a lust pass unsatisfied, seeing he is furnished with that, to which (in his opinion at least) nothing can be denied! How unwilling will he be to be worsted, though in the most unjust cause, seeing he is furnished with that which will blind the eyes of the Prudent, and pervert the understanding of the Wise! For (saith the same Wise man) *as a mans Riches, so his anger encreaseth.* And upon the same grounds, it may be said, that, As a mans Riches encrease, so likewise his Desires and Lusts encrease. I will undertake to give you one Reason more, why Riches are called Mammon of unrighteousness; and it is, because they are Mammon, Riches indeed, only to unrighteous men; none beside such, will rest contented with them, and suffer God to depart from him without a greater blessing than they can be.

20. But what need I trouble my self about enquiring after reasons, why this so universally-adored Idol, Mammon, is so dishonourably branded and stigmatized by our Saviour, since himself in another place has said enough of it, which may suffice, not only to warrant the reasonableness of this title; but also to make them, who are apt to glory so much in riches, if they well consider it, even to envy the happiness and security of those who are not trusted with so dangerous wares. The words were spoken upon occasion of a sudden great sorrow, and melancholy which appeared in a young mans countenance, and procured by the temptations of Riches, which made him refuse the most advantageous Bargain that ever was offered to man. Whereupon, saith Christ to his Disciples (as his words are recorded by St. *Matthew*) *Verily, I say unto you, that a Rich man shall hardly enter into the Kingdom of Heaven. And again I say unto you, that it is easier for a Camel to go through the eye of a Needle, than for a rich man to enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.* Indeed, St. *Mark* reports this speech something more largely than it is there, and instead of a *Rich man*, puts in, *One that trusteth in his Riches*: Which he does not so much to explain the phrase of the speech, as to give a reason of the Impossibility.

Mat. 19. 23, 24.

Mar. 10. 24.

21. For, if our Saviour (in saying, *It is impossible for a rich man to enter into the Kingdom of Heaven*) by a rich man, had meant one that trusteth in his Riches, there had been no sufficient ground for so great an amazement as seized upon the Disciples at the hearing of it; For that was a thing which they knew well enough before; not the most ignorant of his hearers, but could have told him as much. Therefore St. *Matthew*'s and St. *Mark*'s words joyned together, will make up this sense (which I make no question at all, but that it was Christs meaning) namely, that it is even almost impossible for a Rich man to be saved, because he cannot chuse but trust in his Riches.

22. And



22. And this is more clearly evinced by that satisfaction which our Saviour gave to his Disciples to recover them from their astonishment; where he says, *With men it is impossible, but not with God; for with God all things are possible*: Intimating thus much; That considering the great, almost irresistable, Temptations which Riches carry along with them, and mans extreme weakness and natural impotency; his willing propension, and to all ordinary natural means, most incurable inclination to make them his place of rest, his strong City wherein he trusts: It is impossible, that these things meeting together, he should not put his confidence in them, and so make himself incapable of Heaven, between which and Riches thus used, there is a large, as unpassable a gulf as between Heaven and Hell: *With men* therefore *these things are impossible, but not with God; for with Him all things are possible.* It is in his power, by the help and assistance of that grace which he showres upon every one of us in Baptism, to cure this hereditary weakness and sickness of our natures, and to render us healthful and vigorous, powerful enough to free our selves from that bondage and slavery, wherein these outward worldly blessings are apt to captive us, and whereunto by nature we do willingly submit our selves. It is in his power to make those pernicious pleasures, which Riches may promise unto us, to become unwelcome and distasteful unto us: Nay, which is more, it is in his power to make even this Mammon of unrighteousness against its own nature, to become an help and instrument to procure for us the true Riches, even those unvaluable treasures which God hath laid up in heaven for us. Take it not ill therefore, I beseech you, if that, for which you are so much envied and reverenced above other men, be so undervalued by our Saviour in comparison with the true Riches; be not angry with our Saviour for it: But rather endeavour, by trading providently with them, for your own and others benefit, to render Christ's language in this place improper and abusive.

23. But now if Riches deserve no better a title at our Saviour's hands, how can it be likely that they can prove fit instruments to procure friends, and such friends as we stand in need of? *For, do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles?* Indeed the argument held well on St. *Paul*'s side, when he says, *If we have sowed to you spiritual things, is it much if we reap your temporal things*? But will the argument hold also on Christs part; If ye have not been faithful in the Mammon of unrighteousness, who will trust you with the true Riches; Certainly, if it does not, not only this, but divers Chapters besides, might, without any loss, have been left out of the Gospel.

24. And there it was a sullen ill-natured fellow (he in the Parable, I mean, which received the one talent) and without all question, a shameless liar (though I fear, there be many, who are not very averse from his opinion) who with an impudent face durst tell God, *He was austere, reaping where he had not sown, and gathering where he had not scattered.* And though he spake this with the same confidence that his Proselytes do in these our days, not as a probable opinion, but as a thing that he is assured of; (for, says he, *I know thee, that thou art austere*, &c.) Yet I beseech you believe him not: No, no, Our God is a gracious God, and requires of us no more than we are able to do. He does not expect Faith, and Repentance, and good Works, where he has given no abilities to perform them: Nay, doth not God by his Prophet tell us, and Christ repeats it in his Parable, that he is so far from that, that after several years labour bestowed on his Vineyard, and yet no fruit issuing; yet he was content to expect one year longer, even till he had done so much, that no more could be done; he is at a stay, and asks, What he could have done more?

25. It were therefore very fit and convenient, that we should, at least in our own hearts, silence and stifle such opinions concerning God as these are. And believe, that he is a well-wisher to us, when he bestows any means upon us, whereby we may do good. Otherwise, we shall without any comfort or courage, heartlesly, and even sleepily go about the performing of what Christ here counsels us to. If you will

will not believe me upon my word, take the mans own confeſſion: Says he, When I had once entertained this perſwaſion, that God would expect a more yielding plentiful harveſt, fruitful beyond that proportion of ſeed which he gave me to ſow, *I was affraid*: horrour and uncomfortable thoughts ſeized upon me, and I went and hid my Talent in a Napkin, I even ſate ſtill, reſolved to put all to an adventure, and to expect what God would do with me; for, alas, how bootleſs, and to no purpoſe, would my weak endeavours be to procure the favour of ſuch a God, that would not be content but with a great deal more than lay in my power to perform.

26. It is true indeed, Chriſt told him, that though he had had ſuch an unworthy prejudicial conceit of him, yet that even from thence he might have been moved to have made the beſt and moſt advantageous uſe of that Talent, which God had beſtowed on him; for ſays Chriſt, *If thou kneweſt I was auſtere, why didſt thou not therefore put my money into the Exchangers hands, and trade with it, that I might have received mine own with increaſe*? Why didſt thou not at the leaſt do thy beſt, to give ſatisfaction to thy hard auſtere Maſter? God forbid that I ſhould doubt but that there are thouſands, who, though it may be, they have entertained this mans opinion and conceit of God; yet make better uſe of it than he did. But yet the mans own confeſſion ſhews what ordinarily and naturally is the fruit and iſſue of it.

27. That therefore, which God ſows among you, is Riches; but yet, Riches, moſt improperly ſo called, that which he ſcatters and ſtrews abroad, is the Mammon of unrighteouſneſs: *Now, he which ſoweth* (ſaith the Apoſtle) *ſoweth in hope*, and he which ſcattereth, ſcattereth in hope. But what gain or intereſt, what a kind of harveſt does God hope for after this his ſeeds time? Why juſt ſuch another as the ſame Apoſtle ſpeaks of (1 *Cor.* 15.) where he diſcourſes upon the Reſurrection and glorious change of theſe our bodies; *They are ſown*, ſaith he, *in corruption, but are raiſed in incorruption; they are ſown in diſhonour, but are raiſed in glory; they are ſown in weakneſs, but are raiſed in power; they are ſown natural bodies, but are raiſed ſpiritual heavenly bodies*. In like manner, God ſows among you thoſe Riches, which himſelf, moſt diſgracefully calls *the Mammon of unrighteouſneſs*, in hope that he may reap the true Riches: He ſcatters among you ſuch ſmall trifles, that many even Heathen men, have been content to want, for the empty aerial reward of Fame: nay, that ſome of them have been content to caſt away in an humour; and theſe ſmall things he ſcatters abroad, in hope that he may gather (what, think you?) the Everlaſting Salvation of your Souls and Bodies. And is this that harſh auſtere Maſter?

1 Cor. 15. 42, 43, 44.

28. Indeed, if God were ſuch a perſon as ſome men have given him out for; if he ſhould ſcatter abroad his Riches as ſnares, on purpoſe to fetter and entangle men with them. If he ſhould beſtow upon any this Mammon of unrighteouſneſs, with an intent, and reſolution, that it ſhould become unto them the Mammon of unrighteouſneſs indeed, that it ſhould make them indiſpoſed and uncapable of attaining unto the true Riches; there might be ſome plea for them to faſten ſo injurious an accuſation upon God. But can the Judge of all the earth deal ſo with his Servants? Can he, with is Goodneſs and Mercy it ſelf, He who rejoyces to ſtile himſelf, The Preſerver of men, Can he be ſo cruelly bountiful to his Creatures, as by heaping upon them the vaniſhing, unſatisfying, bleſſings of this life, thereby to fat and cherith them againſt the day of ſlaughter and deſtruction? God forbid!

29. I confeſs, notwithſtanding that, ſuch perſons there may be upon whom God may in his wrath ſhower down Bleſſings and Riches in his fierce diſpleaſure: But they are only ſuch, as by living in a continual habitual practice of undervaluing and contemning the daily offers of Grace and favour, have already condemned themſelves, and ſealed themſelves unto the day of deſtruction; and ſuch an one was *Pharaoh*: concerning whom, God himſelf teſtifies, ſaying, *For this reaſon I have raiſed thee up, that I might ſhew my power in thee, and that my Name might be declared throughout*

Exod. 9. 16.



*throughout all the Earth*, that is, Since by thy continual Rebellions thou haſt judged thy ſelf unworthy of life, for this reaſon I have raiſed thee up, I have kept thee alive, and preſerved thee that none of my former Plagues ſhould ſweep thee away, that at laſt, by an utter deſtruction of thee, together with the whole ſtrength and flower of thy Kingdom, I may be glorified throughout the whole world. But I will leave diſcourſing and come nearer unto you, in the ſerious application of Chriſts counſel here.

30. It is the property of *Riches* (ſaith the Wiſe-man) *to gather many friends*: Those who are above others in wealth and power ſhall preſently be furniſhed with friends more than they can well know what to do withal; But ſuch friends are not concerned at all in our Saviour's advice in my Text; The friends here intended are ſuch, who are not here to reſtore again unto you in the ſame Coyn that they received: Give not to the Rich (ſaith our Saviour) for fear they repay you. Of all things in the world, take heed of being paid back again in this life, beware how you carry your reward along with you to your Grave. But leave it to be paid in exchange in another Country, where for uſing five Talents well, you ſhall have ten Cities given you. Where for the bounty of a Cup of cold water, you ſhall receive a Prophet's reward. Such a friend was offered once to the Rich-man in the Goſpel, God ſent him one to his doors, even to crave his friendſhip: But the Rich-man was ſo buſied with the care of his Wardrobe and his Table, that he was not at leiſure to hearken to ſo gainleſs an offer: Notwithſtanding the time came afterwards, when he miſerably, to his coſt, perceived what a bleſſed opportunity he had moſt negligently omitted, and even in Hell attempted to purchaſe his favour, and to obtain from his hand a poor Alms (God knows) but one drop of water; but all too late, the time of making friends was paſt, and a great unfordable Gulf had divided them from all poſſible ſociety and communion for ever. Prov. 19. 4.

31. Now conſider (I beſeech you) that it had been a very eaſie matter, for God ſo to have provided for all his creatures, that each particular ſhould have had enough of his own without being beholding to another for ſupply: But then two heavenly and divine Vertues had been quite loſt; For, Where had been the Poor mans Patience, and the Rich mans Charity? The poor man therefore wants that you may have occaſion to exerciſe your liberality, and that by looſing and diminiſhing your wealth upon them, ye may become more full of Riches hereafter. So that, it is Gods great bounty to you, not only to give you plenty and abundance, but alſo to ſuffer others to languiſh in penury and want: It may be, God has ſuffered himſelf ſo long to be robbed of his own Poſſeſſions his Tithes, that you might have the glory and comfort of reſtoring them: It may be, God has ſuffered the ancient ſuperſtitious Hiſtrionical adorning of his Temples to be converted into the late ſlovenly prophaneneſs (commonly called worſhipping in Spirit, but intended to be Worſhip without coſt) that you may find a happy occaſion to reſtore thoſe ſacred places dedicated to his honour, to that Majeſty and Reverence as may become Houſes wherein God delights that his Name ſhould dwell.

32. Now, if it be not in my power to perſwade you, neither to make God nor man your debtors by your Riches: Yet I beſeech you, make neither of them your Enemies by them: Do not make your Riches Inſtruments of War to fight againſt God himſelf; for example, as maintaining an unjuſt cauſe by power, a cauſe which God abhors: Do not ſo requite God for his extraordinary liberality to you, as to make his Riches Inſtruments for the Devil to wreak his malice upon thoſe whom God loveth: If I had not a care not to injure your patience too far, what might not be ſaid upon this ſubject? But, I perceive, it is fit for me to haſten to your releaſe.

33. But before I quit my ſelf, and eaſe you of further proſecution of this point, I ſhall deſire you all to ſuffer one word of Exhortation, and if there be any here whom it may more nearly concern, I beſeech them even by the bowels of Jeſus Chriſt, that they will ſuffer too a word of moſt neceſſary reproof: And though what

I ſhall ſay, doth not naturally flow from the words in hand, yet they bear a reaſonable reſemblance and proportion with them: So pertinent, I am ſure, they are to the Auditory to whom I ſpeak, that I would chuſe rather quite to loſe my Text, than here to leave them unſaid.

34. It is about making friends too: indeed not with the Mammon of unrighteouſneſs: No, that is a trifle to it. It is about making friends with not revenging of injuries, with patient bearing and willing forgiving of offences: A duty ſo ſeriouſly, ſo inceſſantly, ſometimes in plain words, ſometimes in Parables, all manner of ways, upon all occaſions, urged by our Saviour, that we cannot ſo much as pray, but we muſt be forced to acknowledge obedience to this Law, *Forgive us,—As we forgive:* Yea, ſo boundleſly, and vvithout all reſtrictions or reſervations, is it enjoyned, That vvhen as *Peter* thought it fair to have it limited to a certain number, and propoſed Seven, as, in his opinion, reaſonable and convenient; No, ſaith our Saviour, Forgive not until ſeven times, but until four hundred fourſcore and ten times: And if he could have imagined, that it vvere poſſible for a man to have exceeded even this number alſo in injuries, vvithout queſtion he vvould not have left there neither.

35. But, Hovv is this Doctrine received in the vvorld? What counſel vvould men, and thoſe none of the vvorſt ſort give thee in ſuch a caſe? Hovv vvould the ſobereſt, diſcreeteſt, vvell-bred Chriſtian adviſe thee? Why thus, If thy Brother, or thy Neighbour, have offered thee an injury, or an affront, forgive him? By no means: Thou art utterly undone, and loſt in thy reputation vvith the vvorld if thou doſt forgive him: What is to be done then? Why, let not thy heart take reſt, let all other buſineſs and employment be laid aſide till thou haſt his bloud: Hovv? a mans bloud for an injurious paſſionate ſpeech, for a diſdainful look? Nay, that is not all, That thou may'ſt gain among men the reputation of a diſcreet well-tempered Murderer, be ſure thou killeſt him not in paſſion, when thy bloud is hot and boyling with the provocation; but proceed with as great temper and ſettledneſs of reaſon, with as much diſcretion and preparedneſs as thou wouldeſt to the Communion: After ſome ſeveral days reſpite, that it may appear it is thy Reaſon guides thee, and not thy Paſſion: Invite him mildly and courteouſly into ſome retired place, and there let it be determined, whether his bloud or thine ſhall ſatisfie the injury.

36. Oh thou Holy Chriſtian Religion! Whence is it that thy children have ſucked this inhumane poyſonous bloud, theſe raging fiery Spirits? For if we ſhall enquire of the Heathen, they will ſay, They have not learned this from us; or the Mahumetan, they will anſwer, We are not guilty of it: Bleſſed God! that it ſhould become a moſt ſure ſetled courſe for a man to run into danger and diſgrace with the world, if he ſhall dare to perform a Commandment of Chriſt, (which is as neceſſary for him to do, if he have any hopes of attaining Heaven, as meat and drink is for the maintaining of life!) That ever it ſhould enter into Chriſtian hearts to walk ſo curiouſly and exactly contrary unto the ways of God! That whereas He ſees himſelf every day and hour almoſt contemned and deſpiſed by thee who art his Servant, his creature, upon whom he might without all poſſible imputation of unrighteouſneſs pour down all the Vials of his wrath and indignation, ye He notwithſtanding is patient and long-ſuffering towards thee, hoping that his long-ſuffering may lead thee to repentance, and beſeeching thee daily by his Miniſters to be reconciled unto him: And yet thou on the other ſide for a diſtemper'd paſſionate ſpeech, or leſs, ſhouldſt take upon thee to ſend thy Neighbours ſoul, or thine own, or likely both clogg'd and oppreſſed with all your ſins unrepented of, (for how can repentance poſſibly conſiſt with ſuch a reſolution?) before the Tribunal ſeat of God to expect your final ſentence: utterly depriving thy ſelf of all the bleſſed means which God has contrived for thy Salvation, and putting thy ſelf in ſuch an eſtate, that it ſhall not be in Gods power almoſt to do thee any good. Pardon, I beſeech you, my earneſtneſs, almoſt intemperateneſs, ſeeing it hath proceeded from ſo juſt, ſo warrantable



rantable a ground; And ſince it is in your power to give rules of honour and reputation to the whole Kingdom, do not you teach others to be aſhamed of this inſeparable Badge of your Religion, Charity and forgiving of offences give men leave to be Chriſtians without danger or diſhonour; Or, if Religion will not work with you, yet let the Laws of that State wherein you live, the earneſt deſires and care of your Righteous Prince, prevail with you: But I have done, and proceed to my laſt part, which is the convenience and gain which ſhall accrew unto us by friends obliged with this Mammon of unrighteouſneſs, namely, *by them to be received into everlaſting habitations.*

37. I muſt here again propoſe another queſtion, but when I have done that, I muſt be forced to leave it without an anſwer, unleſs you will be content to take a conjecture, a probability, for an anſwer: It is, How, or after what manner thoſe to whom we have done good here, ſhall hereafter receive us into everlaſting habitations? Whether this is performed only by their Prayers and Interceſſion with God in the behalf of their Benefactors; Or, whether they are uſed as Inſtruments and Conductors, as it were, as our Saviour may probably ſeem to intimate in the Parable where the Lord ſpeaks to his Servants, *That they ſhould take away the one Talent from him which had no more, and beſtow it on him which had ten Talents.* So uncertain it is, whether this task ſhall be performed by them one of theſe ways, or by ſome other unknown courſe, that St. *Auguſtine* ingenuouſly confeſſes, he knows not what to make of it: Yet Cardinal *Bellarmine* ſays, he can eaſily aſſoil it, and can in theſe words find out Purgatory, and ſatisfaction for ſin after death, and a great deal more than I can underſtand: But truly, if he be able to ſpy Purgatory in this Text, eſpecially ſuch a one as he fancies to himſelf in his Books of that Argument, he has made uſe of better Glaſſes than ever *Galileo* found out. And I would to God, thoſe of his Party would conſider how much the weakneſs of their cauſe is argued even from hence, that they are forced to ground moſt of the Points controverted between us upon ſuch difficult places as theſe, of ſo ambiguous and uncertain meanings, and therefore equally obnoxious to any mans Interpretation. There may yet be found out a convenient ſenſe of this place, eſpecially, if we will allow an Hebraiſm in thoſe words (which is frequent enough in the Evangelical Writings) of putting the third Perſon Plural to expreſs a Paſſive ſenſe, and then the meaning will be; *That when,* &c. *they may receive you, i. e.* That ye may be received *into everlaſting habitations:* Parallel to a like Phraſe in *Luk.* 12. 12. *Thou Fool, this night ſhall they take away thy ſoul from thee, i. e.* Thy ſoul ſhall be taken from thee. And, if this ſenſe be true, as it is very likely, many of our Romiſh Adverſaries have ſpent much pains about this Text to no purpoſe. Part. III.

38. But to leave quarrelling: It is no very conſiderable matter: whether we have light upon the true ſenſe of thoſe words, or no; or whether thoſe, to whom we have done good, have a ſhare in purchaſing for us an admiſſion into theſe everlaſting habitations, as long as we may infallibly hence conclude, that though it ſhould fall out, that *Abraham* ſhould forget us, and *Iſrael* become ignorant of us; yet certainly, God, (who alone, is inſtead of ten thouſand ſuch friends) he will keep a Regiſter of all our good actions, and will take particular care of us, to give us a juſt proportion of reward and harveſt of glory according to our ſparingneſs, or liberality in ſowing.

39. But, Would Almighty God have us ſuch mercenary Servants, ſo careful and projecting for our own advantage, that we ſhould not obey him without a Compact and Bargain? Is not He worthy the ſerving, unleſs we firſt make our condition with him, to be ſure to gain and thrive by him? Is this a conſideration worthy and befitting the ingenuity and nobleneſs of a Chriſtian mind, *to have an eye unto the recompence of reward?* Is Chriſt alſo become a School-maſter unto us, as well as the Law was to the Jews, that we ſhould have need of Thunder and Blackneſs of ſmoke, and Voices to affright us, or Promiſes to win and allure us? Nay, Have not your ears *Object.*

oftentimes heard, from ſuch places as this, an Obedience of this nature diſgraced and branded for a Servile ſlaviſh obedience; an obedience ordinarily made the mark and badge even of a formal Hypocrite, the worſt kind of Reprobates?

*Sol.* 40. I confeſs, I could ſhew you a more excellent way than this, if men were ordinarily fitted and qualified for the receiving of it: And that is St. *Paul*'s more excellent way of Charity: the keeping of God's Commandments meerly out of the love of his goodneſs and conſideration of his infinite inconceivable holineſs: *And he that can receive this, let him receive it*, and thrice happy and bleſſed ſhall he be of the Lord: But in the mean time, let him not be forward to judge his fellow-ſervants, if they acknowledge themſelves ſo far guilty of weakneſs and imperfections, that they have need to receive ſtrength and encouragement in this their painful and laborious race, *by looking forward unto the glorious prize of their high calling in Jeſus Chriſt.*

41. Surely God is wiſe enough to contrive the ſureſt courſe, and to ſet down the beſt and likelyeſt means for perſwading us to his ſervice, and the obedience of his Commandments: He is able to enquire and ſearch into the moſt retired corners of our wicked, deceitful hearts, and thereby knowing our temper and diſpoſition, he is able beſt to preſcribe us a method and diet ſutable to our conſtitutions. Therefore, if he out of his infinite wiſdom, and the conſideration of what encouragements we ſtand in need of, hath thought it fit to annex to every Precept almoſt, a promiſe of happineſs, or a threatning of unavoidable danger to the tranſgreſſours; What art thou, O man, that thou dareſt take upon thee to calumniate his proceedings, and to preſcribe better directions than he has thought fit!

42. I beſeech you therefore, (my beloved Brethren) by all means make uſe of any advantages, which may ſerve to render you more earneſt, more eager, and reſolute in your obedience to thoſe holy and perfect Commandments which he hath enjoyn'd you: If you cannot find your ſelves arrived as yet to that height of perfection, as that Love and Charity cannot wreſt from you ſufficient careſulneſs to obey him; Let fear have its operation with you, fear and horrour of that terrible iſſue which ſhall attend the wilful and habitual tranſgreſſours of his Laws: And you need not ſuſpect this courſe as unwarrantable, for you ſhall have St. *Paul* for your example, even that *Paul* for whoſe miraculous converſion, Chriſt was pleaſed himſelf in Perſon to deſcend from his Throne of Majeſty: that *Paul* who laboured in the Goſpel more than all the reſt of the Apoſtles: that *Paul*, whoſe joy and hearts comfort it was to be afflicted for the Name of Chriſt: Laſtly, that *Paul*, who for a time was raviſhed from the Earth to the third Heaven after a moſt inexpreſſable manner, and there heard things that cannot be uttered; This *Paul*, I ſay, ſhall be your example, who after all theſe things, found it yet a convenient motive, and received great encouragement and eagerneſs to proceed in his moſt bleſſed converſation, even from this fear, *Leſt, whileſt he preached to others, himſelf ſhould become a caſt-away.*

43. And when Fear has done its part, let Hope come in; Hope of that happy Communion, which you ſhall once again have with thoſe friends which may be purchaſed in this life at ſo eaſie a rate; Hope of that eternal weight and burden of joy
Heb. 3.6. and glory, which is reſerved in Heaven for you if you hold faſt *the rejoycing of the Hope ſtedfaſt unto the end*: Let a comfortable meditation of theſe things encourage and hearten you to proceed from one degree of holineſs to another, till *we all come in the unity of the Faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God to a perfect Man, to the meaſure of the fulneſs of the ſtature of Chriſt*: And for an example in this, take that whole cloud of witneſſes muſtered together (in *Heb.* 11.) Or, if they will not ſerve the turn, take an Example above all examples, an Example beyond all imaginable exceptions, even our bleſſed Saviour Jeſus Chriſt himſelf, concerning whom the Author of the ſame Epiſtle (it was S. *Paul* ſure) ſaith *Chap.* 12. That *for the joy which was ſet before him, deſpiſed the ſhame, and endured the Croſs*, &c.

44. God knows, we have need of all manner of encouragements, and all little enough for us, ſo ſluggiſh and immoveable, ſo perverſe and obſtinate are we: Therefore for Gods ſake, upon any terms, continue in the ſervice of Chriſt, make uſe



uſe of all manner of advantages, and though ye find hope, or fear, predominate in you, (theſe ſervile affections, as they are commonly called) yet for all that, faint not, deſpair not, but rather give thanks to Almighty God: and God who ſees ſuch good effect of his Promiſes and Threatnings in you, (of which all the Scripture is full from one end to the other) will in his good time fill your hearts full of his Love, even *that perfect love which caſteth out fear*, and of that perfect Love which ſhall have no need of Hope, He will perfect that his good work in you unto the end.

45. To conclude all: Whether ye ſhall perform this Commandment of Chriſt, or whether ye ſhall not perform it, it cannot be avoided, Everlaſting habitations ſhall be your reward: Only the difference is, Whether ye will have them of your Enemies providing, whether ye will be beholding to the Devil and his Angels, your ancient mortal Enemies to prepare everlaſting dwellings for you; *And who can dwell in everlaſting fire*, (ſaith the Prophet) *who can dwell in continual burnings?* Or, whether ye will expect them from the aſſiſtance of thoſe juſt perſons, whom you have by your good works eternally obliged to you, even thoſe bleſſed and glorious Habitations, which God the Father Almighty hath from the beginning of the world provided and furniſhed for you; which God the Son by his meritorious Death and Paſſion hath purchaſed for you; and for the admiſſion whereunto, God the Holy Ghoſt hath ſanctified, and adorned you, that in thankfulneſs and gratitude you your ſelves may become everlaſting Habitations, pure and undefiled Temples for him to dwell in for ever and ever. Now unto theſe glorious and everlaſting Habitations God of his infinite mercy bring us, even for Jeſus Chriſt his ſake: To whom, with the Father, *&c.*

The

# The Seventh Sermon.

## Luke. XIX. 8.

*——And if I have defrauded any man by forged cavillation I restore unto him fourfold.*

Vers. 10. THE *Son of man* (saith our Saviour of Himself in the end of this story) *is come to seek and to save that which was lost.* And how careful and solicitous he was in the discharge of this employment and business about which his Father sent him; this story of *Zacchæus* (out of which my Text is taken) will evidently and lively discover. For here we have a Man, that among ten thousand one would think were the most unlikely to become a Disciple of Christs, so indisposed he was for such a change, so unqualified in all respects. For first, he was Rich, as the third verse tells us; and if that were all his fault, yet in our Saviour's judgment, which was never uncharitable, being so clogg'd and burdened with these *impedimenta* (as even the Heathens could call Riches) it would be as hard for him to press through and enter in at the streight gate, without uneasing and freeing himself from them, as for a Camel to go through the eye of a Needle.

2. But secondly, these his Riches, as it would seem, were scarce well and honestly gotten. For his trade and course of life, was a dangerous trade, obnoxious to great, almost irresistible, temptations: A great measure of grace, would be requisite to preserve a man incorrupt and undefiled in that course: and so ill a name he had gotten himself, that all that afterwards saw Christs familiarity with him, were much
Vers. 7. offended, and scandaliz'd at it; for we read in the seventh verse, *that when they all saw it, they murmured, saying, that he was gone in to lodge with a sinful man*; with one famous and notorious for a great oppressour.

3. Yet notwithstanding all this, such was the unspeakable mercy and goodness of Christ, that even of this Stone, so scorned and rejected of all the people, *he raised*
Vers. 9. *a Son unto Abraham*, as we find in the ninth verse. And to bring this to pass, he took occasion even from a vain curiosity of this *Zacchæus*, an humour of his, it may be such a one as afterward possessed *Herod* (though God knows he had not the same success) namely, to see some strange work performed by Christ, of whom he had heard so much talk. This opportunity, I say, our Saviour took to perform an admirable miracle, even upon the man himself; and that he brought about by as unlikely a course, only with inviting himself to his house: By which unexpected affability and courtesie of our Saviour, this so notorious and famous Publican and sinner was so surprized with joy and comfort, that presently he gives over all thought and consideration of his trade, as a thing of no moment; and being to receive Christ into his house, and knowing how ill agreeing Companions Christ and Mammon would prove in the same Lodging; he resolves to sweep it and make it clean, for the entertaining of him; he empties it of that dross and dung wherewith before it was defiled; half of his estate goes away at a clap upon the poor, and the remainder, in all likelihood, is in great danger to be consumed by that noble and generous offer which he makes in the words of my Text: *Whomsoever I have defrauded by forged cavillation, I restore*, &c.

4. In



4. In which words I shall observe unto you these two General Parts: First, a Discovery, and, it may be, confession of his beloved bosome sin, the sin of his Trade, in these words: *If I have defrauded any man*, or *whomsoever I have defrauded*. Secondly, Satisfaction tendered in the words following: *I restore unto him four fold.* In the former General, we may take notice of two particulars: 1. *Zacchæus* his willingness and readiness of his own accord to discover and confess his sin, when he said, *whomsoever I have defrauded.* And, 2. the nature and hainousness of the crime discovered, which is called a *defrauding by forged cavillation*; or, as some Translations read, *with false accusation.* In the second General likewise (which is the satisfaction tendered by *Zacchæus*) there offer themselves two particulars more, namely, 1. So much of the satisfaction as was necessary to be performed, by virtue of an indispensable Precept, and that is Restitution in these words, *I restore unto him.* 2. That which was voluntary and extraordinary, namely, the measure and excess of this Restitution, which he professeth should be *four fold.* Of these two parts therefore, with their several particulars in the same order as they have been proposed, briefly, and with all the plainness and perspicuity I can imagine: And, 1. Of the former General, and therein of the first Particular, Namely, *Zacchæus* his readiness to confess his Sin, in these words: *If I*, &c. *Division.* 1. 2.

5. I said even now only, It way be this was a confession of his crime; but now I will be more resolute, and tell you peremptorily, this was a confession: for without all question, *Zacchæus*, as the case stood now with him, was in no humour of Justifying himself, he had no mind to boast his integrity in his Office: Or, if he had, he might be sure that common fame (if that were all, yet that alone) might be a sufficient argument, at least too great a presumption against him, to confute him. But to put it out of question: Our Saviour himself, by applying the tenth verse of this Chapter to him, acknowledgeth him for a sinful undone man; one that had so far lost himself in the wandring mazes of this wicked world, that unless Christ himself had taken the pains to search and enquire after him, and having found him, by the power and might of his Grace to rescue and recover him from the error of his ways, by restoring him his eyes, whereby he might take notice towards what a dangerous precipice he was hastening, there had been no possibility but at last he must have needs fallen headlong into the gulf of destruction. *General* I *Partic.* 1.

6. Now it being, I suppose, evident, that *Zacchæus* was guilty, and that in a high degree, and openly and scandalously guilty of the crime here discovered: there is no doubt to be made, but that he who was so willing to unlock and disperse his ill-gotten treasures, would not begin to divert his covetousness upon his sins, he would not hoard them up, but would place his glory even in his shame; and whereas he had been the servant and slave of sin, he would wear his shackles and fetters, as signs of the glorious victory, which through Christ he had won, and emblems of that blessed change which he found in himself, being rescued from the basest slavery that possibly can be imagined, into the glorious liberty of the Sons of God.

7. But it may be, you will say, Suppose *Zacchæus* did freely and voluntarily confess his sin to Christ, who had authority to forgive him his sins, though he had never discovered them: what collection shall be made from hence? *Zacchæus* might be as bold as he would with himself; but as for us, his example shall be no rule to us; we thank God this is Popery in these days, and since we have freed our selves from this burden, we will not be brought into bondage to any man; we will confess our sins, I warrant you, only to God, who is only able to forgive us them; as for the Minister, it may be, we will sometimes be beholding to him to speak some comfortable words now and then to us, when we are troubled in conscience, and we have not been taught to go any further.

8. I

8. I confeſs I find no great inclination in my ſelf, eſpecially being in the Pulpit, to undertake a controverſie, even where it may ſeem to offer it ſelf, much leſs to preſs and ſtrein a Text for it, for I deſire to have no Adverſaries in my Preaching, but only the Devil and Sin. Only having now mentioned Confeſſion, and conſidering how much the Doctrine of our holy Mother the Church hath been traduced, not only by the malice and detraction of our profeſſed enemies of the Church of *Rome*, but alſo by the ſuſpicious ignorance and partiality of her own children; who out of a liking of the zeal, or rather fury, of ſome former Proteſtant Writers, have laid this for a ground of ſtating Controverſies of our Religion: That that is to be acknowledged for the Doctrine of theſe Reformed Churches, which is moſt oppoſite and contradicting to the Church of *Rome*. So that, as the caſe goes now, Controverſies of Religion are turn'd into private quarrels, and it is not ſo much the Truth that is ſought after, as the ſalving and curing the reputation of particular men.

9. Theſe things therefore conſidered, truly for my part, I dare not take upon me ſo much to gratifie the Papiſts, as to think my ſelf obliged to maintain many incommodious ſpeeches of ſome of our Divines in this point. *Hoc Ithacus velit & magno mercentur Atridæ* —— They will never be unfurniſhed of matter to write Books to the worlds end, if this ſhall be the method of ſtating Controverſies. Oh what an impregnable cauſe ſhould we have againſt the Church of *Rome*, if we our ſelves did not help to weaken and betray it, by mixing therewith the intereſts and conceits of particular men.

10. Give me therefore leave, I pray you, to give you the ſtate of the Queſtion, and the Doctrine of our Church, in the words of one who both now is, and for ever will worthily be accounted, The glory of this Kingdom. "Be it known (ſaith he) "to our Adverſaries of *Rome*, (I add alſo, to our Adverſaries even of *Great Britain*, who ſell their private fancies for the Doctrine of our Church) that no kind of "Confeſſion, either publick or private, is diſallowed by our Church, that is any "way requiſite for the due execution of that ancient *Power of the Keys*, which "Chriſt beſtowed upon his Church. "The thing which we reject, is that new pick-"lock of Sacramental Confeſſion obtruded upon mens Conſciences, as a matter ne-"ceſſary to Salvation, by the Canons of the late Conventicle of *Trent* in the 14. "Seſſion.

Biſhop *Uſher's* Anſw to the Jeſuit Cap. of Confeſſion p. 84.

11. And this truth being ſo evident in Scripture, and in the Writings of the ancient beſt times of the Primitive Church, the ſafeſt interpreters of Scripture, I make no queſtion, but there will not be found one perſon amongſt you, who when he ſhall be in a calm unpartial diſpoſition, that will offer to deny: For, I beſeech you, give your ſelves leave unpartially to examine your own thoughts. Can any man be ſo unreaſonable as once to imagine with himſelf, that when our Saviour after his Reſurrection, having received (as himſelf ſaith) all power in heaven and earth, having led captivity captive, came then to beſtow gifts upon men: when he, I ſay, in ſo ſolemn a manner (having firſt breath'd upon his Diſciples, thereby conveying and inſinuating the Holy Ghoſt into their hearts) renewed unto them, or rather confirmed and ſealed unto them that glorious Commiſſion, which before he had given to *Peter*, ſuſtaining, as it were the perſon of the whole Church; whereby he delegated to them an authority of binding and looſing ſins upon earth, with a promiſe, that the proceedings in the Court of Heaven, ſhould be directed and regulated by theirs on Earth: Can any man, I ſay, think ſo unworthily of our Saviour, as to eſteem theſe words of his for no better than complement; for nothing but Court-holy-water?

12. Yet ſo impudent have our Adverſaries of *Rome* Been in their dealings with us, that they have dared to lay to our charge; as if we had ſo mean a conceit of our Saviour's gift of the Keys, taking advantage indeed from the unwary expreſſions of ſome particular Divines, who out of too forward a zeal againſt the Church of *Rome*, have bended the ſtaff too much the contrary way; and inſtead of



of taking away that intolerable burden of a Sacramental, neceſſary, univerſal Confeſſion, have ſeem'd to void and fruſtrate all uſe and exerciſe of the Keys.

13. Now, that I may apply ſomething of that, which hath now been ſpoken, to your hearts and conſciences. Matters ſtanding as you ſee they do; ſince Chriſt, for your benefit and comfort, hath given ſuch authority to his Miniſters upon your unfeigned repentance and contrition, to abſolve and releaſe you from your ſins: why ſhould I doubt, or be unwilling to exhort and perſwade you, to make your advantage of this gracious promiſe of our Saviour's? why ſhould I envy you the participation of ſo heavenly a Bleſſing? Truly, if I ſhould deal thus with you, I ſhould prove my ſelf a malicious, unchriſtian-like, malignant Preacher; I ſhould wickedly and unjuſtly, againſt my own conſcience, ſeek to defraud you of thoſe glorious Bleſſings, which our Saviour hath intended for you.

14. Therefore, in obedience to his gracious will, and as I am warranted, and even enjoyned, by my holy Mother the Church of *England* expreſly, in the Book of Common-Prayer, in the Rubrick of Viſiting the Sick (which Doctrine this Church hath likewiſe embraced ſo far) I beſeech you, that by your practiſe and uſe, you will not ſuffer that Commiſſion, which Chriſt hath given to his Miniſters, to be a vain form of words, without any ſenſe under them, not to be an antiquated, expired Commiſſion, of no uſe nor validity in theſe days: But whenſoever you find your ſelves charg'd and oppreſſed, eſpecially with ſuch crimes as they call *Peccata vaſtantia conſcientiam*, ſuch as do lay waſte and depopulate the conſcience, that you would have recourſe to your ſpiritual Phyſician, and freely diſcloſe the nature and malignancy of your diſeaſe, that he may be able, as the cauſe ſhall require, to proportion a remedy, either to ſearch it with corroſives, or comfort and temper it with oyl. And come not to him, only with ſuch a mind as you would go to a learned man experienc'd in the Scriptures, as one that can ſpeak comfortable quieting words to you, but as to one that hath authority delegated to him from God himſelf, to abſolve and acquit you of your ſins. If you ſhall do this, aſſure your ſouls that the underſtanding of man is not able to conceive that tranſport and exceſs of joy and comfort which ſhall accrew to that mans heart, that is perſwaded, that he hath been made partaker of this Bleſſing, orderly and legally, according as our Saviour Chriſt hath preſcribed.

15. You ſee, I have dealt honeſtly and freely with you; it may be more freely than I ſhall be thanked for: But I ſhould have ſinn'd againſt my own ſoul, if I had done otherwiſe; I ſhould have conſpir'd with our adverſaries of *Rome* againſt our own Church, in affording them ſuch an advantage to blaſpheme our moſt holy and undefiled Religion. It becomes you now, though you will not be perſwaded to like of the practiſe of what, out of an honeſt heart, I have exhorted you to; yet for your own ſakes, not to make any uncharitable conſtruction of what hath been ſpoken. And here I will acquit you of this unwelcome ſubject, and from *Zacchæus* his confeſſion of his ſin, I proceed to my ſecond particular, namely, the nature and hainouſneſs of the crime confeſs'd, which is here call'd a *defrauding another by forged cavillation.*

16. The crime here confeſſed, is called in Greek, *Sycophancy*; for the words are, Εἴ τινος τι ἐσυκοφάντησα. For the underſtanding of which word in this place, we ſhall not need ſo much to be beholden to the Claſſical Greek Authors, as to the *Septuagint*, who are the beſt Interpreters of the Idiom of the Greek language in the Evangelical Writings. Two Reaſons of the word Συκοφάντης are given, the one by *Iſter in Atticis*, the other by *Philomneſtus de Sminthiis Rhodiis*; both recorded by *Athenæus* in that treaſury of ancient Learning, his *Deipnoſophiſts*, in the third Book: which becauſe they are of no great uſe for the Interpretation of S. *Luke*, I willingly omit. *Part.* 2.

17. Now there are four ſeveral words in the Hebrew, which the Seventy Interpreters have rendred in the Old Teſtament by the word, Συκοφάντης, and the verbal thereof Συκοφαντέω. One whereof ſignifies to abalienate or wreſt any

thing from another by fraud and ſophiſtry, oppoſed to another word in the ſame language, which imports to rob by plain open force and violence, *Job* 25. 9. *Pſal.* 119. 121. *Prov.* 28. 3. *Eccleſ.* 4. 1. as likewiſe in *Pſal.* 71. 4. *Prov.* 14. 33. A ſecond word ſignifies to deal captiouſly and fallaciouſly with another, *Levit.* 29. 11. A third implies, a puniſhment or Mulct, which (as the Latin word *multa* will bear it) is either inflicted on the body or the purſe. And the laſt ſignifies, to circumvent, or rather indeed to roll himſelf upon another, *Gen.* 43. 18.

Job 25. 9. Pſal. 119. 121. Prov. 28. 3. Eccl. 4. 1. Pſal 71. 4. Prov. 14. 33. Lev. 29. 11. Gen. 43. 18.

18. Out of all which expreſſions in the Hebrew compounded together, we may extract a full ſenſe of the Crime here confeſſed by *Zacchæus*, and rendred in the Greek Original by συκοφαντέω, (eſpecially if we have reſpect to *Zacchæus* his office and trade of life, which was to be a maſter of the Publicans in that part of the Country where he liv'd, *i.* one who had chief authority in receiving the rents and cuſtoms due from thence to the Empire:) *Zacchæus* his crime therefore (as may likewiſe be collected from that counſel which S. *John* the Baptiſt gave to the Publicans who came to his Baptiſm; which was, *that they ſhould exact no more than was their due*:) His crime, I ſay, was to wring and extort from his poor Country-men, either by fraud and falſe ſuggeſtions, or by violence, more than was due from them to the Empire: to enrich his private coffers by the ſpoils of the miſerable Inhabitants; to roll himſelf upon them and overwhelm them, by exactions for his private benefit: for that end, pretending the rights and neceſſities of State, and thereto tentering and ſtreining to the uttermoſt, that power and authority wherewith he was inveſted from *Rome*.

19. Theſe kind of Officers, though they were of good reputation with the *Romans*, as we may collect out of ſeveral orations of *Cicero*, for by their place they had the priviledge to be reckoned among the *Equites Romani*: yet in the Countries wherein they liv'd, eſpecially in *Jewry*, a tenacious covetous Nation, they were the moſt odious perſons upon the earth: inſomuch as the very name of a Publican was grown into a Proverb, expreſſing a perſon that deſerved at all mens hands infamy and hatred. This therefore was *Zacchæus* his crime, this is that which he calls by as odious a name, of Sycophancy. But to leave this general diſcourſe of the name (for in your behalfs, I am weary of an argument ſo uſeleſs to you) I will now try what advantage every one of us may make from *Zacchæus* his behaviour in this place.

*Uſe* 1. 20. You ſee here *Zacchæus* (though he was a man exalted above the ordinary rank of men, yet he) deals ſomething plainly and homely with himſelf, when he can afford himſelf no better a name than Sycophant: a title of ſo odious and hateful a ſignification, that the Devil himſelf has not got ſo diſgraceful a name as that: For he is call'd but Satan, or Διάβολος, that is, as the Holy Ghoſt himſelf interprets it *an accuſer of the brethren*. And though even that be a ſufficient crime, yet it is counted a more plauſible generous ſin, out of hatred, and rancour, and ill nature by falſe accuſations, to endeavour the ſubverſion of ones enemy, than by baſe dilating and informing, only for the hope of a little gain to himſelf, to procure the overthrow of his Neighbours Eſtate and Reputation; which is the condition of a Sycophant.

21. From hence then we may be taught how differently we ought to behave our ſelves in the diſcovery of our own, and other mens ſins. If our brother hath offended, we are to ſoften and qualifie his ſin, to think charitably of him notwithſtanding, and to frame our ſelves excuſes, that the matter may not be ſo bad as is generally ſuppoſed; as likewiſe hope, that hereafter, by a reformed life, he may redeem and cancel his fore-paſt tranſgreſſions. And ſo we ſee even *John Baptiſt* himſelf (though a man of no plauſible Court-like behaviour, yet) giving his advice to theſe Publicans, he would only call that an exacting more than was due, which *Zacchæus* here in himſelf moſt boiſterouſly terms Sycophancy. Whereas towards our ſelves, we muſt be tetrical and almoſt uncharitable; we muſt not *break our own heads with precious Balm*, as the Pſalmiſt ſpeaketh, that is, by ſoftned or ly excuſes, aggravate and aſſiſt our own diſeaſe.

*Uſe* 2. 22. Secondly conſider, that *Zacchæus* his ſin, which he deals ſo roughly and diſcourteouſly



courteouſly withal here, was his beloved boſom ſin, the ſin of his trade and courſe of life, a ſin, in whoſe company and ſociety, he had always been brought up; his *Peccatum*, εὐπερίστατον (as S. *Paul* moſt elegantly calls it) *the ſin that doth ſo eaſily beſet him*, or rather, that doth ſo well and fitly encompaſs him, that doth ſo exactly ſuit with him. For ordinarily, every man hath ſome one particular ſin, that fits his humour better and ſits cloſer to him, like a well made garment, then any other. (And I think this expreſſion renders S. *Paul*'s *peccatum* εὐπερίστατον, reaſonably well.) Other ſins are either too ſtreight for him, and do continually vex and gird him; ſo that he can take but little comfort in them: And ſuch are ſins againſt a mans conſtitution and temper: as for example, one act of Adultery, though for the time pleaſant, would yet afterwards more torment and afflict a covetous mans conſcience, than the devouring, it may be, of a whole Country. Or elſe they hang looſe about him, ſo that though they be eaſie and delightful ſometimes, yet to wear them continually, would prove tedious and irkſome. But his dearly reſpected ſin, is good company at all times for him; and, ſo he may have leave to enjoy but that, he cares not much what becomes of all the reſt. Heb. 12. 1.

23. As for inſtance, that I may preſs a little nearer to your conſciences. Put the caſe there were any one in this company, a covetous oppreſſing perſon, ſuch a one as *Zacchæus*; I'le warrant, he would have been content, that I ſhould rather have taken any Text in the Bible than this: he would have been pleaſed, nay, even rejoyced, to hear me inveigh bitterly againſt any other ſin beſides: Yea, he would willingly, in his own thoughts have joyn'd with me againſt any man living; for thereby he would be apt to juſtifie himſelf in his own eyes, and to ſay in his thoughts, The Preacher indeed is very earneſt in Gods behalf againſt ſome body, but I thank God I am righteous all this while, I am not at all concern'd in it: Nay, it may be he would have been content to have taken my part even againſt himſelf too, in any other ſin beſides this.

24. But now, that I begin to ſet my ſelf againſt his darling, only favourite ſin, the delight of his ſoul, and, as it were, the breath of his noſtrils, he will by no means endure it. What? (thinks he) is there not room enough in all the Old and New Teſtament for this Preacher to expatiate in; are there not a thouſand precepts, and almoſt as many ſtories in the Bible, and muſt he needs ſingle out this? Am I the only perſon that he muſt aim at? Or if he would needs be medling with me, could he not ſpare me, at leaſt in this one ſmall ſin? Let him do his worſt to the reſt of my ſins; let him draw blood from me in any other place beſides this: but this is a very ſucking of my hearts blood; it is a renting to my bowels. The Lord ſurely will be merciful to me in this ſin only; *Lo, is it not a little one, and my ſoul ſhall live* in pleaſure and happineſs. And ſuch thoughts as theſe would the laſcivious perſon have entertain'd, if I had light upon his Text; and ſo the reſt.

25. But as for our new convert *Zacchæus*, (and I beſeech you let him be herein your example) he deals not ſo mercifully, no not with his dearly lov'd ſin of Oppreſſion: No, he is ſo far from that, that as if, in all other reſpects, he had been the moſt innocent holy man alive; he cannot remember, that his conſcience is troubled with any ſin beſides: All his aim and ſpight is directed againſt this only ſin, which having rooted out of his heart, he ſuppoſes he ſhall then be worthy to entertain his new invited bleſſed Gueſt.

26. And to ſay the truth, if a heart once enlightned by grace, find ſo much courage, as to be able to prevail againſt his *peccatum* εὐπερίστατον, it will be an eaſie ſecure skirmiſh and reſiſtance that all the reſt will afford him: Hereupon, ſaith our Saviour to the Phariſees who were covetous, *If you give your riches to the poor, all things ſhall become pure unto you*: As if he ſhould ſay, this ſin of Covetouſneſs is the main chain whereby the Devil holds you captive at his pleaſure; ſtrein and force your ſelves only to break this chain, and then you ſhall be free indeed in perfect liberty; all your other ſins will be only to you as the green withs were to *Sampſon*, even as *threds of tow that have ſmelled the fire*.

27. Pertinent to this may that saying of our Saviour's be in the 13 of St. *John's* Gospel; where giving his Disciples a blessed Example of Humility, in vouchsafing to wash their feet; when it came to S. *Peter's* turn, he would by no means endure it. But after our Saviour had somewhat sharply rebuk'd him; Well, says he, since
John 13. 9. thou wilt descend so far, as to wash me, *Lord, not my feet only, but my hands and my head:* Leave not the work unperfect, since thou will begin to cleanse and sanctifie
Verse 10. me; perfect this thy good work unto the end. Our Saviour replies, *He that is washed, needeth not, save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit.* As if he should say, If thou wilt take so much care, as to cleanse and purifie such parts as by continual exercise and travel, are most subject to be defiled, it will be an easie matter to preserve thy self pure through all the rest. Thus *Zacchæus* having search'd out the head and fountain, whence all those noysome lusts which appeared in his life, did flow, he supposes he shall sufficiently purifie the streams thence issuing; if he can once cleanse the spring. Which he proceeds to perform, in my second General; which is the satisfaction by him tendred in lieu of his former oppressions, in these words, *I restore unto him four-fold.* In the handling of which, I will, according to my promise begin with the first particular thereof, namely, so much of this satisfaction, as is necessary to be performed by virtue of an indispensable precept, which is of Restitution, in these words, *I restore unto him.*

*General Part.* 28. There is a Doctrine blown about and dispersed by a sort of Preachers in the *II.* Reformed Churches, and greedily imbraced by their followers and Proselytes, *Part. I.* because they are perswaded, that themselves are the most interested in it; which teacheth, that no man has any right or propriety in the goods and riches which he possesseth, unless he be one of Gods elect faithful Servants. So that those who are resolv'd to account themselves in this number, and to exclude from this society, all others who suit not with their humours; such, I say, are apt too forwardly to think all others no better than usurpers of their patrimony and inheritance. The dangerous effects and consequences of which Doctrine (especially where power has not been wanting to make the best use and advantage of it) was wofully discovered in those tumults, which not very long since were raised in *Germany*, especially in *Westphalia*, about the City of *Munster*.

29. This Doctrine I suppose was borrowed especially from the Jesuites, who, upon the same grounds, have entituled their Catholick King to almost all the Western parts of the world; whereby many millions of poor souls have been most unhumanely and barbarously massacred, to make way for the supposed right owners the *Spaniards*, as we find testified with horrour and detestation, even by many ingenious honest-hearted writers of their own Nation.

30. Neither the time nor my Text will allow me leisure to stand long upon the confuting of this pernicious Doctrine, I will only oppose to it that saying of the Psalmist, *The Earth is the Lords, but he hath given it to the children of men:* No man alive hath any right in the goods of this world, but only by a gift from God: and by his gift, all the children of men, without exception, are instated in it; so that no pretence of Religion or Election can be sufficient for any one to disseise another man, of what condition or quality soever he be, that is once legally possessed of them.

31. Therefore, whosoever he be, that whether by fraud, or violence, or any other title, shall invade, or usurp upon the rights of another, he does, as much as in him lies, without any warrant, nullifie the gift of God, and takes upon him to oppose and thwart his most wise providence; setting up himself as it were in Gods seat, and dethroning him, establishing a new order of providence of his own. And thinkest thou that doest these things, that thou shalt escape the Judgment of God? Canst thou imagine, that he will patiently endure to see his Judgments reversed, or his Mercies evacuated by thee? That whereas he hath said, *I will bless this man, and enlarge his bounds upon the Earth*; thou shouldest take upon thee to say on the other side, Let God deal as mercifully as he pleaseth to this man, but I know what I am



I am resolved of, I am determin'd to crush and grind him to powder; I am resolv'd that his children shall beg at my gates, and not be satisfied; they shall bow unto me, and not be regarded. What a wretched unworthy opinion must such a one of necessity entertain of God?

32. And I beseech you, do not think that this is only a Rhetorical forced streining of a Point. The Holy Ghost will tell you as much in expres terms, *Prov.* 14. 31. and again, *Prov.* 17. 5. *He that oppresseth the poor, reproacheth his Maker.* He sets his mark and brand of infamy almost upon all Gods glorious Attributes; as if God had not power enough to maintain the poor man against his Adversary; as if he had not wisely enough dispensed his blessings; as if he would not suffer God to extend his mercies but upon whom himself shall please; and so of the rest. Prov. 14. 31. and 17. 5.

33. But I will now, for your sakes, transgress something the limits of my Text, and whereas I should only meddle with the unlawfulness of detaining goods gotten by oppression, and sycophancy, I will make the subject more general in this Propolition, which I beseech you heedfully to attend, and hereafter seriously to consider of: This therefore I say and testifie, *That whosoever he be, whose Conscience shall convince him, that he hath gain'd any thing by an unlawful course, If he resolve not to restore it, and die in that resolution, it is impossible he should be saved.* For the confirming of which Proposition, instead of many, almost infinite, unanswerable reasons, I will only make use of two, each of them drawn from the impossibility in such a man of performing two duties, most necessarily required at every mans hands that professeth Christianity; the one whereof is, Prayer; the second, Repentance. *Doct.*

34. Concerning Prayer, I will demonstrate, That he can neither seriously give God thanks for bestowing upon him those Riches which he calls Blessings; nor secondly, desire Gods blessing upon those Riches. For the first, Without question, if such a one shall dare to open his mouth to give God thanks for his Riches, it will prove to him a greater sin than the unjust unlawful gathering of them, as the Psalmist saith, *His very Prayers shall be turned into sin*; for thereby he will entitle the just righteous God unto his abominable sin. Dares such a man, with any confidence give thanks to Almighty God for suffering him to be his Enemy in oppressing and persecuting, it may be, Gods faithful beloved servants, for suffering him to be an instrument of the Devils? Therefore, if there be any such that hear me this day, (yet I hope, nay, I am almost confident, there is not) but, and if there be, let me beseech him, that of all things in the world, he will take heed of giving thanks, let him rather proceed on blindly in his sin, and put out of his mind all thought and consideration of God; for never any Heathen could offer him such an indignity as this, no not *Epicurus* nor *Diagoras* himself.

35. In the second place, How can such a one desire God to bless unto him, and increase those Riches so unjustly gotten? Will he say, Lord make it appear unto the world, by blessing me in these my ungodly courses that thou likest well of them, and that thou hast been of conspiracy with me in all mine ungracious projects; so shall the godly quickly be rooted out of the earth, for every one will take advantage to wrong another; if thou wilt bless me every one will be ready to tread in my steps. We see a man in such a state cannot seriously pray no kind of Prayer, unless he purpose to mock God to his face, so that he has defrauded himself of one necessary means of Salvation: But that which follows is of greater importance yet.

36. There is nothing wherein a man (that is resolv'd not to part with goods unlawfully gathered) can deal with more despightful petulancy and uncivility with God, then by offering to pretend to an unfeigned Repentance. It is much like the behaviour of *Charles* the Fifth unto God, who caused publick Prayers and Processions to be made unto God for the delivery of the Pope in *Spain*, whom himself at the same time detain'd Prisoner in his own Castle S. *Angelo*, with a resolution that howsoever those Prayers wrought with God to pity his Vicar, yet till he had concluded Conditions for his own advantage with him, he should never be released: Just such another Enterlude, and phantastical Pageant must this mans Repentance be.

37. He

37. He will say, perhaps: Lord, I confess, I cannot justifie those ways and courses whereby I procur'd my wealth; it may be, to make way for my excess and superfluity many a poor soul (yet richer in thy grace and favour than my self) has been forc'd almost to starve for penury and want. It may be there are store of Orphans and Widows that are importunate upon thee for vengeance against my unchristian profession; and I acknowledge, that for my demerits I am liable to be forc'd to drink the very dregs of thy fierce wrath and indignation for ever. I will therefore rely and cast my self upon thy mercy and pity, which yet, if I cannot purchase without the loss and restitution of my ill gotten wealth, I will rather adventure upon thy fury; And though I know it to be a fearful thing and insupportable misery to fall into thy hands, as into the hands of an enemy and pursuer; yet upon no manner of conditions will I part with my Riches; No, not though I were now upon my death-bed, being out of all hopes of ever enjoying any comfort and pleasure my self from them, and within few hours expecting to be convey'd into my everlasting Prison: yet rather then my Son, or my Kinsman (who even after restitution made of what is unlawfully got, might perhaps have remaining to him sufficient to maintain him plentifully in this world) yet rather then he shall abate any thing of that vanity and superfluity which my excess of wealth will be able to bear, I will endanger the forfeiture of my inheritance in the land of the living.

*Obj.* 1. 38. But it may be, you will say, That it is an impossible thing for any man that pretends to Christianity, to have such thoughts in him as these. I confess, it is a hard thing for a man to make such a formal distinct Discourse with himself as this was:

*Sol.* But consider, whether such a mans thoughts (which at an exigence, like this, are confus'd and tumultuous) yet if they were reduc'd into order and method, consider, I say, whether they would not be digested into a sense and meaning equivalent unto that which before I express'd; so that God who knows the bent and inclination of his heart (much better than himself) he will display and discover them distinctly and legibly before his eyes, and will proceed against him, as if he had behav'd himself towards him after such an unworthy, more then Atheistical, fashion.

*Obj.* 2. 39. But again, it is possible, I may be reply'd upon, and have the case put, that a man who hath unrighteously oppressed or defrauded his neighbour, has not means enough left to make satisfaction by restoring. And that is no extraordinary example, that Goods ill got should have by the Justice of God wings given them to fly away, and escape out of the hands of the Purchasers: Shall such men, because they are not able to restore, be concluded in such a desperate estate as before I have mentioned? No, God forbid! If in such circumstances a man shall be unfeignedly sor-

*Sol.* ry for his misdeeds, and withal resolve, if God shall hereafter bless him with abilities, to make restitution, our merciful God will accept of that good inclination of his heart, as if he had perfectly satisfi'd and restor'd to each man his due: For without all question, God will never condemn any man because he is not rich.

*Obj.* 3. 40. If it shall be again questioned, and the supposition made, that a man (for example, a Tradesman) cannot possibly call to remembrance each particular mans name whom he hath wrong'd, (as indeed, it is almost impossible he should) what

*Sol.* advice shall he take in such a case? I answer, that he must in this case consider, that by this sin, he hath not only wrong'd his Neighbour, but God also; therefore since he cannot find out the one, let him repay it to the other: Let him be so charitable, and do that kindness to God, as to bestow it in Alms upon his poor servants: Or, since God himself is grown so poor and needy, (especially in this Kingdom) that he hath not means enough to repair his own houses, nor scarce to make them habitable, he may do well to rescue Gods Churches from being habitations of Beasts, and stables for Cattel: or lastly, which more concerns you, since God is here grown so much out of purse, that he has not means enough to pay his own servants wages equal to the meaneſt of your houshold servants, let not them any longer be the mocking stocks of those *Canaanites*, your enemies, that so swarm in your Land; here is a subject fit indeed for your Charity: and a miserable case it is, God knows, that they should



should be the persons, who of all conditions of men should stand in greatest need of your mercy and charity.

41. Oh! but will some man say: we have found now at what the Preacher aimeth: all this ado about restitution is only to enrich the Clergy. If such thoughts and jealousies as these arise in your hearts, (as I know, by experience it is no unlikely thing they should) O then, I beseech you, for the mercies of God, consider in what a miserable state the Church must needs be, when the most likely course to keep the Ministers of God from starving, must be your sins: When those to whom you have committed your souls in trust, as they that must give God an account for them, shall through want and penury be rendred so heartless, and low-spirited, that for fear of your anger, and danger of starving, they shall not dare to interrupt or hinder you, when you run headlong in the paths that lead you to destruction: when out of faintheartedness they shall not dare to take notice, no, not of the most scandalous sins of their Patrons, but, which is worst, be the most forward officious Parasites to sooth them in their crimes, and cry peace unto them, when God and their own Consciences tell them that they are utter strangers from it, and neither do, nor are ever likely to know the ways of peace: Lastly, when these Messengers of God shall be the most ready to tell you, that those Possessions and Tithes which have been wrested out of Gods hands are none of Gods due, that they are none of the Churches Patrimony; that their right is nothing but your voluntary Alms and charitable Benevolence, and that they shall think themselves sufficiently and liberally dealt withal, if you shall account them worthy to be the companions of the basest and meanest of your servants. I could almost be silent in this cause, did not our enemies in *Gath* know of it, and if it were not publish'd in the streets of *Askalon*; insomuch, that you have given cause to the enemies of God to blaspheme our glorious and undefiled Religion.

42. I will conclude this Doctrin of Restitution most necessary certainly to be prosecuted in these times, only with proposing to your considerations two Motives, which in all reason ought to perswade you to the practise of it: the one shall be, that you would do it for your own sakes; the other, for your childrens sake. For the former, though I could never be scanted of Arguments sufficient to enforce it, though I should make it the subject of my Sermons to my lives end, yet because, I perceive, it is time for me to hasten to your release, I will only desire you to remember how much I have told you already, that this Doctrine concerns you, since it is impossible for any man while he is guilty of the breach of this duty, to put in practise even the most necessary and indispensable Precepts of Christian Religion.

43. But concerning the second Motive, which I desire should induce to the practise of Restitution, namely, that you should be perswaded to it even for your childrens sake, I beseech you, take this seriously into your consideration. That whereas it may be, you may think that by heaping wealth, howsoever purchased, upon your heirs, you shall sufficiently provide for them against all casualties, yet, that God also hath his treasures in store to countervail yours, and to provide so, that your Heirs shall take but little content, God knows, in all their abundance: for, as it is in *Job* 20. 8. *God will lay up the iniquity of sinners for their children, i. e.* He will not satisfie himself with wreaking vengeance of other mens wrongs upon your heads that have done them, but will take care also, that your children shall be no gainers by the bargain: Therefore, as you desire the welfare of those for whose sake especially, you dare adventure to hazard even your own souls, bequeath not to them for a legacy a canker and moth, that will assuredly consume and devour all your Riches: Take pity of those poor souls who are nothing interessed in their own persons in those crimes wherewith their wealth was purchased, and leave not unto them a curse from God upon their Inheritance. But, I see, I must be forc'd even abruptly to break from this argument of Restitution; I come therefore, briefly, to my last particular, namely, the excess and extraordinary measure of *Zacchæus* his Restitution, which he professeth shall be four-fold, to be dispatch'd in one word.

44. However, I found it something a hard task to clear my first particular of *Part.* 2.

Con-

Confeſſion, from the danger and neighbourhood of Popery, yet, I fear, that in moſt mens opinions, it will prove more difficult to do as much for this: For here is an
*Object.* action perform'd by *Zacchæus*, (namely, Four-fold Reſtitution) without all queſtion, good and acceptable to God, and yet not enjoyn'd by virtue of any Commandment, and, What is that, but plain Popiſh Super-erogation? For, the Judicial Law of reſtoring fourfold, is only in ſtrictneſs and propriety applicable to plain direct Stealing.

*Sol.* 45. I confeſs, that ſome particular men, for fear of this conſequence have thought themſelves oblig'd to diſſent not only from St. *Paul*'s diſtinction of counſels from Precepts in the Goſpel, but alſo from the general uniform conſent of all Antiquity: Whereas, if we ſhall well conſider it, they have feared where no fear was: For, our Churches never condemned that diſtinction, as if there were danger from thence of making way for Popery: But this is that abomination of a more then Phariſaical ſelf-juſtifying Pride in the Church of *Rome*, that upon ſo weak a foundation they have moſt inartificially erected their *Babel* of Super-erogation, whereby they teach that they cannot only through the whole courſe of their lives exactly perform all the Commandments of God, without offending in any one mortal ſin; by this means challenging at Gods hands Remiſſion of their Sins, and everlaſting Salvation for themſelves; but alſo by their voluntary unrequired obedience unto Evangelical Counſels, leave God in arrearages unto them, and make an extraordinary ſtock of merits, which ſhall be left unto the Popes care and providence to manage, and diſpenſe to any mans uſe for ready mony. This is that Doctrine which the Church of *England*, in expreſs words, moſt worthily profeſſeth a deteſtation unto, in their fourteenth Article, which hath been tranſcribed into the five and fortieth of this Church. And yet for all this neither of theſe Churches have any quarrel to
1 Cor. 7. 25. that diſtinction of S. *Paul*, (when ſpeaking of voluntary Chaſtity, he ſaith, I have received no ſuch Commandement from the Lord, yet I give my advice or counſel) as hath been excellently diſcovered by the late incomparable Biſhop of *Wincheſter* in his *Reſp. ad Apologiam.*

46. And now though I have gone through and quite abſolv'd my Text, yet I can ſcarce think my Sermon finiſh'd, till I have endeavoured to make it beneficial unto you by applying it to your Conſciences and practiſe: But when I ſhould come to that, I confeſs, I find theſe times wherein we live ſo indiſpoſed for ſuch an Application, that I know not which way to begin with you: For, ſhall I ſeriouſly enjoyn you, as by a Precept from God, that where you have unjuſtly oppreſs'd, or cunningly and cloſely defrauded your Neighbour, that you ſhould, as *Zacchæus* did here, reſtore unto him four-ſold? No, I dare not adventure ſo far, I have received no ſuch Commandment from the Lord: and then, I ſhould be guilty of that which was an unjuſt accuſation laid upon *Moſes* and *Aaron*, *Ye take too much upon you, ye ſons of Levi.*

47. Shall I then endeavour to perſwade you to conform your ſelves to this pattern of *Zacchæus*, as to a Counſel? Alas the times are ſuch, that well were we if as ſome have turn'd all Counſels into Precepts, that the ſame men would not at leaſt in their practice convert all Precepts into Counſel: If they would not think that the Moral Legal Precepts were antiquated and diſſolved by bringing in the New Covenant of Grace! Or, if not quite abrogated, yet left ſo arbitrary, that they ſhould become matters of no neceſſary importance and conſequence, duties, which if we ſhall perform, we ſhall thereby approve our gratitude and thankfulneſs unto God our Saviour; and yet, if by chance they be left undone, ſince they are eſteem'd no neceſſary conditions of the New-Covenant, there is no great danger as long as we can keep a ſpark of faith alive, as long as we can perſwade our ſelves that we have a
Dr. *Carrier* in his Epiſtle to K. *James.* firm perſwaſion of Gods mercy in Chriſt to our ſelves in particular; which kind of newly invented faith, an Adverſary of our Church pleaſantly, and I fear too truly defines, when he ſays, It is nothing but a ſtrong fancy.

48. Theſe



48. Theſe things therefore conſidered, I will leave the application of *Zacchæus* his extraordinary Reſtitution to your own Conſciences, according as God and your own ſouls ſhall agree together: Only I beſeech you, not to make a counſel of Reſtitution in general, but to free your ſelves from the burden and weight of other mens Riches, leſt they over-leaven and ſwell you ſo unmeaſurably, that you ſhall not be able to preſs in at that ſtraight gate, which would lead you unto thoſe bleſſed and glorious habitations which Chriſt hath purchaſed for you, not with theſe corruptible things of ſilver and gold, but with his own precious Blood: Unto which habitations God of his infinite mercy bring us all, for the ſame our Lord Jeſus Chriſt his ſake, To whom with the Father, *&c.*

# The Eighth Sermon.

## Gal. V. 5.

*For we through the Spirit, wait for the hope of Righteousness by Faith.*

THIS day the wisdom of the ancient Primitive, and I think, Apostolick Church hath dedicated to the memory of an Epiphany, or Apparition of a miraculous Star, which was sent to guide the *Magi*, or Wisemen of the East, to the place where our Saviour was born. But suppose there were such a Star seen, and three men of the East conducted by it; must all the Christian World presently fall a rejoycing for it? There was reason indeed, that they should be exceeding glad, but shall we therefore rejoice whole days labour by it. To say the truth, there is no reason for it: therefore some better grounds must be found out for our rejoycing, or it were well done to make Christmas a day shorter hereafter.

2. But for all this, if we well consider it, we Gentiles might better spare any Holiday in the year than this; for there is none besides this, properly our own, but the Jews will challenge an equal interest in it. The appearing of the Star, then, is the least part of the Solemnity of this day: For a greater and more glorious light than the Star this day arose unto us, even that so long expected *Light which was to lighten the Gentiles, which was to give light to them which sate in darkness, and in the shadow* Tit. ii. 12. *of death, and to guide our feet in the way of peace.* This day, as St. *Paul* saith, Ἐπεφάνη ἡ χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ, There was an Epiphany likewise of the grace of God, to wit, the Gospel; which now, as on this day, began to *bring salvation*, not to the Jews only, but *to all men*, even to us sinners of the Gentiles, of whom those three wise men were the first fruits. And, to say the truth, the appearing of Christ himself, unless he had brought with him this light to lighten the Gentiles in his hand, had not been sufficient to make a solemn day for us. The Star then *was not that light, but it was sent to bear witness of that light*, namely, the Gospel, the glory whereof fills my Text fuller than the Majesty of God ever fill'd the Temple. For here we have the whole nature of the Gospel comprehended and straitned within the narrow compass of my Text, yet no part of it left out; yea, we have not only the Gospel discovered by its own light as it is in it self, but in comparison with those twinkling cloudy stars of Jewish Ordinances, and that once-glorious, but now eclipsed light, the Law of Works: since then, this is the day which the Lord hath made for us, we will rejoyce and be glad in it, and we will be ready to hearken, especially to any thing that shall be spoken concerning our Epiphany; concerning that blessed light, for many ages removed out of our sight, and as on this day beginning to appear in our Horizon.

3. The words of my Text, I find so full and swelling with expression, so fruitful and abounding in rich sense, that I am almost sorry I have said so much of them to fit them to this day: But in recompense, I will spare the labour of shewing their dependence and connexion with the preceding part of the Epistle, and consider them as a loose severed Thesis. In which is contain'd, not only the sum and extract of this Epistle, but likewise of Christian Religion in general, in opposition both to the Mosaical



saical Law given to the Jews; and the Law of works, call'd also the Moral Natural Law, which from the beginning of the world hath been assented to, and written in the hearts of all mankind. The sense of which words, if they were inlarg'd, may be this, "*we* Christians, by the tenour and prescript of our Religion, *expect the hope of* "*Righteousness*, *i.* the reward which we hope for by righteousness; not as those, "vain Teachers newly sprung up among you *Galatians*, would have us, by obedi- "ence unto the carnal Ceremonial Law of *Moses*, but, *through the Spirit*, *i.* by a spi- "ritual worship; neither by performing the old Covenant of Works, which we are "not able to fulfil, but *by faith*, by such an obedience as is prescribed unto us in the "Gospel. *We through the Spirit wait*, &c.

4. In these words then, which comprehend the compleat essence of the Covenant of Grace, we may consider, First, the conditions on mans part required, in these words, *through the Spirit*, and *by Faith*. Secondly, upon the performance of our duty, there follows Gods promise, or the condition which God will make good unto us, and that is, *the hope of Righteousness*, or Justification. In the former part, namely, the obedience which is required from us Christians, we may consider it, first, in opposition to the Mosaical Law, by these words, *through the Spirit*; which import, that it is not such an outward carnal obedience, as *Moses* his Law required: but an internal spiritual worship of the heart and soul. Secondly, the opposition of this new Covenant, to the old Covenant of Works, in these words, *by Faith*; which signifie, that we do not hope for salvation by the works of the Law, but by the righteousness of Faith, or the Gospel. In the second General, we may likewise observe, first the nature of Justification, which comprehends the promises which God has been pleased to propose to us as the reward of our obedience. Secondly, the interest which we Christians in this life after we have perform'd our duties, may have in these promises, which is Hope, express'd in these words, *We wait for the hope*, &c. Of these—

1. 2. I. 1. 2. II. 1. 2.

5. First then of the Covenant of Grace, as it is distinguish'd from the Mosaical Law by these words, *through the Spirit*. Where we will consider the nature of the Jewish Law, and wherein it is distinguish'd from the Christian. When Almighty God, with a high hand and a stretched out arm, had rescued the people of *Israel* from the Egyptian slavery, and brought them in safety into the Wilderness, intending then to settle and reduce them into good order and government himself, and, by common voluntary consent, they all agreed to submit themselves to whatsoever laws he shall prescribe unto them, as we find *Exod.* 19. from the 3d to the 9th verse. So that afterwards, *Judg.* 8. when the people, after an unexpected glorious victory obtain'd by *Gideon*, would have made him a King, and have setled the government in his house: No, saith *Gideon*, (ver. 23.) *I will not rule over you, neither shall my Son rule over you, The Lord shall rule over you.* And likewise afterward when *Samuel* complained to God of the perverseness of the people, who were weary of his Government, and would have a King, as the Nations round about them had: Thou art deceived, saith God, it is my government that they are weary of; *They have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me*, and now are risen up in rebellion against me, to depose me from that Dominion which with their free consents I assumed: For which intolerable base ingratitude of that Nation, in his wrath he gives them a King, he appoints his Successour, which revenged those injuries and indignities offered to Almighty God, to the uttermost upon them.

Exod. 19. 3, &c. Judg. 8. Ver. 23.

6. Now during the time of Gods reign over them, never any King was so careful to provide wholesom laws both for Church and Commonwealth as he was: Insomuch, as he bids them look about, and consider the Nations round about them, If ever any people was furnished with Laws and Ordinances of such equity and righteousness, as theirs were: which Laws, because they were ordained by Angels, in the hand of a Mediator, namely *Moses*, are commonly called by the name of the Mosaical Law, and are penned down at large by him in his last four Books.

7. The Precepts and prohibitions of this Law, are of several natures: For some duties therein enjoyn'd, are such as in their own natures have an intrinsecal essential

goodneſs and righteouſneſs in them, and the contrary to them, are in themſelves evil, and would have been ſo, though they had never been expreſly prohibited: Such are eſpecially the ten Words or Precepts written by Gods own finger in the two Tables of Stone: Other Precepts concern matters of their own nature indifferent, and are only to be termed good, becauſe they were commanded by a poſitive divine Law; ſuch are the Ceremonial Waſhings, Purifications, Sacrifices, *&c.* A third ſort are of a mixt nature, the objects of which, are, for the moſt part, things in their own nature, good or evil; but yet the circumſtances annex'd unto them, are meerly arbitrary and alterable, as namely, thoſe things which are commanded or forbidden by that which is commonly called the Judicial Law: for example, The Law of four-fold Reſtitution of things ſtollen. Theft of its own nature is evil, and deſerves puniſhment: But that the puniſhment thereof ſhould be ſuch a kind of Reſtitution, is not in it ſelf neceſſary, but may be chang'd either into a corporal puniſhment, or, it may be, into a civil death, according as thoſe who have the government of Kingdoms and States ſhall think fit and convenient for the diſpoſitions of the times wherein they live, as we ſee by experience in the practiſe of our own Kingdoms. For the due execution of which Laws, and puniſhment of tranſgreſſors, God appointed Judges and Rulers; and where they failed through want of care or partiality, himſelf many times would immediately and perſonally inflict the puniſhment.

8. Now the general Sanction of this whole Law is expreſſed, *Deut.* 27. *ver.* 26. in theſe words, *Curſed is every one that continueth not in all the words of this Law to do them:* which curſe, as we find it afterwards at large interpreted, imported a ſudden violent untimely death, together with all kind of misfortune, that could make this life miſerable: ſo that he was liable to this Curſe that ſwerved in any one point or circumſtance, from what was contained in that Law. Notwithſtanding, in ſome caſes, God was pleaſed to remit the rigour of this Curſe, and to accept of certain gifts and offerings, and the expiatory ſacrifices of Beaſts, as it were, in exchange for the lives of the delinquents. I ſhould but fruitleſly trifle away the time in inſiſting any longer upon the nature and quality of the Moſaical Law. I will now, as I am required by my Text, ſhew you the extreme difference, and incomparable excellency of the Covenenant of Grace, or the Goſpel beyond this, in ſeveral reſpects. Deut. 27. 26.

9. As firſt, The Moral Duties of the two Tables, as they are part of the Moſaical Jewiſh Law required only an external obedience and conformity to the Affirmative precepts thereof, and an abſtaining from an outward practiſe of the Negative. They did not reach unto the conſcience, no more than the National Laws of other Kingdoms do: ſo that for example, where the Law of *Moſes* forbids Adultery upon pain of Death, he that ſhould in his heart luſt with any woman, could not be accounted a tranſgreſſor of *Moſes* his Law, neither was he liable to the puniſhment therein ſpecified: whereas the Goſpel requires not only an outward, and, as I may ſay, corporal obedience to Gods Commandements, but alſo an inward ſanctification of the ſoul and conſcience upon the ſame penalty of everlaſting damnation with the former. And what is now ſaid of the moral precepts (as they are part of *Moſes* his Law) by the ſame proportion likewiſe, is to be underſtood of the Judicial.

10. Notwithſtanding what hath now been ſaid, yet we muſt know, that theſe very Jews, to whom this Law was given, being the children of *Abraham*, were heirs likewiſe of the promiſes which were made unto him and his ſeed; and the way or means whereby they were to attain unto theſe promiſes, were the very ſame by which himſelf obtained them, namely, Faith. So that this Moſaical Law (whatſoever glorious opinion the Jews had of it) was not that Covenant whereby they were to ſeek for Juſtification in the ſight of God. Till Chriſt's coming there was no Law given, which could have given life, that is, which could promiſe everlaſting life unto man; not the Law of Works by reaſon of mans imperfection and weakneſs; not the Law of *Moſes*, by reaſon of its own weakneſs, as St. *Paul* clearly demonſtrates, eſpecially in the Epiſtle to the Hebrews.

11. For what end then was the Law of *Moſes* given? St. *Paul* ſhall anſwer the queſtion,



queſtion, *Gal.* 3. 19. *It was added* (ſaith he) *becauſe of tranſgreſſions, till the ſeed ſhould come to whom the promiſes were made.* It was added, as if he ſhould ſay, After the promiſes made unto *Abraham* and his ſeed, this Law was moreover annexed, not as any new condition whereby they were to attain unto the promiſes, but that, in the mean time, till the promiſes were fulfilled, they ſhould be reſtrained, as it were, and kept under a ſtrict outward diſcipline, from running into any exceſs of diſobedience: for thoſe, whom perhaps the goodneſs and mercy of God, in affording them thoſe promiſes, would not by the hope of them be able to bridle, they notwithſtanding when they ſaw puniſhment even unto death without mercy inflicted upon the tranſgreſſors, they would be more careful of their ways. It follows, *Till the ſeed ſhould come to whom the promiſes were made*; or as himſelf in *Heb.* 9. alters the phraſe, *till the time of Reformation*: that is, When Chriſt, who was that bleſſed Seed, promiſed to *Abraham*, ſhould come, he would ſo clearly and convincingly ſhew unto the world the way of Salvation, that they ſhould no longer need to be kept under their old Schoolmaſter, the Law; and therefore at his coming, the date of the whole Moſaical Law ſhould expire. And that may be one reaſon why S. *Paul* is in this Chapter ſo violent againſt thoſe that would urge the obſervation of the Moſaical Law; foraſmuch as by inforcing it now when the ſeed was already come, to whom the promiſes were made, they did ſeem to evacuate the coming and Goſpel of Chriſt. Gal. 3. 19. Heb. 9. 10

12. Now, that the Moſaical Law was not given to the Jews for this end, that by the fulfilling thereof, they ſhould promiſe to themſelves the reward of righteouſneſs, everlaſting life; is evidently demonſtrated, both by our Saviour in the fifth of *Matthew*, and by S. *Paul* through all his Epiſtles, but eſpecially in that to the *Hebrews*. The force and virtue of whoſe arguments, may in general be reduc'd to that iſſue which before I mentioned, *viz.* That the Law, by the performance whereof we may expect life, requires not only an external conformity to the outward works, but an inward ſpiritual ſanctification alſo of the ſoul and heart.

13. But what ſaith the Law of *Moſes*? *It was ſaid*, ſaith our Saviour, *by them of old, i. e.* in the Law of *Moſes*, *Thou ſhalt not kill*; not, Thou ſhalt not be angry, thou ſhalt not bear malice in thy heart: ſo that if thou abſtaineſt from Murder, thou fulfilleſt *Moſes* his Law; *And if thou doeſt kill, thou ſhalt be in danger of Judgment, i.* the only puniſhment which the Law of *Moſes* inflicted upon the tranſgreſſors thereof, was the danger to be condemn'd to death by the Judgment, or Bench of Judges appointed for the execution of this Law. *But I ſay unto you*; I, who clearly ſhew unto you that way wherein you muſt walk, before you can promiſe to your ſelves any hope of eternal life; I ſay unto you, not only, whoſoever ſhall kill his neighbour, but whoſoever out of malice or rancour, *ſhall ſay unto his brother, Thou fool, ſhall be in danger of Hell fire.* So likewiſe, not only he which commits Adultery in the outward act, is culpable by my Goſpel before God, but alſo he which looks upon a woman to luſt after her in his heart. And ſo inſtead of forſwearing and breaking of Oaths, and Vows, which *Moſes* his Law forbad; Chriſt condemns fruitleſs and unneceſſary, though true, Oaths. Inſtead of the Law of Retaliation of injuries, Chriſt commands rather to ſuffer a ſecond injury, than to revenge the firſt. Mat. 5. 21 Ver. 22. Ver. 27. Ver. 33. Ver. 38.

14. But in the laſt place, the laſt example which our Saviour gives, may ſeem to deſtroy this collection which hath been drawn out of this Chapter: for, ſaith he, Ver. 43. *You have heard, that it hath been ſaid of old, Thou ſhalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy.* What! did *Moſes* his Law then permit a man to bear hatred and malice unto another? Did I ſay, permit them? Nay, it commanded them ſo perfectly to hate their enemies, to wit, the ſeven Nations who poſſeſſed that Land, which was theirs by promiſe, mentioned, *Exod.* 34. 2. *Deut.* 7. 1. to which were added the *Amalekites*, *Exod.* 27. 19. *Deut.* 30. 19. That they were enjoyned to deſtroy them utterly, old and young, men, women, and children, even to the very cattel, without all pity and conſideration. Inſomuch, that *Saul*, for his unſeaſonable pity but of one perſon, and that a King of the *Amalekites*, and reſerving the beſt Ver. 43. Exod. 34. 2. Deut. 7. 1. Exod. 27. 19. Deut. 30. 19.

of

of the cattel for sacrifice to God, had the Kingdom utterly rent from him and his posterity. Whereas, by our Saviour, in the words of S. *Paul*, enmity is slain. No enemies now in Christianity, but all neighbours, and friends, and brethren; nay more, if any one will needs be your enemy, love him notwithstanding, saith Christ, *If he curse you, bless him; if he hate you, do good unto him; If he use you despitefully, and persecute you, pray for him.* To conclude this argument from our Saviour's authority; Christ adds, as a Corollary to his discourse, speaking to his Disciples and followers,
Ver. 20. *Except your righteousness exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, i.* whereas they content themselves with an outward carnal obedience to the Law, unless you, besides this, add a spiritual sanctification of the mind, *ye shall in no wise enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.* I deny not now, but that there may be a mystical spiritual sense even of this Law, and an application thereof almost as perfect, as is express'd in the Gospel, which those vvho vvere guided extraordinarily by the Spirit of God, and vvith help of Tradition, might collect out of it: As the Prophet *David*, *Psal.* 19.
Psal. 19. 7. vvhere he saith, *The Law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul; the Commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightning the eyes,* &c. And in this sense, the succeeding Prophets endeavoured to persvvade the people to apprehend it. But this vvas a forc'd sense of *Moses* his Law, not primarily intended by the author; it was no proper natural meaning of it.

15. Proportionably to this Doctrine of our Saviour, S. *Paul*, speaking of *Moses* his Law, considered in its proper natural and direct sense, and as extremely unsuffi-
Gal. 4. 9. cient to justifie a man in the sight of God, calls it ἀσθενῆ ϗ πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα, *weak and*
Heb. 7. 16 *beggerly elements*, Gal. 4. 9. And Νόμον τῆς ἐντολῆς σαρκικῆς, *a Law of a carnal commandment*, Heb. 7. 16. *i.* a Law which a carnal man, one not guided by the Spirit of
Ibid. v. 19. God, might perform. And, *a Law which made no man perfect*, Heb. 7. 19. Nay more,
Heb. 8. 7. saith he, it is not ἄμεμπτος, *not without fault*, Heb. 8. 7. *i.* a man might perform the Law of *Moses*, and yet not be ἄμεμπτος, he may be a wicked man still in Gods sight; for all his legal Righteousness, he may remain dead in trespasses and sins. Insomuch, as the same *Paul* speaking of himself, before he was converted to Christianity, says he,
Phil. 3. 6. *Concerning the righteousness which is of the Law, I was blameless*; I did so exactly fulfil that measure of Righteousness, which *Moses* his Law required of me: that, in respect of that Law, I was a guiltless innocent person; I could justifie my self; I durst with confidence oppose my self in judgment, to the censure of our most severe strict Judges.

16. But what then? Durst *Paul* with this his Legal Righteousness appear before God, as expecting to be justified in his sight, as claiming any interest in the promises of eternal life, by virtue of this his innocency? By no means: No, saith he, though I were blameless, as concerning this righteousness which is of the Law, though I had
Phil. 3. 6. all the priviledges that any Jew could be capable of, *circumcised the eighth day, of the stock of Israel, of the Tribe of Benjamin, an Hebrew of the Hebrews, according to the Law a Pharisee,* (*i. e.* of that Sect which had preserved the Law in the greatest integrity)
Ver. 6. though I were *so zealous thereof, that I persecuted the Churches* of Christ, which sought to abrogate it: and lastly, though *concerning the righteousness of the Law, I was blameless*: Yet, notwithstanding all these, I will have no better an opinion of these priviledges than they deserve; I will account them only outward carnal priviledges; If I at all rejoyce in them, yet this I will account only *a rejoycing in the flesh.* Far be it from me, to think to appear before Christ with such a righteousness as this is. God forbid I should expect to be accepted of by him, for these carnal outward priviledges: Nay, so far am I from that, that, whatsoever I thought, before I knew him, to be a gain and a prerogative unto me, now that I have attain'd to the excellency of the knowledge of Jesus Christ, *I account as loss*, as things likely to be rather a hin-
Ver. 9. drance unto me; yea, as dross and dung, and *desire to be found in him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the Law*: For, alas, how mean, and unworthy will that appear in his eyes? *but the righteousness which is of Faith, the righteousness which is of God by Faith.* The former righteousness was mine own, and therefore could



could not stand in his sight; but that righteousness to which Faith or the Gospel directs me, proceeds not from my own strength, but only from God, who will crown his own graces in me.

17. I have thus far shew'd you, both from our Saviour's authority, and S. *Paul*'s likewise; that the performing of the Moral Duties as far as they were inforc'd, by virtue of *Moses* his Law, could not make a man capable of attaining to the promises of the New Covenant. And (that I may add one confirmation of this more out of the Old Testament) hereupon it is, that God by the Prophet *Ezekiel* manifestly sheweth, that God gave not the Law of *Moses* to the Israelites, for this end, that they should think that the performance of that Law, was all the duty which they owed unto God; or that that obedience could make them accepted of him unto eternal life: No, saith he, if you have any such conceit of those Ordinances, *The Statutes which I gave them, were not good, and the Judgments such, as they should not live* Ezek. 20. 25.
*by them.* I will now proceed to shew you the weakness and unprofitableness of the Ceremonial part of *Moses* his Law likewise, for such a purpose; and that by Arguments taken from St. *Paul*, especially out of that his most Divine Epistle to the *Hebrews.*

18. The first argument shall be drawn out of the 9th Chapter of that Epistle, the sum whereof is this: The first Covenant, which had *Ordinances of Divine Service, and a worldly Sanctuary, which consisted in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and* Heb. 10.
*carnal ordinances imposed on them till the time of reformation, in which also were offered* 10.
*gifts and sacrifices*; yet with all these Ceremonies and Formalities, they could enter no deeper than the flesh, *they could not make him which did the service perfect, as per-* Verse 9.
*taining to the conscience*: That is, for example; those Expiatory Sacrifices which were to be offered for him which had transgressed, they absolved him indeed from a civil carnal punishment, but they could not reach to the conscience; that remained still as guilty and defiled before God, as ever it was. And can it be imagined, that a man so qualified, with such an accusing, condemning conscience, could with any hope or confidence appear before God, as expecting to be freed from the danger of Hell, for the cost or ceremony of a Sacrifice? Those Sacrifices therefore and Ceremonies, *the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer, sprinkling the unclean,* Ver. 13.
*might sanctifie a man to the purifying of the flesh*, and that is all they could do; and so far they could sanctifie even the most profane person, or the veriest Hypocrite in the world; *But it must be only the Blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit, offered* Ver. 14.
*himself without spot unto God, that is able to purge our consciences from dead works to serve the living God.*

19. But it may be objected, The Baptizing and washing of us Christians, and our *Object.*
Commemoration of the true Sacrifice, are powerful and effectual, even to the sanctification of the soul and spirit: And why should not the water of *Jordan* have as much virtue in it, during *Moses* his Law, as it has had since, or as ours has now? Why should not their pre-figuration of the true Sacrifice by typical Sacrifices, be as much worth as our post-commemoration thereof? for Christ was the same yesterday, and to day, and for ever. I answer, that Baptism and the Eucharist, are proper *Sol.*
instrument, vvhereby the Sacrifice of Christ is applied, and made beneficial unto us, and vvere instituted for that and no other end: vvhereas the proper and direct end of *Moses* his Liturgy and Ceremonies, vvere only civil carnal immunities; and though it be true, that the Legal Sacrifices vvere very apt and commodious, to shadovv forth the Oblation and satisfaction of Christ; yet this use of them vvas so mystical and reserved, so impossible to be collected out of the letter of the Law, that vvithout a special Revelation from God, the eyes of the Israelites vvere too vveak to serve them to pierce through those dark clouds and shadows, and to carry their observation to the substance: so that I conceive those Sacrifices of the Law, in this respect, are a great deal more beneficial to us Christians; for there is a great difference between Sacraments and Types: Types are only useful after the Antitype is discovered, for the confirmation of their Faith that follow. As for example, *Abraham*'s offering of

*Isaac*

*Isaac* by faith, did lively represent the real Oblation of Christ, but in that respect, was of little or no use till Christ was indeed crucified; it being impossible to make that history a ground-work of their Faith in Christ. The like may be said of the Legal Sacrifices.

20. My second Argument shall be taken out of those words of St. *Paul*, Acts 13. 38. where, speaking of Christ, he saith, *By him all that believe, are justified from all things, from which they could not be justified by the Law of Moses*: From which I infer, that since there were many sins for which the Law of *Moses* allowed no Sacrifice, no Redemption, no Satisfaction, no Commutation, in what a fearful desperate case would a person that should commit such sins be, if he were to expect Justification before God by the Law of *Moses*, for that must needs lead him to despair? It could shew him no refuge, no Sanctuary to fly unto; nothing would remain unto such a person but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation to consume Gods Adversary: And therefore no marvail if the same Apostle (*Heb.* 7. 17, 18.) saith, *That the former Law for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof (i. e.* to Justification) *was to be disannull'd*, since it could make nothing perfect.

Acts 13. 38.

Heb. 7. 17, 18.

21. The last Argument shall be infer'd from that saying of the Apostle, *Heb.* 8. 6. where speaking of the New Covenant of Grace, he saith, *It was established on better promises*, namely, than the Jewish Covenant was: For all the happiness which was to be expected from *Moses* his Law, was only an exemption from the inconveniences and curses of this life, long days and peaceable, enrich'd with worldly content and prosperity: Whereas the blessings which attend the performance of the New Covenant or the Gospel are unspeakable and glorious, *Such as eye hath not seen*, nor indeed, as long as it is mortal, can see, *neither can the heart of man conceive them, being eternal in the Heavens.* Neither will the ordinary evasion serve the turn, as if these temporal blessings, or plagues and curses mentioned in *Moses* his writings, should purposely signifie the blessed estate of glorified Saints, or woes of the damned, for then Saint *Paul's* Argument would fall to the ground; and indeed, that whole Epistle to the *Hebrews*, would be rendred inconcluding, as might easily be demonstrated, if the time, and throng of matter, which follows would permit.

Heb. 8. 6.

22. I would not now have you so conceive me, as if I would exclude the *Jews* of the Old Testament from being partakers of the Promises of the Gospel: No, God forbid: But that which I have said is this, that they attain'd not unto them by performing *Moses* his Law, but by the very same means by which we hope to be partakers of them, namely, by performing the substance of those duties which are clearly delivered unto us in the Gospel, and may be found sprinkled in several places, even in *Moses* his Writings, and no question but were more fully and compleatly delivered unto them by Tradition from their Fathers. And hereupon, I suppose, it is, that when any were converted to the knowledge and worship of the true God in those times, they who made them Proselytes, were not curious to enforce upon them the Observation of *Moses* his Ordinances and Ceremonies, as we find in the behaviour of *Elisha* to *Naaman* the *Assyrian*, of *Jonah* to the *Ninivites*, of *Daniel* to *Nebuchadnezzar*, and of the rest of the Prophets to the *Tyrians*, *Moabites*, *Egyptians*, to whom they writ, and whose conversion they sought: None of which urged upon them the observation of the *Mosaical* Liturgy as a thing necessary or needful to be observ'd by them: Indeed those who were content to live amongst the *Jews*, and enjoy their priviledges and immunities, were bound to undergo the burden and costliness of the Offerings and Sacrifices, which as St. *Paul* saith, was so great, that they were both to themselves and their fore-fathers intolerable.

23. I will conclude this whole point of the difference between *Moses* his Law, and the Law of Faith, or the Gospel, in Gods own words by the Prophet, *Jer.* 31. 31. twice quoted by S. *Paul* in *Heb.* 8. and 10. where God saith, *Behold the dayes come saith the Lord, that I will make a New Covenant with the House of Israel, and with the House of Judah: Not according to the Covenant which I made with their Fathers*

Jer. 31. 31.



*Fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt, which my Covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, saith the Lord: But this shall be the Covenant that I will make with them, After those dayes, saith the Lord, I will put my Laws in their hearts, and write them in their inward parts,* &c. As if he should say, The former Covenant which I made with them by *Moses* was only written in two Tables of Stone, as the *Roman* Laws were in twelve Tables, and required only an outward conformity and obedience, for the which they did not need an inward sanctifying spiritual Grace to enable them, as the New Covenant of Grace doth. And therefore for the performing of that, I will abundantly afford and supply them with all the Graces of my Holy Spirit.

24. But a little to interrupt this Text: You will say, What, had not the Jews God's Law written in their hearts also? Did not they worship him in Spirit as well as we? No question: But this they did not as commanded by *Moses* his Law, but by that Covenant made with *Abraham*, and by him traduced unto them. It follows, *And I will be their God, and they shall be my people, i. e.* I will be their God after a more especial manner than I was unto them in the Wilderness; I will not only be their King to govern them in peace and tranquility, out of the danger and fear of their Enemies the Nations about them, and preserve them safe in the promised Land; but I will keep them from the fury and malice of their spiritual Enemies that would seek to destroy their souls, and I will bring them to a Land infinitely exceeding theirs, and whereof the Land of *Canaan* was but a most unproportionable type and shadow, even mine own blessed and glorious Kingdom, reserved in the highest Heavens, for them who sincerely perform the conditions of my New Covenant. Thus far as largely as so small a measure of time would permit me, I have told you the difference betwixt the Covenant of Grace and *Moses* his Law, implied in these words of my Text, *through the Spirit*: I come now to my second particular, namely, the distinction of the same Covenant of Grace from the Law of Works, wherein I shall proceed by the same method, *i. e.* shewing you first absolutely the nature of those Laws, and then the several differences betwixt them.

25. The Law of Works is the same with that, to the obedience whereof *Adam* was obliged in Paradise with this exception, that besides the Moral natural Law written in his heart, (the substance whereof is to this day reserved in the minds of all the Sons of *Adam*) *Adam* had a second positive Law injoyned him by God, namely, the forbidding him to eat of the Tree of Good and Evil: which one Precept cannot properly be called a part of the Law of Works, or Nature, since the Action thereby forbidden was not of its own nature evil, but only made unlawful by vertue of God's prohibition: Excepting therefore this one particular Precept, the Law which was given to *Adam*, (called the Law of Works) comprehended in it all kind of moral duties referred either to God, his Neighbour, or Himself, which have in them a natural essential goodness, or righteousness; and, by consequence, the prohibition, of all manner of actions, words, or thoughts, which are in themselves contrary to Justice and Reason. All these Precepts are generally supposed to be contained in the Ten Words written by Gods own finger in two Tables of Stone; though, with submission, I think, that those two tables contain only directly the moral duties of man to God and his Neighbour: for it will require much forcing and straining to bring in the duties and sins of a man against his own person within that compass, as Temperance, Sobriety, and their opposites, Gluttony, Drunkenness, Self-incontinency, *&c.*

26. The Obligation to this Law is so strict, severe and peremptory, That it required not only an universal Obedience to whatsoever is contained in that Law, in the full extent, latitude, and perfection thereof, but that continual without interruption through the whole course of a man's life: Insomuch, that he that should but once transgress it in the least point or circumstance, should without redemption, or dispensation, be rendred culpable as of the breach of the whole Law, and remain liable to the malediction thereof. And to this Law in this strictness mentioned

are all men living obliged, who are out of Christ, and who either know not of him, or are not willing to submit themselves to his New Covenant.

27. The Justification which was due to the performance of this Law by Justice, and as the wages thereof, that is, the condition wherein God obliged himself to such as fulfilled it, was the promises of this life, and that which is to come; Long, happy, and peaceable days in this world, and in their due time a translation to the joys and glory of heaven: This Justification did not comprehend Remission of Sins, as ours does, for the Law excluded all hope of pardon after sin, no promise made to repentance, repentance would do no good: The Court wherein they were to be judged was a Court of meer rigorous Justice, Justice rejoyced over and against Mercy, Grace, Loving-kindness, and all those blessed and glorious Attributes, whereby God for our Saviour Jesus Christ his sake is pleased and delighted to be known unto the world.

28. This Law in the rigour thereof might easily have been performed by *Adam*; he had that perfection of grace and holiness given him, which was exactly equal and commensurable to whatsoever duties were enjoyned him: But by his wilful voluntary (God forbid we should say enforced, or absolutely decreed) prevarication he utterly undid both himself and his Posterity, leaving them engaged for his debts, and as much of their own, without almost any money to pay them: Without Christ we are all obliged to the same strictness and severity of the Law, which by reason of our poverty and want of grace, is become impossible to be performed by us: As the blessed Apostle St. *Paul* hath evidently proved by Induction, in the beginning of his Epistle to the *Romans*: In the first Chapter, declaring that the Gentiles never did, nor could perform the Law; in the second, saying as much for the Jews; and in the third, joyning them both together in the same miserable desperate estate. The conclusion of his whole discourse is, *All have sinned and come short of the glory of God.* Thus much for the Law of Works.

29. The state of mankind without Christ, being so deplored, so out of all hope, as I told you: Almighty God out of his infinite mercy and goodness, by his unspeakable wisdom found out an attonement, accepting of the voluntary exinanition and humiliation of his dearly beloved Son, who submitted himself to be made flesh, to all our natural infirmities (sin only excepted) and at last to die that ignominious accursed death of the Cross for the Redemption of mankind; Who in his death made a Covenant with his Father, that those, and only those, who would be willing to submit themselves to the obedience of a new Law, which he would prescribe unto mankind, should for the merits of his obedience and death be justified in the sight of God, have their sins forgiven them, and be made heirs of everlasting glory: Now, that Christ's death was in order of Nature, before the giving of the Gospel, is (I think) evident by those words of St. *Paul*, *Heb.*9.16,17. where comparing the old Covenant of the Jews with that of Christ, he saith, *where a Testament is, there must of necessity be the death of the Testator: for a Testament is of force after men are dead, otherwise it is of no strength at all while the Testator liveth; whereupon neither the first Covenant was dedicated without blood. It was necessary therefore* (saith he, ver.23.) *that the patterns of things in heaven should be purified with these, i. e.* with the bloud of Beasts, *but the heavenly things themselves with better things than those*, namely, with the bloud of Christ.

Heb.9. 16,17.

30. Which Covenant of Christ (called in Scripture the New Covenant, the Covenant of Grace, the Grace of God, the Law of Faith) according to the nature of all Covenants being made between two parties (at the least) requires conditions on both sides, to be performed, and being a Covenant of Promise, the Conditions on man's part must necessarily go before, otherwise they are no Conditions at all: Now man's duty is comprehended by St. *Paul* in this word *Faith*, and God's Promise in the word *Justification*: And thus far we have proceeded upon sure grounds, for we have plain express words of Scripture for that which hath been said: But the main difficulty remains behind, and that is the true sense and meaning



meaning of these two words, *Faith* and *Justification*, and what respect and dependance they have one of the other. Which difficulty by Gods assistance, and with your Christian charitable patience, I will now endeavour to dissolve.

31. For the first therefore, which is Faith; we may consider it in several respects, to wit, first as referring us to and denoting the principal object of Evangelical Faith, which is Christ: Now, if Faith be meant in this sense, (as by many good Writers of our Reformed Churches, it is understood) then the meaning of that so often repeated saying of St. *Paul*, *We are justified by Faith without the works of the Law*, must be, We are justified only for the obedience of Christ, and not for our righteousness of the Law, wich is certainly a most Catholick Orthodox sense, and not to be denied by any Christian, though, I doubt it does not express all that St. *Paul* intended in that Proposition. Secondly, Faith signifies the Act, or exercise, or duty of Faith, as it comprehends all Evangelical Obedience, called by St. *Paul the Obedience of Faith*, Rom.16.26. *The Righteousness of Faith*, Rom.4.13. & 9.13. & 10.6. And it is an inherent grace or vertue, wrought in us by the powerful operation of God's Spirit: Or thirdly, it may be taken for *the Doctrine of Faith*, called also by him, *the Word of Faith*, Rom.10.8. and *the Word of Gods Grace*, Acts 20.32. and *the hearing of Faith*, Gal.3.2. In which sense, as if he meant the Word, St. *Paul* may seem to resolve us, *Rom.* 3.27. where he saith, *that boasting is excluded by the Law of Faith*, i which words are extant in the very heat of the controversie of Justification. Now these senses of Faith, if they be applied to that conclusion of St. *Paul*, *We are justified by Faith*, come all to one pass, for in effect it is all one, to say, We are justified by our Obedience, or Righteousness of Faith, and to say, We are justified by the Gospel, which prescribes that Obedience: As on the contrary, to say, We are justified by the Law, or by works prescribed by the Law, is all one. There is a fourth acception of Faith, taken for the single Habit or Grace of Faith, and applied to this proposition (only of all Christians that I have heard of) by the *Belgick* Remonstrants: which being a new invented fancy, and therefore unwarrantable, yet I shall hereafter have occasion it may be to say something of it.

1. 2. Rom.16. 26. & 4.13. & 9.13. & 10.6. Rom.10. 8. Acts 20. 32. Gal.3.2. Rom.3. 27. 4.

31. St. *Paul*'s Proposition, I am perswaded, excludes none of these senses; it is capable of them all: But, before I shew you how they may consist together, I will, in the first place, declare of what nature that righteousness is, which God by vertue of his New Covenant requires at our hands before he will make good his promise unto us. First, then, God requires at our hands a sincere Obedience unto the substance of all Moral duties of the Old Covenant, and that by the Gospel: And this obedience is so necessary, that it is impossible any man should be saved without it. The pressing of this Doctrine takes up by much the greatest part of the Evangelical Writings. Now, that these Duties are not enforced upon us, as conditions of the Old Covenant of Works, is evident, because, by Christ we are freed from the Obligation of the Old Covenant: God forbids, that we should have a thought of expecting the hope of righteousness upon those terms: For, that Covenant will not admit of any imperfection in our works, and then, in what a miserable case are we! There is no hope for us, unless some course be taken, that not only our imperfections, but our sins, and those of a high nature, be passed by, and over-looked by Almighty God, as if he had lost his eyes to see them, or his memory to remember them.

32. The substance then of the Moral Law is enjoyned us by the New Covenant, but with what difference I shall shew you presently. And hereupon it is that our Saviour saith to the *Pharisees*, who were willing to make any misconstruction of his Doctrine, *Think you that I am come to destroy the Law?* I, by all means, say we, God forbid else, for unless the old Law be destroyed, we are undone; as long as that is alive, we are dead: If the Law of Works have its natural force still, woe be to us. Therefore, that must not be Christ's meaning: His intent is, as if he should say, Think you that I am come to destroy the righteousness of the Law? Or disoblige men from the necessity of being good, holy, and vertuous? No, by no

means; *I am not come to destroy the Law, but to fulfill it*: The righteousness of the Law, according to the substance thereof, shall be as necessarily required by vertue of that New Covenant which I preach unto you, and to which I exhort you all to submit your selves, as ever it was by the Old Covenant; only because of your weakness and infirmity, I will abate the rigour of it: Those who notwithstanding my offer of Grace and Pardon upon such easie conditions as I prescribe, will yet continue in an habitual state of prophaneness and irreligion shall be as culpable, nay, ten times more miserable than if they never had heard of me, for their wilful neglecting so great salvation. *It is easier for Heaven and Earth to pass away, than for one tittle of the Law to fail*: For God would be no looser by the annihilation of the world, whereas if any part of the Moral Law should expire, the very beams and rays of Gods essential goodness should be darkened and destroyed.

Rom. 3. ult. 33. In like manner saith St. *Paul*, Rom. 3. *ult. Do we make void the Law through Faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the Law.* Now, if a succeeding Covenant establisheth any part of a Precedent, especially, if there be any alteration made in the conditions established, all obligation whatsoever is taken from the Old Covenant, and those conditions are in force only by vertue of the New. When the *Norman* Conquerour was pleased to establish and confirm to the *English* some of the ancient *Saxons* Laws, Are those Laws then become in force as they are *Saxon*? No, for the Authority of the *Saxons*, the Authors of those Laws, is supposed to be extinguished, and therefore no power remains in them to look to the execution of them: But by the confirmation of the *Norman* they are become indeed *Norman* Laws, and are now in force, not because they were first made by the *Saxons*, but only by vertue of the succeeding power of the *Norman* Line. So likewise, when the Gospel enjoyns the substance of the same duties which the old Covenant of Works required; Are we Christians enforced to the obedience of them, because they are duties of the Law? By no means! But only because our Saviour and only Law-maker Jesus Christ commands the same in the Law of Faith.

34. Thus far the New Covenant is in some terms of agreement with the Old, inasmuch as the same Moral duties are enjoyned in them both, as parts of the conditions of both. But the difference herein is, That the Law commands a precise exact fulfilling of these Precepts, (as I told you before) which the Gospel descending to our infirmities, remits and qualifies much: For in the Gospel, he is accounted to fulfill the moral Precepts, that obeys them according to that measure of Grace which God is pleased to allow him; that obeys God, though not with a perfect, yet with a sincere upright heart; that when he is overcome with a temptation to sin, continues not in it, but recovers himself to his former righteousness by Repentance and new Obedience: Thus much then for the moral Precepts, and with what difference they are commanded in the Old and New Covenant.

35. In the second place, there is another part of Evangelical Obedience, which is purely Evangelical, and which has no commerce nor reference at all to the Law, and that is the Grace of Repentance: For saith St. *Paul*, Acts 17.30. *But now* (that is by the Gospel) *God commands all men every where to repent.* Acts 17. 30. Now Repentance implies a serious consideration and acknowledgment of that miserable estate whereunto our sins have brought us, and thereupon an hearty unfeigned sorrow for them, a perfect hatred and detestation of them, inferring a full peremptory resolution to break them off, and interrupt the course of them by new obedience. This, I say, is an obedience purely Evangelical, The Law of Works did not at all meddle with it, neither indeed could it: The Law condemns a man as soon as ever he is guilty of the breach thereof, and makes no promise at all of Remission of sins upon Repentance; but rather quite excludes it. Yet from the grace of Repentance we may gather a forcible argument to make good that which before we spoke concerning the Renewing of the Moral Precepts in the New Covenant. For no reasonable man can deny, that Repentance is absolutely necessary before a man can be justified. Now what is that for which (for example) a new converted Heathen repents, but the breach



breach of the Moral Law? Therefore by this necessity of Repentance, he acknowledgeth (and so do we) that by such sins he was excluded from all hope of being Justified. Now it were absurd, for a man to say that any thing excludes a man from being capable of receiving the promises of a Covenant, but only the breaking of the conditions thereof.

36. The third part of Evangelical Righteousness is, *Faith*, not Moral, but Christian; which is, A relying upon Christ, as the only meritorious cause of whatsoever benefit we obtain by the New Covenant; It being for his sake, both that God bestows upon us Grace, whereby we are enabled to perform his will; and after we have done our duty, that he will freely, and not as wages, bestow upon us the reward thereof. There is another virtue Evangelical, which is Hope, but of that I must speak in my last Point. And thus I have gone through the Conditions required on mans part in the New Covenant, all which I suppose are implied in this word *Faith*: which being taken in so general a sense, may, I conceive, be thus not improperly defined, *viz.* To be a receiving and embracing of the Promises made unto us in Christ upon the terms and conditions proposed in the Gospel.

37. Now follow the conditions on Gods part, comprehended in these words: The hope of Righteousness, which are equivalent to the term of Justification: the nature whereof, I shall now endeavour to discover. Justification, I suppose, imports the whole Treasure of blessings and favours, which God, who is rich in mercy, will freely bestow on those whom he accepts as Righteous for his beloved Son our blessed Saviour Jesus Christ his sake; which are first, Remission of sins, and an interest unto the Joys of heaven in this life, and a full consummation both of Grace and Glory in the life to come. Some, I know, think that St. *Paul* when he discourses of Justification, thereby intends only Remission of sins: And the ground of this opinion is taken from St. *Paul* quoting those words of *David*, when he states the Doctrine of Justification, *Rom.* 4.6,7,8. where he saith that *David describeth the blessedness of the man unto whom God imputeth Righteousness without works, saying, Blessed are they whose unrighteousnesses is forgiven, and whose sins are covered; Blessed is the man unto whom the Lord will not impute sin.* Rom. 4. 6, 7, 8. But if this Argument out of the Epistle to the *Romans* be of sufficient force for their sense of Justification; Then certainly an Argument from as express words in the Epistle to the *Galatians*, will be as concluding for mine (in which Epistle he also purposly states the same questions.) The words are *Gal.* 3.11. *That no man is justified by the Law in the sight of God, it is evident, for the Just shall live by faith.* Now, *to live*, I hope, does not signifie, to have one's sins forgiven him, but to be saved: Therefore, unless St. *Paul* include a right unto Salvation within the compass of Justification, that Text might have been spared, as nothing at all serving for his purpose. Besides, Is not Salvation as free, as gracious, as undeserved an act of God, as Remission of sins? Is it not as much for Christs sake that we are saved, as that our sins are forgiven us? Thus much for what I suppose is meant by Justification. I will now as briefly and as perspicuously as I can (without using Allegories and Metaphorical expressions, with which this Point is ordinarily much obscured) shew you the combination of these two words, in what sense I suppose St. *Paul* may use this Proposition; *We are Justified by Faith, without the Works of the Law.* Gal. 3. 11.

38. In the first place therefore I will lay down this Conclusion as an infallible safe foundation, That if we have respect to the proper meritorious cause of our Justification, we must not take Faith, in that Proposition, for any virtue or Grace inherent in us, but only for the proper and principal object thereof, Jesus Christ and his Merits. And the meaning of that Proposition must be, that we are not justified for the merits of any Righteousness in our selves, whether Legal or Evangelical, but only for the Obedience and Death of our Blessed Saviour Jesus Christ. Though this be most true, yet I suppose that St. *Paul* in that Proposition had not a respect to the Meritorious Cause of our Justification; but to that Formal Condition required in us before we be Justified: as I think may appear by that which follows.

39. I

39. I told you even now, that I would in this Point purposely abstain from using Metaphors, and Figurative Allusions; and the reason is, because, I suppose, and not without reasonable grounds, that the stating of this Point of Justification by Metaphors, has made this Doctrine, which is set down with greater light and perspicuity in holy Scripture, than almost any other, to be a Doctrine of the most Scholastical subtility, the fullest of shadows and clouds of all the rest. For example: In that fashion and dress of Divinity, as it is now worn, sliced and mangled into Theses and Distinctions, we find this Point of our Justification thus expressed: That Faith is therefore said to justifie us, because it is that which makes Christs Righteousness ours: it is as it were an instrument or hand, whereby we receive, lay hold on, and apply Christ unto our selves. Here's nought but flowers of Rhetorick, Figures, and Metaphors; which though they are capable of a good sense, yet are very improper to state a Controversie withal.

40. But let us examine them a little: We must not say, they conceive of Faith, as if it were a Vertue or Grace, or any part of Righteousness inherent in us: For Faith as a Grace has no influence at all into our Justification. Mark the Coherence of these things: Faith is considered as an hand or an Instrument in our Justification, and yet, for all it is a Hand, it is nothing in, or of, us; for it seems, Hands are not parts of mens bodies. Again, Faith puts on Christ, receives him, lays hold upon him, makes his righteousness ours, and yet it does nothing for all that. Besides, How can Faith be properly called an instrument of Justification? An Instrument is that which the principal Cause the Efficient makes use of in his operation. Now Justification in this sense, is an immanent internal action of God, in which there is no co-operation of any other agent, nor any real alteration wrought in man, the object thereof. Does God then use Faith as an instrument, in producing the Act of Justification? No, but it is *Instrumentum Passivum*, saith one; That is a thing never heard of in nature before, and the meaning is sure, Faith, certainly, is something, but what a kind of thing, we know not. By these means it comes to pass, that the Doctrine of our Justification, as some men have handled it, is become as deep, as unsearchable a mystery, as that of the Trinity.

41. Without question, there is nothing can be more evident to a man, that shall unpartially consider St. *Paul*'s method in his discourse of Justification, then that by Faith he intends some operative working grace in us: For instance, The Apostle proves that we Christians are to seek for Justification the same way that *Abraham* attained unto it, namely by Faith; for saith the Scripture in his quotation, *Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness.* What was that which was accounted to him? His believing; That is, say some, Christ who was the object of his Belief: This is a forced interpretation certainly, and which a Jew would never have been perswaded to. But that Christ was not at all intended in that place it is evident; for *Abraham*'s belief there, had respect to Gods Promise made to him of giving him a Son in his old age, and by that Son, a Seed as innumerable as the stars in heaven, as appears *Gen.*15.4,5,6. whereas the Promise of Christ follows three Chapters after, to wit, *Gen.*18.18. Again, the Apostle in many places useth these words, *We are Justified by Faith in Christ*, and *by the Faith of Jesus Christ*; which speeches of his, will admit of no tolerable sense, unless by Faith he intends some work or obedience performed by us. This therefore being taken for granted, that by Faith, is meant some condition required at our hands, (and yet my former conclusion of our Justification only for the merits of Christ remaining firm:) we will in the next place consider what kind of obedience that of Faith is, and in what sense it may be said to justifie us.

Gen.15. 4,5,6. Gen.18. 18.

*Assertion* 42. What satisfaction I conceive may be given to this Quæry, I will set down in this Assertion: That since Justification, even as it includes Remission of sins, is that Promise, to perform which unto us, God has obliged himself in the New Covenant; it must necessarily presuppose in the person to be so justified, such an obedience as the Gospel requires; namely, first, Repentance from dead works, a conversion



sion to a new obedience of those holy Moral Commands which are ratified in the Gospel, and a relying upon Christ as the only meritorious cause of our Justification and Salvation, by a particular Evangelical Faith. All this, I say, is pre-required in the person who is made capable of Justification, either in the exercise, or at least *in præparatione cordis*, in a full resolution of the heart, and entire disposition of the mind: So that, though God be the sole proper Efficient Cause; and Christ, as Mediator, the sole proper Meritorious Cause of our Justification: yet these inherent dispositions, are exacted on our part, as *causæ sine quibus non*, as necessary conditions to be found in us, before God will perform this great work, freely, and graciously towards us, and only for the Merits of Christ.

43. This Assertion may, I suppose, be demonstrated, first from the nature of a Covenant: For unless there be pre-required conditions on man's part to be performed, before God will proportion his reward; the very nature of a Covenant is destroyed. And it will not boot to answer, that though there be no qualifications required in a man, before he obtain Remission of sins, yet they are to be found in us before we be made capable of Salvation. For, as I have shewed before, Salvation is as properly a gracious Act of Mercy, as free and undeserved a gift, as truly bestowed on us only for the Merits of Christ, as Remission of sins; and therefore may as well consist without any change in us as the former. And secondly, If that Proposition of St. *Paul, we are Justified by Faith, without the works of the Law*, exclude all conditions to be performed by man; If it exclude not only the righteousness of the Law (which indeed it doth) but the obedience of Faith, or the Gospel likewise, from being necessary dispositions in us before we receive remission of sins; Then another saying of his, parallel to this, will exclude as well the necessity of an Evangelical Obedience to our salvation: For, saith St. *Paul*, Eph.2.8. *By Grace are ye saved through Faith, and that not of your selves, it is the gift of God: not of Works, lest any man should boast.* But I hope no man will be so unchristian-like, as to exclude the necessity of our good works to salvation, for all this saying of St. *Paul*; therefore they may as well be pre-required to Remission of sins, notwithstanding the former place.

*Reas.*1. *Sol.*1. *Sol.*2. Eph.2,8.

44. Secondly, If there be no necessity of any pre-disposition in us before Remission of sins; then a man may have his sins forgiven him, and so become a person accepted of God, whilest he is a person unregenerate, unsanctified, whilest he is *dead in trespasses and sins*, whilest he *walks according to the course of this world, according to the Prince of the power of the air, the Spirit that worketh in the children of disobedience*; whilest he *has his conversation in the lusts of the flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh, and of the mind*, being notwithstanding his Justification, *a child of wrath*, as much as the profanest heathen, though the veriest reprobate in the world; Lastly, though he be no child of *Abraham* according to faith, that is, not having in him that faith which was imputed to *Abraham* for righteousness. Now whether this Divinity be consonant to Gods Word, let your own consciences be Judges.

*Reas.*2. Eph.2. 1,&c.

45. A third Argument to prove the Truth of the former Assertion, shall be taken from several Texts of Scripture; where Justification, even as it is taken for Remission of sins, is ascribed to other virtues besides Faith, (whether it be taken for a particular virtue, or for the object thereof.) For example, Our Saviour saith expressly, *By thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned*: Where we see, Justification is taken in that proper sence, in which we maintain it against the Papists. Again, *If you forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you; But if you forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses.* Again, our Saviour speaking concerning *Mary*, saith, *Her sins are forgiven her, because she loved much.* If the time, or your patience, could suffer me, I might add a fourth Reason to prove my former Assertion, which is the clearness and evidence of agreement and reconciliation between St. *Paul*, and St. *James* in this Point upon these grounds, without any new invented Justification before men, which is a conceit taken up by some men, only to shift off an Adversary's

*Reas.*3. Mat.12. 37. Mat.6. 14,15. Luk.7.47

*Reas.*4.

sary's Argument, which otherwise would press them too hard, they think: for St. *Paul*'s Faith, taken for the obedience of the Gospel, would easily accord with
Jam. i. 27 St. *James* his *holy and undefiled Religion before God*, or works which is all one; And St. *James* would be St. *Paul*'s Expositor without any injury or detraction at all from the merits of Christ, or Gods free and undeserved mercy to us in him. But I must hasten.

46. The full meaning, then, of St. *Paul*'s Proposition, *We are justified by Faith, and not by the works of the Law*: and by consequence, the state of the whole Controversie of Justification, in brief, may be this; That if we consider the efficient cause of our Justification, it is only God which Justifies: if that for which we are justified, that is, the meritorious cause thereof, it is not for any thing in our selves, but only for the obedience and satisfaction of our Blessed Saviour, that God will Justifie us: But if we have respect to what kind of Conditions are to be found in us, before Christ will suffer us to be made partakers of the benefit of his Merits, then we must say, that we are not justified by such a Righteousness, so perfect, absolute, and complete, as the Law of Works does require; but by the righteousness of the Gospel, by a Righteousness proportionable to that Grace which God is pleased to bestow on us; not by the perfection, but the sincerity of our obedience to the New Covenant. And the Apostle's main Argument will serve to prove this to any understanding, most undeniably. St. *Paul* has demonstrated, that if we consider the rigour of the Law, all men, both Jews and Gentiles, are concluded under sin, and most necessarily obnoxious to Gods wrath. Which Reason of his, would not be at all prevailing, unless by works of the Law, he intended only such a perfect obedience as the Law requires; which by reason of mans weakness, is become impossible unto him. For it might easily be replied upon him thus: We confess, no man can fulfil the Law; but the conditions of the Gospel are not only possible, but, by the assistance of Gods Spirit, easie to be performed; so that though, for this reason, the former Righteousness be excluded from our Justification, not only *quoad meritum*, but also, *quoad præsentiam*; yet the later Evangelical Righteousness is excluded from our Justification, only *quoad Meritum*.

47. But I perceive an Objection ready to assault me; And I will impartially assist the force and strength thereof against my self, with all the advantage I can. It is to this purpose: When men are disputing in the Schools, or discoursing in the Pulpit, they may state this Question as they please: But the fittest time to decide this Point, is, when, in a serious contemplation, we present before our eyes Almighty God, the righteous impartial Judge of heaven and earth, sitting in his Throne, ready to execute Judgment, and our selves arraigned at the Bar before him, expecting a final irreversible sentence. In these circumstances, I would fain see the stoutest-hearted man alive, that should dare to say unto Almighty God, Thou hast given me a Law, which my conscience witnesseth unto me, that I have performed. Therefore I now challenge thee upon thy Truth and Faithfulness, that thou perform thy conditions also with me, and give me Remission of my former sins, as a Reward of my obedience.

*Sol.* 48. For answer to this Objection: This is confessed by all Christians of all Religions, that a Profane person, or an Hypocrite dying in such an estate, shall neither in the last day be acquitted of his sins, nor saved: Therefore unless a mans heart
1 Joh. 3. 20. can witness unto him, that he hath unfeignedly kept Gods Commandments, *God, who is greater than his heart, and knoweth all things*, will assuredly condemn him: But then we must know, that it is not a Christians plea, to relie upon his own, though sincere unhypocritical Righteousness, and therefore to challenge heaven. But as our
Luk. 17. 10. Saviour adviseth us, *we when we have done all we can, must say, We are unprofitable servants*: And not say so in a complement only, but in the truth and sincerity of our hearts. It is the perfection of Evangelical Righteousness, to deny our own righteousness, to disclaim all meritorious efficacy thereof, either in Remission of sins, or Salvation. Therefore, he that after he hath performed Gods Commandments



ments, shall think to challenge the reward as of a debt, or as promised only to his own holiness, wants the proper peculiar righteousness of a Christian: he must say in holy *Job*'s words, *Though I were righteous, yet would I not answer God but I will* Job 9. 15. *make supplication to my Judge*: I would say unto him, Lord look not upon that holiness which is in me, which yet is not mine neither, for thou wrought'st it in me; But look on him in whom only thou art well pleased; Accept of me in him, and for his sake only, who hath fulfilled all righteousness for me, who through the eternal Spirit, hath offered himself without spot unto thee, being made sin and a curse for me, that I might be made the Righteousness of God in him. To him only be glory for ever and ever. The sum of all which I have said, is contained *Tit.* 2. 11, 14. *The Grace of God which bringeth*, &c. And so I come to the second General, namely, the Promise which God will make good unto us who sincerely obey him, contained in these words, *We wait for the Hope*, &c.

49. Which General I divided into two Particulars: 1. The nature of the reward promised, which I told you was, Justification containing Remission of Sins, and everlasting Life. 2. The interest, which, during this life, we ordinarily have in that reward, namely Hope, expressed in these words, *We wait for the Hope of Righteousness*: that is, by hope we expect the reward of righteousness. I cannot now enlarge my self in the former Particular, something I have already been forc'd to say of it, which must suffice: I will in few words consider the second Particular, namely, the interest which we have in the Promises, which is Hope: *We wait for*, &c.

50. I know nothing more effectual to perswade me to search for and embrace Divine Truth with singleness of heart, and without respect of persons, than to consider, that there are no opinions so unreasonable, so directly contradictory to one another, but the Spirit of contradiction and partiality will make a man easily to swallow and digest them. As for example, whereas the Papists most presumptuously maintain, that it is in a mans power, by the ordinary assistance of Grace, so exactly to perform all Gods Commandments, that he shall have no need to say, *Lord forgive us our trespasses*; Some of their Adversaries strive so much to avoid this Assertion on the contrary extreme, that they will not allow, even the best and most holy Actions of the most Regenerate man, to be such as God requires at our hands; they will not only have them to be imperfect, but sinful, I, if strictly examined, sins. And yet for all this, those who put it in a mans power to fulfill all Gods Commandments, will not suffer any man to have any certainty of their Salvation: On the contrary, the others, though they make a mans best actions to be sins, yet require at his hands an infallible divine Faith of his Salvation, not only as an attendant, but as the very nature and essence of that Faith, whereby he shall be Justified.

51. It may be possible, that one of these parties might light upon the truth, if either of them would be willing to change one of his opinions with his Adversary: but, as they have been pleased to yoke such jarring Positions together, I am confidently perswaded, that both of them have missed of the truth, and left it in the middle to any third person that will be willing to stand Neuter in a mean betwixt them both. I will not now examine how far each side have out-run the truth contrary ways: only as I am required by that part of my Text which remains, I will lay down two Assertions participating, in some measure, of both opinions; The first 1. whereof is this (which I have already touched) That no man can justly and reasonably expect or hope for the reward of righteousness, but he whose heart and conscience can unfeignedly witness unto him, that he hath, though not exactly, yet sincerely, and without Hypocrisie, performed the conditions of the New Covenant. The second, That the interest which such a person ordinarily hath in the Promises, is 2. only Hope.

52. Now concerning the first Assertion, namely, That no man can justly, &c. I *Assert.* 1. would not now be mistaken, as if I said, that before a man can hope for Salvation he must perform Gods Commandments exactly, but only according to the equity of the Gospel; according to that famous saying of St. *Augustine. Retract. l.* 1. *c.* 19.

fary's Argument, which otherwise would press them too hard, they think: for St. *Paul*'s Faith, taken for the obedience of the Gospel, would easily accord with
Jam. i. 27 St. *James* his *holy and undefiled Religion before God*, or works which is all one; And St. *James* would be St. *Paul*'s Expositor without any injury or detraction at all from the merits of Christ, or Gods free and undeserved mercy to us in him. But I must hasten.

46. The full meaning, then, of St. *Paul*'s Proposition, *We are justified by Faith, and not by the works of the Law*: and by consequence, the state of the whole Controversie of Justification, in brief, may be this; That if we consider the efficient cause of our Justification, it is only God which Justifies: if that for which we are justified, that is, the meritorious cause thereof, it is not for any thing in our selves, but only for the obedience and satisfaction of our Blessed Saviour, that God will Justifie us: But if we have respect to what kind of Conditions are to be found in us, before Christ will suffer us to be made partakers of the benefit of his Merits, then we must say, that we are not justified by such a Righteousness, so perfect, absolute, and complete, as the Law of Works does require; but by the righteousness of the Gospel, by a Righteousness proportionable to that Grace which God is pleased to bestow on us; not by the perfection, but the sincerity of our obedience to the New Covenant. And the Apostle's main Argument will serve to prove this to any understanding, most undeniably. St. *Paul* has demonstrated, that if we consider the rigour of the Law, all men, both Jews and Gentiles, are concluded under sin, and most necessarily obnoxious to Gods wrath. Which Reason of his, would not be at all prevailing, unless by works of the Law, he intended only such a perfect obedience as the Law requires; which by reason of mans weakness, is become impossible unto him. For it might easily be replied upon him thus: We confess, no man can fulfil the Law; but the conditions of the Gospel are not only possible, but, by the assistance of Gods Spirit, easie to be performed; so that though, for this reason, the former Righteousness be excluded from our Justification, not only *quoad meritum*, but also, *quoad præsentiam*; yet the later Evangelical Righteousness is excluded from our Justification, only *quoad Meritum*.

47. But I perceive an Objection ready to assault me; And I will impartially assist the force and strength thereof against my self, with all the advantage I can. It is to this purpose: When men are disputing in the Schools, or discoursing in the Pulpit, they may state this Question as they please: But the fittest time to decide this Point, is, when, in a serious contemplation, we present before our eyes Almighty God, the righteous impartial Judge of heaven and earth, sitting in his Throne, ready to execute Judgment, and our selves arraigned at the Bar before him, expecting a final irreversible sentence. In these circumstances, I would fain see the stoutest-hearted man alive, that should dare to say unto Almighty God, Thou hast given me a Law, which my conscience witnesseth unto me, that I have performed. Therefore I now challenge thee upon thy Truth and Faithfulness, that thou perform thy conditions also with me, and give me Remission of my former sins, as a Reward of my obedience.

*Sol.* 48. For answer to this Objection: This is confessed by all Christians of all Religions, that a Profane person, or an Hypocrite dying in such an estate, shall neither in the last day be acquitted of his sins, nor saved: Therefore unless a mans heart
1 Joh. 3. 20. can witness unto him, that he hath unfeignedly kept Gods Commandments, *God, who is greater than his heart, and knoweth all things*, will assuredly condemn him: But then we must know, that it is not a Christians plea, to relie upon his own, though sincere unhypocritical Righteousness, and therefore to challenge heaven. But as our
Luk. 17. 10. Saviour adviseth us, *we when we have done all we can, must say, We are unprofitable servants*: And not say so in a complement only, but in the truth and sincerity of our hearts. It is the perfection of Evangelical Righteousness, to deny our own righteousness, to disclaim all meritorious efficacy thereof, either in Remission of sins, or Salvation. Therefore, he that after he hath performed Gods Commandments



ments, shall think to challenge the reward as of a debt, or as promised only to his own holiness, wants the proper peculiar righteousness of a Christian: he must say in holy *Job*'s words, *Though I were righteous, yet would I not answer God but I will make supplication to my Judge*: I would say unto him, Lord look not upon that holiness which is in me, which yet is not mine neither, for thou wrought'st it in me; But look on him in whom only thou art well pleased; Accept of me in him, and for his sake only, who hath fulfilled all righteousness for me, who through the eternal Spirit, hath offered himself without spot unto thee, being made sin and a curse for me, that I might be made the Righteousness of God in him. To him only be glory for ever and ever. The sum of all which I have said, is contained *Tit.* 2. 11, 14. *The Grace of God which bringeth*, &c. And so I come to the second General, namely, the Promise which God will make good unto us who sincerely obey him, contained in these words, *we wait for the Hope*, &c. Job 9. 15.

49. Which General I divided into two Particulars: 1. The nature of the reward promised, which I told you was, Justification containing Remission of Sins, and everlasting Life. 2. The interest, which, during this life, we ordinarily have in that reward, namely Hope, expressed in these words, *We wait for the Hope of Righteousness*: that is, by hope we expect the reward of righteousness. I cannot now enlarge my self in the former Particular, something I have already been forc'd to say of it, which must suffice: I will in few words consider the second Particular, namely, the interest which we have in the Promises, which is Hope: *We wait for*, &c.

50. I know nothing more effectual to perswade me to search for and embrace Divine Truth with singleness of heart, and without respect of persons, than to consider, that there are no opinions so unreasonable, so directly contradictory to one another, but the Spirit of contradiction and partiality will make a man easily to swallow and digest them. As for example, whereas the Papists most presumptuously maintain, that it is in a mans power, by the ordinary assistance of Grace, so exactly to perform all Gods Commandments, that he shall have no need to say, *Lord forgive us our trespasses*; Some of their Adversaries strive so much to avoid this Assertion on the contrary extreme, that they will not allow, even the best and most holy Actions of the most Regenerate man, to be such as God requires at our hands; they will not only have them to be imperfect, but sinful, I, if strictly examined, sins. And yet for all this, those who put it in a mans power to fulfill all Gods Commandments, will not suffer any man to have any certainty of their Salvation: On the contrary, the others, though they make a mans best actions to be sins, yet require at his hands an infallible divine Faith of his Salvation, not only as an attendant, but as the very nature and essence of that Faith, whereby he shall be Justified.

51. It may be possible, that one of these parties might light upon the truth, if either of them would be willing to change one of his opinions with his Adversary: but, as they have been pleased to yoke such jarring Positions together, I am confidently perswaded, that both of them have missed of the truth, and left it in the middle to any third person that will be willing to stand Neuter in a mean betwixt them both. I will not now examine how far each side have out-run the truth contrary ways: only as I am required by that part of my Text which remains, I will lay down two Assertions participating, in some measure, of both opinions; The first 1.
whereof is this (which I have already touched) That no man can justly and reasonably expect or hope for the reward of righteousness, but he whose heart and conscience can unfeignedly witness unto him, that he hath, though not exactly, yet sincerely, and without Hypocrisie, performed the conditions of the New Covenant. The second, That the interest which such a person ordinarily hath in the Promises, is 2.
only Hope.

52. Now concerning the first Assertion, namely, That no man can justly, &c. I *Assert.* 1.
would not now be mistaken, as if I said, that before a man can hope for Salvation he must perform Gods Commandments exactly, but only according to the equity of the Gospel; according to that famous saying of St. *Augustine*. *Retractat. l.* 1. *c.* 19.

*Omnia mandata facta deputantur, quando quicquid non fit ignoscitur.* Now, that a man may keep Gods Commandments, as far as the Equity of the Gospel expects from him, may, I think, be thus demonstrated: There is no man that hears me this day, I am perswaded, but he does often seriously desire of God, that he would give him the Grace to do his will: Now, all Prayer, if it be right, is to be performed in Faith, *i. e.* with a full perswasion, not only that it is lawful, and warrantable, for him to desire that which he prays for, but also with as full a perswasion, that Almighty God is not only able, but ready and willing also to grant him his Petitions; otherwise, it is not only a vain, but a sinful Prayer; it is a tempting of God, as if he should desire him to do that, which he knows is impossible. Besides, can we think that God would command us (and withal add a promise of hearing and granting our Petitions) would he, I say, command us to pray for that which we are assured of before hand, cannot, and must not, be granted? Therefore certainly, some Christians have been heard in these Petitions; some men have been found, who have fulfilled the righteousness of the Gospel.

53. Now till thou hast done this, which thou seest by the assistance of God's Spirit, (which will never be wanting to them which desire it) it is possible for thee to do; nay, I will add further, is easie for thee to do: Doth not Christ say as much? *My yoak is easie, and my burthen is light.* I say, till thou hast done this, thou canst have no reason in the world to hope for Gods mercy. For tell me! why dost thou hope, thou that continuest still in an unrepentant estate, in an habitual opposition to God's holy Commandments? Art thou resolved to hope, because thou hast a mind to it, upon no ground, when thou oughtest rather to fear, almost to despair? Or rather, canst thou perswade thy self in earnest, that this is indeed a hope? Is it not a fancy
Rom. 5. 5. of thine own brain, or rather a Temptation of the Devil? *Hope, which is hope indeed,* which is not a fancy and Chimera, *makes not ashamed,* saith St. *Paul*: A man may with confidence, without confusion of face, profess and maintain it. But such a hope as this is, which is not a hope in earnest, how will it disgrace a man, and put him out of countenance, when God shall ask him why he did offer to hope?

54. Let thy conscience now answer me, whosoever thou art, in such a state. Thou that knowest how often God hath said, nay, sworn in his wrath, that none of those which continue disobedient shall enter into his rest! That none shall be partakers of the second Resurrection unto Glory, but those that have been partakers of the first unto Grace! Canst thou for all this imagine that God has such a peculiar particular affection and respect to thee, who art yet a slave of the Devils; that he will be content to strain his Truth and Veracity, to break his Oath for thy company? Shall the whole Scripture, which promises glory to none but those who perform the conditions prescribed, for thy sake be turned into a Romance, into a melancholy Tale to fright Children with hal? No, no, assure thy self, it is not a conceit of Election which will save thee: thou must work, and work hard, in fear and trembling, before God will raise in thee the good Spirit of Christian Hope.

55. For to say the truth, of all Divine Graces, Hope is incomparably the hardest to attain unto: And the reason is evident, because it presupposes the possession of all other Graces before it. And yet for all this, nothing counted so easie, now adays, as Hope, though men both are and resolve to be never so wicked: Nay, and it is well if Hope will serve their turn, they must have an infallible assurance, a Divine Faith of everlasting glory; And no manner of sins, though never so hainous, never so oft committed, shall be able to weaken this their assurance, that they are resolved of. This they think is a spell strong enough for the Devil in all assails; when, God knows, the Devil is more joy'd and comforted, to see them so vainly delude themselves, than they themselves possibly can be. This for my first Assertion; now follows the second.

*Assert. 2.* 56. When I say, that the Interest which a Christian ordinarily has in the Promises of God, is *Hope*; I mean, it is not absolute and irrespective, but depending upon conditions, namely, Grace, and perseverance therein. And this I took for granted, for



for I never heard of any yet, that denied perseverance to be necessary to salvation. If then his Interest be by Hope, then it is not yet by Faith, properly so called; For it is not possible that the same object (considered with the same circumstances at the same time) should be the object both of Faith and Hope. For example: I believe by a Divine Faith, *i. e.* a Faith grounded upon God's Word, that there shall be a Resurrection of the Flesh, even of this flesh of mine; And I believe it firmly, because God hath said that he will bring it to pass; neither is there any condition of mine pre-required to the performance of this promise of God; for howsoever I behave my self here in this world, whether well or ill, it matters not, my behaviour cannot make God alter his resolution. Now, if I assuredly believe this, it would be improper and absurd for me to say, I hope there will be a Resurrection of my body; for when I say, I hope any thing, I imply a possibility, in nature, that such a thing may not be, which in this case I cannot do without infidelity.

57. But, on the other side, I hope that God will raise this flesh of mine unto Glory, and I hope this upon safe grounds: Therefore, if it be true that I hope it, I cannot properly be said to believe it, because my salvation yet depends upon conditions; namely, perseverance. Therefore let me propose this one question to any mans conscience: Hast thou such an assurance of salvation given thee of God, that Hope is quite evacuated in thee: Is there no such virtue left in thee as Hope? Surely God hath dealt extraordinarily mercifully with thee; Thou art many degrees gone beyond the state of those believers which St. *Paul* speaks of, and includes himself in the number, when he saith, *We live by hope*: For thou doest not live by Hope, thou art exalted above it. Notwithstanding, I beseech you, consider well upon the matter, (for it concerns you very much) be not too hasty to credit fancies, when conceits of assurance or impeccability shall be suggested to your minds. There may be great danger of a confidence ungrounded; a confidence only taken upon trust from other mens words or opinions.

58. Do I go about (now think you) to bereave you, or couzen you of any spiritual comfort in this life? Do I envy any of you your assurance? Alas, why should I deal so with you? For I was never injured by you; or, if I were, surely, of all places, I would not make choice of this to execute my Revenge in. Or if I thought that such an assurance were ordinarily to be had, at least necessary, to the making up of a Justifying Faith, (and have you never heard it said so?) Would I not (think you) strive and endeavour to obtain it at any rate, even with the loss of all worldly comforts? Yes certainly, I would count them all but as dross and dung in comparison of it: But I confess unto you I am yet contented with enjoying Heaven by Hope: And I bless Almighty God, that he has dealt so graciously with me, that I should dare to hope for it, and not be shamed and confounded by my hope. And if there be any amongst you, that will vouchsafe to content himself with such a neglected degree of comfort, with only hope, and no more, I will not enter into comparison with those that are perfect; but I dare promise him, that all those troublesom pleasures, which do so ravish the men of this world, shall be as nothing; yea, as afflictions and torments, in comparison of those spiritual heavenly Joys, which Hope, well and legally atchieved, will be able to afford us: No dangers will there be of terrours or jealousies, as if God would happen to grow weary, or repent himself of any grace or blessing which he hath bestowed upon us.

59. For, tell me; Do you think that *Adam*, while he continued in his Innocency, had any grudgings of suspicions or fears? Was he not, during that time, in as great a quiet and serenity of mind, as any of us dare hope for? And yet the most that he could do then, was to hope that he might continue in that state even to the end: The event shews, he could not have an infallible Faith of his perseverance. If then such a contented setled mind could accompany *Adam* in Paradise, even when he knew it was in his power, with but reaching out his hand, and tasting an Apple; yea, with a sudden wicked word, or an unsanctified thought, utterly, and irrecoverably to degrade himself from that happy estate; surely, we Christians have much more reason

to rejoice in our hope, since we know assuredly, that as God has been so gracious to begin this good work in us, so he will not be wanting to perfect it even to the end, if we will but perform our parts, which he has already given us more than sufficient grace to do, and will never fail to supply us with more, for the asking, nay, more, which are surer grounds to build upon than ever *Adam* had; since we know, that not one, nor ten, nor a hundred sins, shall be able so irreparably to cast us out of God's favour, but that he will be willing upon our Repentance, especially calling to mind his old mercies, to restore us again to our lost happiness.

Heb. 6. 11 Ibid. 9. 6. Neither are we utterly excluded from all assurance; for there is a πληροφορία, *A full assurance of Hope*, saith S. *Paul*, *Heb.* 6. 11. *This Hope we have as a sure Anchor of the Soul* fastned on a Rock: The Rock cannot fail us, the Anchor will not; all the danger in in the Cable or Chain of spiritual Graces, whereby we are fastned to this Rock: If this Chain but hold, no tempest, no winds, no flouds can endanger us. And part of our Hope respects this Chain; for God has promised his willingness and readiness to strengthen it every day more and more, till our state shall be so changed, that there shall be no such things as Tempests known, no tossings of waves, no tumults of winds, nor fear of leaking or decay in the Vessel, but all calmness and security. And for the attaining to this happy unchangeable estate, where is it that we place our hope? Truly our Hope is even in thee, O God; who, if thou shalt think it convenient or necessary for us, wilt enlarge this our Hope into confidence, and add, unto that, assurance, and swallow up all in possession; And that not for any merits of ours, but only for thy free undeserved Mercies in our blessed Saviour Jesus Christ, *in whom alone thou art well pleased*; To whom, with thee, O Father, and the blessed Spirit, be ascribed by us, and thy whole Church, the Kingdom, and the Power, and the Glory, for ever and ever. *Amen.*

The



# The Ninth Sermon.

## 1 COR. X. 13.

——*God is Faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able.*——

WHatever punishments befel the disobedient *Israelites*, who murmured and tempted God in the Wilderness, *They all hapned unto them* (saith St. *Paul*) *for ensamples to us, and are written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come.* This Priviledge we may have beyond our fore-fathers, that we may present before our eyes a larger Series and History of God's Providence, even since the foundation of the World: We may take a view and prospect of his constant unaltered course of revenging himself upon sin, in whatsoever persons he finds it; And we ought from thence to collect, that whatsoever immunities and priviledges we may conceive to our selves, whatsoever comfortable Errors we may take up upon trust, yet that God will not (for our sakes) begin a new frame of Polity in the Administration of the World; but that we also, unless we break off our sins by repentance, and conversion unto God, We, I say, after the example of these murmuring *Israelites*, as those upon whom the Tower of *Siloe* fell; as those fourteen, whose bloud *Pilate* mingled with the Sacrifices, that *we also unless we repent, shall all likewise perish.* Nay certainly, we (upon whom the ends of the world are come) shall be much more culpable, our punishment and stripes shall be more in number and weightier, if we (notwithstanding that larger experience which we may have of Gods unpartial dealing with sinners) shall yet promise to our selves impunity, *If we shall say, we shall have peace, though we walk in the imaginations of our hearts.* Verse. 6. Verse. 11.

2. The same collection we may proportionably make to our own benefit and advantage, from Gods gracious dealing and behaviour to any of his beloved faithful servants, we may appropriate to our selves, all those blessings and promises which have been afforded unto them, If our Consciences can assure us, that we do obey Gods Commandments in the truth and sincerity of our hearts. Now for warrant to this kind of collection, instead of several examples in Holy Scripture, I will only make use of one taken out of (I think) this our Apostle, where he saith, *Let your conversation be without covetousness, and be content with such things as you have; For God hath said, I will never leave thee, nor forsake thee.* Which words by him quoted, as the Margins of our Bibles will direct us, are to be found, *Josh.* 1. 5. Which, though they be a particular Promise which God immediately made to *Joshuah* thereby to encourage him after the death of *Moses*, to take upon him the conducting of the *Jews* into the Land of Promise, assuring unto him a continuation of his extraordinary assistance in the enterprise: Yet notwithstanding, St. *Paul*, we see (as if God had proclaimed this Promise to the whole world) applies these words to all the Faithful among the *Hebrews*, and by the same proportion to all Christians likewise. Heb. 13. 5. Josh. 1. 5.

3. Upon which grounds I may as reasonably direct the words of this verse, out of which my Text is taken, to you that now hear me, as the Apostle does to the *Corinthians*, And say, *There hath no temptation taken you, but such as is common to man*: For certainly, we will not imagine, that the Church or City of *Corinth* had any such

such extraordinary Immunity or Charter granted them, whereby they should be exempted from the danger of Temptations above all the Christian world besides. Therefore let your memories recollect and examine the time past of your lives, and tell me, Did there ever any Temptation take hold of you, or assault you so powerful and irresistable, that there was no way left for you but to be overcome by it? (Take Temptation now in what sense you please, either for a misfortune and Affliction, or else for a Suggestion to sin.) Was there ever any calamity, any loss, any pain, any sickness, so violent and impetuous, but that still you might perceive your selves notwithstanding (though perhaps in your outward man unequally match'd by it) yet in your spirits and minds strong enough to conquer the malice thereof, and to convert it into wholesom Physick? Again, Was there ever any sinful Temptation so strongly urged upon you, but that you might by the assistance of that Grace which God had already given you, or at the least, for the asking, would have super-added, you might easily have dulled and diverted the force thereof? Did not your Consciences, even after you were overcome by such a Temptation, tell you, that it was meer voluntary cowardize in you, to suffer your selves to be overcome by it, that you willingly surrendred and betrayed those forces which already God had given you?

4. Now, though I am perswaded this be so evidently true, that there is scarce any one here but his Conscience will assure him as much; Yet, for all this, we must not begin hereupon to fancy in our minds any extraordinary worth or dignity in our selves, as though by our own power or holiness we could work such wonders. No alas, nothing less: For take away the assistance and guard of our Auxiliary Forces, God's free and undeserved Graces within us, and his Divine assistance, together with the guard of his blessed Angels without us, and there is no Temptation so weak and despicable, which we should not suddenly yield unto; Nay, we should need no outward Tempters to help us to sin, our own wicked hearts would save the Devil that labour; For nothing is there so vile and abominable, whereunto without God's restraining Grace we should not readily and impetuously hasten unto.

5. Therefore let us neither defraud God nor our selves of their dues: But as we have spoken of the time past, so likewise of that which follows, If hereafter we shall overcome any temptation (as certainly, by Gods help, if we have but a mind to it, we may) Let us bless Almighty God for assisting us so far, let us give the glory and Trophies of the conquest to him: But on the contrary side, if we shall neglect to make use and advantage of those many helps against sin, which Almighty God is ready to supply unto us: If notwithstanding those many Promises of assistance so frequently set down in Holy Scripture; If notwithstanding those many secret whisperings and inspirations of his Holy Spirit in our souls: If notwithstanding God's Voice, which (as every days experience can witness unto us) continually calls upon us, saying, *This is the right way, walk in it, and ye shall find rest to your souls*; we will yet continue to extinguish those good motions, to deafen and drown God's voice, and be ready to hearken unto, and obey our own filthy lusts and vile affections: Let us lay the fault where it is due, even upon our own deceitful wicked Hearts; or otherwise, the time will come when in Hell we shall be evidently convinced thereof, when the worm of Conscience which never dyeth shall continually torment and gnaw us. Let God be true and faithful in his Promises, and every man a Lyar. For, as hitherto God has been so merciful to you to preserve you, that no temptation should take you, but such as is common to man: so likewise for the time following, though perhaps greater trials may befall you, than hitherto you have had experience of, yet of this you may be confident, that howsoever they may seem grievous; yet the same God continues faithful and righteous to fulfil his Promises, *He will never suffer you to be tempted above that you are able.*

6. Temptation is a thing of its own Nature indifferent, and is rendred good or evil, from the end and intention of the Tempter especially: It is nothing else but making



making a trial or experiment. If good; an assay, whether that good which seems to be in a subject be true and firmly grounded, or no: So God may be said to tempt, as he did *Abraham, &c.* And this he performs not to satisfie his curiosity, but meerly out of a good inclination to the party; both thereby to confirm his graces in him, and to reward them with a greater measure of Glory. If evil; Temptation is an assay, whether that good which seems to be in a man, may not by some means or other be extinguished, and so the person destroyed, so the Devil is most properly called the Tempter: And of this nature are the Temptations of my Text: Now these we find in Holy Scripture to be twofold: For either they are apt to draw us 1.
from good by way of Discouragement; so all manner of afflictions, misfortunes, persecutions, *&c.* are called Temptations, because by these a man is inclinable to be
affrighted from, or at least discountenanced in a holy conversation: Or else they allure 2.
us by way of invitation or solicitation to evil; so wicked pleasing suggestions are said to be Temptations, because these are fit to palliate the unloveliness and deformity of sin, and thereby to make it desirable unto us. It would be but loss of time to heap together Examples of holy Scripture to make good this distinction; since it is an Argument which you daily meet with al discoursed of in Sermons.

7. But, I confess, I find it something difficult to determine, whether of these two senses, with exclusion of the other be intended by St. *Paul*, in my Text, whether, when he says, *God will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able*, his meaning should be, God by his Wisdom and Providence, will so contrive businesses for you, that though you are not likely to live in a continual uninterrupted course of happiness and security, but that sometimes you shall dash your foot against a stone, you shall be disquieted and molested with afflictions of several natures; notwithstanding, this you may confident of, that let what misfortune will, come, how grievous and even insupportable soever it may seem unto you, it shall never be so violent and outragious, but that God will provide a way for you to escape from it, there will be a door left open for you to avoid the furiousness and impetuousness of it; either God will arm you with Patience to bear it, and then the comfort which your souls may feel, in the consideration of what glorious rewards are promised unto your Patience, shall make your afflictions even matters of rejoycing unto you; in which respect, (as St. *James* saith) *you ought to count it all joy, when you fall into divers Temptations*, Or, if those Temptations and Afflictions reach so far as to the destroying of your Lives, yet notwithstanding all this, they are so unable to make you miserable, unless you will take part with them against your own souls, by repining and murmuring under the mighty hand of God, that when you shall consider that blessed change which death shall bring unto you, when all tears shall be wiped from your eyes, all fear and expectation of misery removed, nothing but inexpressable and everlasting joys to be expected, you shall bless the time that ever you were afflicted, and with St. *Paul* confess, *That the afflictions of this life are worthy of that joy which shall be revealed*: This, I say, is a good Catholick, Orthodox sense, and which it is very probable, that St. *Paul* might more directly intend in these words of my Text.

8. Notwithstanding I cannot exclude the other sense of the word *Temptation* from this Text; for according to the Analogy of Faith, and without any wrong done to the dependence and connexion of these words (*God will not suffer you to be tempted*, &c.) St. *Paul*'s intent in them might be such, as if it had been thus spread out more at large, though considering the many disadvantages we have in the way of godliness, in respect both of our powerful, malicious, industrious, and subtile Enemy the Devil, who continually waits upon us to entrap us; in respect of our seeming flattering friend, the world and vanities thereof alluring us; But especially in respect of our own wicked and deceitful hearts, forward and desirous enough to embrace the wicked suggestions and temptations of both, nay, sufficient to destroy us without the assistance of either: I say, that though (these things considered) we may seem to be set (in the expression of the holy Ghost) *upon slippery places*, where it is almost impossible for us

to

to keep our footing, and to preserve our selves from falling dangerously, and dashing our selves in pieces.

9. Notwithstanding, if our eyes were opened, as were the eyes of the Prophet *Elisha*'s servant, we should find as well as he, that they that be with us are more than they that be against us: For God and his holy Angels, who are on our side, are both wiser and stronger than the Devil, and more willing to do us good, than the other can be to hurt us: Besides, the expectation of those glorious rewards, which are laid up in Heaven for us, are sufficient, even to any reasonable man, to distelish unto him the vain unsatisfying pleasures of this world: And though our own hearts naturally be never so traitorous and unfaithful, yet by the power of that Grace which is plentifully showred down upon every one of us in our Baptism, and which is daily encreased and supplied unto us, they may easily be corrected and renewed. So, that if the suggestion of any wicked Temptation get the mastery over us, let us not impute too much to the valour and strength of our Enemies; let us not accuse God of any unwillingness to succour us; For never any Temptation hath or ever shall happen unto us, but such as is ἀνθρώπινος. futable unto the nature of man, such as a reasonable, considerate, and a circumspect man, by the ordinary assistance of God's Grace, and careful application of those means wherewith we are abundantly furnished out of Holy Scripture, as Prayer, Watchfulness, Fasting, and the like, may easily conquer and subdue.

10. This sense of these words may with as good reason and probability be supposed to be intended by St. *Paul* in this place as the former: And indeed, unless we inlarge St. *Paul*'s words to this meaning also, we shall receive no extraordinary comfort and encouragement from them: For though indeed, it is true, that it is more than we can deserve at God's hands to obtain a Promise from him, to secure us, that no Temptations, no outward Afflictions of this world, shall be so violent and furious upon us, as to exceed the strength of Reason and Grace so wrought in them; Yet, since Sin is that only Enemy which is able to withdraw God's favour from us, and make him our Enemy, unless we can be put in some hope, that there is a possible course for us to prevail against sin also, and all the dangerous temptations and suggestions thereof, we should live but an uncomfortable discontented life, we should be continually affrighted with sad melancholick thoughts, with disquieting jealousies and fears, that however we may now and then please our selves with conceits of Gods favour for the present, yet, since he has passed no promise of securing us for the future, it may happen, that such a sinful Temptation may come upon us, which may be able, do what we can, to overwhelm us irrecoverably. Therefore since this latter sense (which I mentioned of these words) is more profitable and advantageous to us, I will especially at this time insist upon it, and labour to demonstrate undeniably to every one of us, that *God is faithful*, and will assuredly make good that promise which he hath made unto us all, namely, *Not to suffer us to be tempted*, that is, by any sinful temptation, *above that we are able*.

11. Now, he is said to be tempted above that he is able, who, do what he can, though he strain his natural endowments to the uttermost, and though he endeavour heartily to make use of all the outward helps and assistances which he finds prescribed unto him out of God's Word, though he extend that measure of Grace wherewith he is furnished to the extremest activity thereof to resist such a Temptation; yet, in the end is forced to yield to the power of it, utterly fainting and languishing in the combate. So, on the contrary, that man who being compleatly furnished with all requisite weapons both for his own defence, and encountring his Adversary, and besides, having in him both ability of body, and courage enough, and yet out of a sleepy negligence, or obstinate sullenness, will not take the pains to lift up his arm, or otherways bestir himself to oppose his Enemy, such a man, if overcome, can in no reason be said to be Over-match'd, but is a meer Traitor to his own safety and reputation.

12. And



12. And indeed, before I can proceed any further, I must either take this for granted, That some men though (*de facto*) they have been overcome by a Temptation, yet might have resisted it by the assistance of that Grace wherewith they were enabled, or truly, I know not what to say: For, if this be a good inference, a man is overcome by a Temptation, therefore he could not possibly have resisted, *Adam*, for all he was seduc'd by the Devil, is not so culpable as I took him to be. How can I charge such a man for not doing his duty? How can I convince his Conscience, that it was his own fault and negligence, that he did not that which he ought and might have done? Is there no man then to be found, that could possibly have done no more good than actually he has done? Does every man improve that Talent of Grace which God has given him to the uttermost of his power and skill? Or will any of you, when you confess your sins unto Almighty God, tell him to this purpose, Lord, I confess, I do daily fall into many and grievous sins; but, since they are gone and past, I perceive there was no remedy for it, it could not be avoided, those sins must needs have been practis'd by me, I did whatsoever I was enabled to do; if I had had more strength, I had done better; when thou bestowest on me more Talents of Grace, I shall be a more profitable servant, and yield thee a greater interest and advantage by them. If any of you entertain such conceits as these, I confess, you are a great deal more righteous than I thought you had been.

13. For mine own part, I confess with grief and shame, and self-condemnation, that I have offended Almighty God in many respects, when I might have done otherwise. I have not only hid my Talent in a Napkin, I have not only not improv'd that stock of Grace which God gave me; but, on the contrary, notwithstanding that, I have been very laborious and abounding in the unfruitful works of darkness. I have wilfully grieved the Holy Spirit of God, and many times quenched his good motions in me. Yea, so voluntarily and resolvedly have I done all these sins, that I am perswaded I could easily have chosen, whether I would have committed them or no; no necessity at all lay upon me to compel me thereunto, God was faithful and righteous in his promises and dealings with me, and my own wicked heart deceiv'd me. And, I think, all of you have been guilty in some measure of betraying and surrendring the abilities which God has bestowed on you, though I dare not charge you so deeply as my self.

14. Now that we have heard, who may be said to be able to resist a Temptation or not: for my more distinct proceeding in the confirmation of S. *Paul*'s Proposition in my Text, I will take our Saviour's counsel, I will *sit down and examine, whether he that hath but ten thousand, be able to meet with him which cometh against him with twenty thousand*. Here are two Enemies Camps, and no doubt great Forces on both sides: But without question, disproportionable: It concerns me therefore now, by taking a survey and muster of each, to demonstrate, that in all respects the advantage lies on our side. I mentioned before, briefly, that we had three especial enemies to deal with, the Devil, the World, and the Flesh: We will proceed in this order against them, in the first place examining the Devil's power, and the forces we have to oppose against him.

15. There are many terrible names, I confess, by which the Devil is described in Holy Writ; He is called *Abaddon*, and Ἀπολλύων, *the Destroyer*, as one whose imployment it were to counter-work against God; who calls himself *the Saviour and preserver of all men*: He is call'd *a ramping and a roaring Lion, that runs about seeking whom he may devour*: He is call'd *the great Dragon, the old Serpent, the Devil, and Sathan, which deceiveth the whole world*. (All this in one verse.) He is call'd *the Red fiery Dragon*. There are extant a great many more hideous pictures of him in God's Word: But these will serve our turn sufficiently, to shew how dangerous an enemy we have, and therefore how great ought to be our resolution and wisdom in encountring with him: And lest we should think, that since he is named in the fore-cited places in the singular number, that therefore there is but one Lion, and but one fiery Dragon to deal with all mankind, and thereupon begin to be a little more secure; Apocal. 12. 9.

since we should have hard fortune, if it should light upon us to be singled out by him, out of so infinite a crowd as the world is. No, God knows, it is so far from that, that there is an unutterable number of them, such an infinite vast Army, that one whole Legion (which are near about 4000) were at leisure to possess one man;

Ephes. 6. 12. And S. *Paul* tells us, *We wrestle not against flesh and blood*; as if he should say, These worldly enemies are so weak and despicable, in comparison of those we are to meet withal, that they are not to be reckoned of: But, says he, *We wrestle against Principalities and Powers*, (There are it seems, many Principalities and Powers) *against the Rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickednesses in high places*, (the word is) *in heavenly places*.

16. Now, what have we to oppose against such an innumerable multitude of Spirits, whereof each particular for his excessive strength is called *a Lion*; for his fierceness, a *Dragon*; for his poysonous malice, *a Red Dragon*; for the extream intenseness of that poysonous malice, *a Red fiery Dragon*; and for his wisdom and cunning to make use of this strength, fierceness, and malice, he is called *the old Serpent*; one that has been a Serpent continually spitting out his poyson against us, within very few days since any creature was; and therefore, if at the first, by his own natural wit, he was able, upon even terms, to overcome *Adam*, then innocent, and therefore not apt to betray himself, as we are, What may we conceive of him now after above 5000 years experience: I say, What shall we who are ready to fall into a swound, if we see but an apparition of one of them, though he do us no harm; How are we likely, think you, to behave our selves in combat against so many thousands of them?

17. Why truly, God be thanked, notwithstanding all this, we may do well enough. For we have spiritual Armies on our side too, that are able to contend with all these, and overcome them in all these advantages which they have against us. Are they many? *Michael* and his Angels are more certainly; which to me is evident by that saying in *Daniel*, where it is made an expression of Gods Glory and Majesty;

Dan. 7. 10. His innumerable multitude of attendants; the words are, *Thousand thousands minister unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stand before him*; which surely, God would not have made choice of as fit language to express his Power and Glory, if the Devil had been able to contend with God, I, and out-vie him too in this Article: Again, are they strong? These sure are stronger: for we read of one that slew an hundred fourscore and five thousand Souldiers in one night: We never heard of such an exploit of the Devils. Are they malicious against us? These are more loving and careful to do us good. And certainly, as God is stronger than the Devil, so likewise excessive goodness in the Angels will easily prevail against extream malice in the Devil, Now, it is the nature of Love, to be willing to take any pains for the good of the person beloved: whereupon St. *Paul*, in that most divine description of the three Cardinal Christian Virtues, thus expresseth them:

1 Thess. 1. 3. *Remembring your work of Faith, and labour of Love, and patience of Hope in our Lord Jesus Christ.* I confess, it is the nature of Malice too to be very laborious and observant of all advantages against the subject hated: But this must needs be granted, that Love will conquer malice in the same degree.

18. Thus you see, we are reasonably well befriended and back'd by these our Auxiliary Forces of our Guardian Angels, so, that we need not be disheartned, if we had no more: But beyond all these, we have Almighty God to our friend, whose power is so unlimited, that without any straining of himself, without the bending of his Bow, and drawing his Sword, only with unclasping his hand, *Subtractione Manutenentiæ*, with meer letting hold go, all creatures in Heaven and Earth, would re-

Psal. 34. 1. turn to nothing. He is in the language of the Psalmist, *a Sun and a Shield*, that is, in the phrase of another Psalm, *a Light and Defence*; *a Sun* to discover unto us the secret ambushes and practises of our Enemies, and a *Shield* to protect us from their open force and violence.

*Object.* 19. I, (will some man say) there is no man can make any question of God's Power?



Power; But the difficulty is, how we should be sure of his good will: if that were but once procured, the Battel were as good as at an end: Why, for that we must *Sol.* have recourse to God's Word, there it is that we must find upon what terms businesses stand between him and us. And there certainly, we shall find words, which at the first sight to any ordinary reasonable man would seem to make much for us: There are Invitations to a League with him: desires and requests as passionate as (I think) ever Poet strain'd for: There are Promises which look as if they were serious and unfeigned, they are confirm'd with Vows and solemn Oaths of sincerity, and all these seemingly directed to every one of us. What can we desire any more, especially from Almighty God, who stands in no need of our favour, and therefore is not likely to bespeak our good opinions of him with dissembling and lies.

20. Oh, but it is the easiest matter in the world for a man with a School-Subtilty, *Object.* by an Almighty distinction to cut off any mans right of Entail to those Promises; to appropriate them only to our own friends, to some two or three that he is pleased to favour: I would to God, that men would but consider what end, what project *Sol.* Almighty God should have in making his poor creatures believe he means well to them, when there is no such matter: *Would any of you*, saith our Saviour, *when his Son shall ask him bread, give him a stone; or instead of a fish to nourish him, a serpent* to destroy him? *If then you (which are evil) know how to give good gifts*; If you would not have the heart to mock poor children after this manner, how much rather would not God? For Gods sake therefore let there be but as much sincerity, as much good nature in Almighty God (I will not say as in your selves, for it may be that would be too much for you to grant, but) as our Saviour confesseth, that there were in the Jews that crucified him; and then we all of us have right enough to his Promises; we shall have no reason to doubt of his good intention to help and assist us so far, that unless we delight in destruction, unless we will turn fugitives, unless we will fight on our enemies side; all the Devils in Hell shall not be able to prevail against us. And thus much of the first squadrons, *Michael* and his Angels opposed to the Devil and his Angels.

21. The second enemy which we professed hostility against in our Baptism, was the vain temptations of this world; and so forcible and prevailing are the temptations thereof; that the Devil (who for his powerful managing of this weapon is called *the God of this world*) in his Encounter with our Saviour, set up his rest upon it, as supposing if this would not serve his turn, there were no more fighting for him; *All this will I give thee*, said he. And such a value he set upon this stake, that no less than the extremest degree of horrible Idolatry could serve his turn to oppose against it; *All this will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me.* And when he saw that this proffer would not be accepted, he presently quits the field, despairing utterly of any success. The more dangerous indeed is this enemy, I may say, more dangerous to us than the Devil himself; because we all acknowledge the Devil in person to be our enemy; and therefore not one of us will be beholding to him for any thing, if he bring us the gift himself; a sick man would not be healed by him, nor a poor man made rich, but scarce one among a thousand has that opinion of the vain pomps and sinful pleasures of the world. Our enemy! No certainly, It is the best and most comforting friend we have in this life; all our thoughts are taken up with it, it possesseth us at all times, we dream of it sleeping, and pursue it waking: And yet our Saviour saith, *Ye cannot serve God and Mammon.* And again, *How can ye believe, who seek honour one of another*: And again, *If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him.* What strength then have we to oppose this enemy?

22. Why, surely that which would suffice but an ordinary, reasonable man, and might serve any of us, but that we will needs be unreasonable only in things which concern our everlasting welfare: And that is the consideration of those unspeakable joys which shall attend those who can despise the unsatisfying vain pleasures of this life. A Philosopher, which but reading *Plato*'s Poetical description of the serenity

of that life, which a virtuous soul (delivered from the prison of the body) lives, was so far transported with the conceit of it, though for ought he knew, there was no such thing indeed; or if there were, perhaps never intended for him, that he becomes presently weary of this prison, and by a violent death frees himself from it; and God only knows what a change he found. Whereas we have Gods word for the certainty of that glorious life which his servants shall live; yea, a great deal of pains he hath taken, to make it desirable and amiable unto us, by ransacking all the treasures of this world, the most costly jewels, the most precious metals, to embellish the description thereof withall. We have besides the experience of several men, who have seen and tasted as much of that glory, as a mortal creature is capable of; St. *Paul*, and St. *John* the Divine. Surely, the consideration hereof might serve our turn, if not quite to disrelish unto us, and even to make us hate the vain pleasures of this world; yet, at least, not to prefer them when they come in competition with the other: And I would to God we would suffer them but so far to prevail upon us. But I cannot stay.

23. I have rank'd the three Armies of our enemies, just after the Roman fashion, reserving the Triaries, the old experienced Souldiers to the last. For though in shew, the first rank of the Devils appear most terrible; yet in very deed, all their power is nothing, unless the lusts of our hearts take part with them, and give them advantage against us. The lusts of the flesh, are those Traytors which continually keep us company, we cannot be quit of them; without the Devils assistance, they are able to captive us; what, think you, then are they able to do, being manag'd by so powerful, so wise an enemy? without them, all the powers of Hell and darkness are insufficient to withdraw us from our obedience, and, by consequence, from the love and favour of God. For, suppose the Devil (for example) present a lustful object to our fancy, as it were holding a lascivious picture before our eyes; if we consent not in our minds, to any base delight in such a spectacle; if we settle not our thoughts upon it, as upon a pleasing sight; it will be so far from doing us any harm, that it will rather prove a means to root us more deeply in the favour of God, as persons unwilling to take pay of his and our enemies.

24. But alas, as we are ordinarily so far from this nobleness of mind, from this bravery of a Christian-like Spirit; that, as if the Devil were too slow to object such Temptations to us, we will not await his leisure; but on all occasions be ready and desirous to raise up, and then settle such unworthy thoughts in our minds; we will be content to spend many hours sometimes in the acting of this inward contemplative Adultery. S. *Paul*, speaking of those lusts of our flesh, calls them our members, Col. 3. 5. when he saith, *Mortifie your members which are on earth; fornication, uncleanness, inordinate affection, evil concupiscence*, &c. And indeed we, by our practise, make good the Apostles expression; for we account our selves as lame unperfect creatures without them; we know not what to do with our selves, especially when we are alone, unless we set our selves on work this way, by acting our selves such filthy sins, which perhaps natural bashfulness, want of mony or opportunity, will not suffer us to put in practise. What strength have we now to oppose to these most pernicious enemies, which are so closely cemented, and even incorporated within us, that they are become as it were flesh of our flesh, and bones of our bones?

25. Why surely, as naturally we have received this root of Bitterness in our hearts, which is apt to give an infectious tincture to all the thoughts and actions issuing from thence. So likewise it hath pleased Almighty God to imprint a new Principle in our minds, to plant as it were a new spirit in our souls; I mean, that active powerful Grace, which without any co-operation of our own, he infuses into us especially, in our Baptism; and which is afterward, ἀναζωπυρούμενον, strengthened and enlivened daily, by a constant frequent exercising our selves in the use of those manifold blessed means of our salvation, the hearing, reading, and meditating on his holy Word, and participation of his heavenly mysteries. For surely, if Reason alone (by the help of those worthy grave precepts which are extant in the Treatises



tises of Moral Philosophy) hath been able to change many men from the habitual practise of several vices to a virtuous (I had like to have said also a Religious) life; why should any man think so meanly of God's Holy Word and Sacraments, as to doubt, but that much rather they should be able to make us *new creatures, to make us wise unto salvation*, especially considering that continual assistance of Gods Holy Spirit which infallibly attends the use and exercise of those his blessed means. Do you think God is so favourable to the Devil or his instruments, (our lusts) that he is unwilling to have them subdued and mortified in us? And, if he be not unwilling, surely much less is he unable to perform this great work in us, even to the end.

26. Therefore, as before, speaking of those outward forces, God and his holy Angels, which are ready to take our parts, and fight on our sides against the Devil and his Angels, we apply'd that saying of *Elisha* to his servant, If thine eyes were opened, thou shouldest perceive, *that they which are with us, are more than they which are against us*. So likewise in the case in hand, we may make use of that saying of S. *John, Greater is he which is in you, than he which is in the world*: implying that 1 John 4. 4. God is not only in himself stronger than the Devil, but also as considered *in us, i. e.* as working in our hearts by his Grace: This way, I say, he is stronger than the Devil; his Spirit co-operating with the means of our salvation, is more vigorous and powerful to renew us unto the Image of his Holiness; if we will but do that which lies in our own power, then the Devil (though taking his advantage of that concupiscence, which in some measure is continually resident in us) is or can be to corrupt, and so to destroy us. For his power is not considerable, unless we be willing to joyn with him. Thus you see, though our enemies be allowed all the advantages they can challenge, yet in exact esteem, without any flattering of our selves, we may conclude, that they who are ready, and desirous to joyn forces with us, are greater in all respects, than they which are against us.

27. But yet for all this, since the conducting and managing of those forces, is left to our discretion; for God will not fight single against the Devil in our behalf, unless we lend him our aid and assistance: And therefore, *Curse ye Meroz, saith the* Judg. 5. 23. *Angel of the Lord* (in the victorious Song of *Deborah*) *curse bitterly the inhabitants thereof*. And why must poor *Meroz* be so bitterly cursed? *Because they came not to the help of the Lord, to the help of the Lord against the Mighty*. Hereupon it may seem, that Almighty God will not put to his strength in our defence, unless we joyn with him; he will not be our Champion to fight, whilst we sit still, only spectators of the Combat. And therefore this consideration alone may be sufficient to abate that confidence, which the foregoing discourse might be apt to raise in us, especially if we be not utter strangers to our selves, if we be not ignorant of our own weakness.

28. For satisfaction therefore to this discouragement, I will now endeavour to demonstrate by proofs drawn from undeniable Reason, and experience; That there is no sinful Temptation so strong, but that an ordinary Christian may (by the assistance before mentioned) easily conquer it. And lest my proceeding herein may lie open to any manner of exception; let me choose from among you the weakest, most unexperienc'd Christian, I dare oppose this man against the sharpest and most furious Temptation; and will make him confess, that though he be *(de facto)* subdued by it, yet that that came to pass meerly by his own voluntary and affected unwatchfulness and cowardise, and that it was truly in very deed, in his power to have resisted it, I will make choice to instance in the sin of uncleanness and Fornication; a sin, that generally finds such excuse and patronage in the world; because it is supposed to be so naturally born and bred up with us, that there is no shaking it off: it is a sin so resolved upon to be unconquerable, that few men go about to restrain it. The ancient Antidotes against this sin, Watching and Fasting, are grown out of use with us, we conclude they will do us little good against this hereditary evil, and therefore the best is to give them clean over.

29. Yet

29. Yet I say, let me suppose an ordinary Christian, environed with all the strongest temptations to this so natural, and therefore concluded so excusable a sin; let him have the most charming beauty, that has the most artificial ways of solicitation, together with opportunity, and all circumstances which are not fit to be supposed here; yet for all this, if that man should say he is not able to resist such a temptation, he lies against his own soul: For if at that instant a sudden message should interrupt him, a threatning of Death, if he did not free himself from the danger of her filthy embraces, would he not do it? I desire only that each one of you in his heart would answer for him. Then it is clear, he is able to resist this pretended irresistable temptation: And why should not the consideration of the danger of eternal Torments be as perswasive against any sin, as the fear of a momentary death? But I will not make my advantage of so frightful an enemy to his pleasure, as Death. Suppose in all those circumstances before-mentioned, a good sum of mony were but offered him, upon condition he would abstain but that time from the execution of his filthy lust: I doubt not at all, but that upon these terms he would find strength enough to conquer this temptation. Shall Satan then be able to cast out Satan, and shall not God much more do it? Shall one sin be able to destroy the exercise of another, and shall not Grace much rather?

30. Besides, if we believe that generally it is not in our power to resist any of these temptations; How dare you who are Fathers, suffer your Daughters after they are come to years, to live unmarried? How dare you expose their souls to such dangers, unless you think, that ordinarily any man or woman is able to resist the temptations of the flesh? How dare you who are Merchants, for the hope of a little gain, live in foreign Countries, as if you were divorc'd from your Wives; if you religiously think, that were it not for the benefit of marriage, they could not ordinarily be honest?

31. Lastly, you may remember that our Saviour (in his descriptions of Hell) seldom leaves out this phrase, *where the worm dieth not*: which worm is generally by interpreters moraliz'd into the sting of conscience, *i. e.* a continual vexation of soul in the Reprobates, caused by the consideration, how it was meerly their own faulr, their wilful folly, which brought them to that misery. Now this worm would die, and be quite extinguish'd in them, if they were of some mens opinions; that the reason why they sin'd, was not because they would sin, but because they could not choose but do it, because they wanted power to resist all the temptations which were objected to them. Such a conceit may serve indeed to vex them, but it is not possible it should trouble their conscience; for by this Reason, *Corah*, *Dathan*, and *Abiram*, might with as good reason be tormented in conscience for falling into Hell, when the earth opened under them, as for their sin of Rebellion against *Moses*; If the Reason why they committed that sin, was the subtraction of Divine Grace and assistance, without which it was impossible for them not to be Rebels. But indeed,

*Object.* why should Almighty God withdraw his Grace from any man? Because (say some)

*Sol.* by falling, they may experimentally learn their own weakness without his assistance; and so be discouraged from trusting or relying upon themselves. A strange Reason no doubt: For as long as they have the Grace of God, they will not rely upon themselves; and when they are destitute of his Grace, they cannot rely upon him: so that it seems, God takes away his Grace from a man for this end, that wanting it, he may sin; and by that means, when he has got that grace again, he may perceive,

*Object.* that when he is destitute of Gods Grace, he cannot choose but sin; which was a thing which he knew at the first without all this ado. But there may be a better reason given, why God should take away his Grace from a man; and that is, because

*Sol.* he negligently omits to make his best use of it, and so deserves that punishment. But this reason will satisfie as little as the former: For suppose (for example) a man at this instant in the state of Grace, and so in the favour of God. Upon these grounds, it is impossible that this man should ever sin; for surely God will not undeservedly take away his Grace from him, till he merit that punishment by his Sin; and till God



God take away his Grace from him, he cannot sin; therefore he must never sin. But this discourse, though it meerly concern practise, looks so like a Controversie, that I am weary of it.

32. We are apt enough to slander God with too much mercy sometimes, as if he bore us so particular an affection, that notwithstanding our never so many sins, yet he will still be merciful unto us. Oh that we could conceive of his mercy and goodness aright! as rather willing to prevent our sins by giving us sufficient preservatives against the committing them. I would to God, that instead of making subtil scholastical disputes of the power and efficacy of Gods Grace, we would magnifie the force thereof, by suffering it to exercise its sway in our lives and conversation; we should then easily find, that *we are able to do all things through Christ that strengtheneth us*.

FINIS.