THE JUGGLING OF THE JESUITS

WHETHER THE CAUSE OF THE ROMAN OR REFORMED CHURCHES BE OF GOD?



RICHARD BAXTER

The Juggling of the Jesuits

Whether the Cause of the Roman or Reformed Churches be of God?

Richard Baxter

Monergism Books

This text has been initially updated from EEBO-TCP by Project Puritas.

Further revision and editing done by Monergism.

Copyright Monergism via universal text usage permission from the above.

Copyright © 2025

Published by Monergism Books

P.O. Box 491

West Linn Oregon 97068

www.monergism.com

All rights reserved.

No portion of this book may be reproduced in any form without written permission from the publisher or author, except as permitted by U.S. copyright law.

Editor’s Note – During the EEBO-TCP Transcription Process, all the text was hand transcribed according to visual representation; and as such, sometimes the letters s, l, f & t are misconstrued with each other, these letters regularly being almost illegibly similar in the original facsimile script. Though it is rare for these errors to remain post-edit, unfortunately they may remain if uncaught. My sincere apologies in advance where such errors occur. As the Puritan Edward Leigh once said "If thou findest faults and Errata in the book, let love cover them, for to err (as the Satirist saith) is the sad privilege of mortality, and he (of all men) erreth most, who challengeth a privilege from error." Also, the symbol <H&G>, when included, signifies omitted Hebrew & Greek. Lastly, some archaic words may be updated to more contemporary terminology; but changes have been kept to a bare minimum, and any mentioned page numbers in the text will correlate to the original facsimile and not the eBook or Reprint.

Contents

PREF. I. To his Highness.

PREF. II. To the Reader.

PART I.

1. CHAP. I. Popery no way to Unity.

2. CHAP. II. Directions for them that will deal with a Papist.

3. CHAP. III. Against Popery, by which every honest godly man is secured from them.

4. CHAP. IV. The second Argument.

5. CHAP. V. That deposing Kings that will not exterminate us, and absolving Subjects from their Allegiance, and giving their Dominions to others, is an Article of the Papists Faith.

6. CHAP. VI. The Church of Rome unholy in its Essentials.

7. CHAP. VII. The Papists of more than One Church, yet each part pretending to be the Catholic Church.

8. CHAP. VIII. The Church of Rome hath discontinued.

9. CHAP. IX. From sense; securing all men from Popery that will believe their eyes, or any of their or others senses.

10. CHAP. X. Prove them but guilty of one Error in Faith, and all Popery is confuted.

11. CHAP. XI. A Doctrine so contrary to Scripture and itself, cannot be free from Error.

12. CHAP. XII. Agree on the way of proof, before you dispute: Papists will take neither Sense, Reason, Scripture, nor the Tradition or Judgment of the greater part of the Church for judge or proof.

13. CHAP. XIII. Understand what they mean, when they call to you for a Judge of Controversies. How far a Judge is necessary, and who.

14. CHAP. XIV. They pretend, that in their way there is an End of Controversies, but in ours there is none.

15. CHAP. XV. Their boast of Unity, and reproaching us with Divisions.

16. CHAP. XVI. Their confounding the Essentials and Integrals of Christianity.

17. CHAP. XVII. Their extolling the judgment of the Catholic Church.

18. CHAP. XVIII. Some of their deluding Ambiguities.

19. CHAP. XIX. Their Confounding 1. A human Ordinance, and a Divine. 2. Mere Primacy with Sovereignty. 3. An alterable Order with an unalterable Essential.

20. CHAP. XX. The vanity of their pretending Tradition detected. How far we are for Tradition. Tradition confoundeth Popery.

21. CHAP. XXI. Their pretense that the Greeks and all other Churches were once under the Pope.

22. CHAP. XXII. Their plea that the Church of Rome is a True Church, and therefore we are Schismatics for separating from it.

23. CHAP. XXIII. Their pretending to fixed Unity and settledness, and that we are at uncertainty, incoherent, and changelings.

24. CHAP. XXIV. Their plea that our Church and Religion is new, and theirs old; and their calling for a Catalogue, and proof of the Succession of our Church before Luther.

25. CHAP. XXV. Their jumbling all our differences together, and then making lesser or common differences to be the Protestant Religion.

26. CHAP. XXVI. Their false interpretation of the sayings of Ancients, from whence they would extort a proof of their Sovereignty.

27. CHAP. XXVII. Their corrupting Councils and Fathers, and citing such.

28. CHAP. XXVIII. Their persuading the people that we are all Liars, that nothing we say and write may be regarded.

29. CHAP. XXIX. Their feigned Miracles.

30. CHAP. XXX. Their Impudent slanders. The horrid Lyes against Luther and Calvin, insisted on by the Marquess of Worcester, and their common Writers.

31. CHAP. XXXI. Their quarrels at our Translations of Scripture.

32. CHAP. XXXII. Their design to make the Ministers odious to the people. Their riches and ours compared.

33. CHAP. XXXIII. Their cavils against our Ministry, Ordination and Succession, confuted.

34. CHAP. XXXIV. Their pretense of the Holiness of their Church, and the unholiness of ours.

35. CHAP. XXXV. Their demanding of us to tell them when every one of their Corruptions did begin.

36. CHAP. XXXVI. They charge us with New Articles, for denying their new Articles of Faith, and then bid us prove the Succession of our Negatives.

37. CHAP. XXXVII. They conclude that theirs is the safer Religion, because it is most uncharitable and damneth others, and ours the less safe because the more charitable.

38. CHAP. XXXVIII. They win the Great ones and multitude by suiting their Doctrine and Worship to the fleshly conceits and inclinations of ungodly men.

39. CHAP. XXXIX. They pick up the mistakes or harsh passages of some particular Divines, and persuade men that these are the Protestant Religion.

40. CHAP. XL. Ranking the Protestants among the rabble of Sects and Heresies that are in the world.

41. CHAP. XLI. Another of their juggling's is, By working upon the people's natural affections, and asking them, Where they think all their forefathers are that died in the communion of the Roman Church?

42. CHAP. XLII. Their presence of a Divine institution, and Natural Excellency of a visible Monarchical Government of the whole Church.

43. CHAP. XLIII. Their new device of receiving nothing as Scripture Evidence; but the express words.

44. CHAP. XLIV. They choose such persons to dispute with against whom they have some notable advantage.

45. CHAP. XLV. Their designs to divide us, or sow Heresies among the Vulgar, and then draw them to some odious practices.

46. CHAP. XLVI. They Hide themselves (in their Agents and new Converts:) The means: Our danger by the Hiders.

47. CHAP. XLVII. Their exceeding industry to pervert men of Interest and power.

48. CHAP. XLVIII. Their Treasons against the lives of Princes and the Peace of Nations, and their dissolving the bond of Oaths and Covenants, and making Perjury and Rebellion to seem Duties and Meritorius.

49. CHAP. XLIX. Their last course is to turn to open Hostility, and stir up Princes to war and blood.

50. CHAP. L. Some Proposals for a (hopeless) Peace.

51. CHAP. LI. Five several Degrees of Peace which lie before us to be attempted between the Roman and Reformed Churches.

52. CHAP. LII. The second Degree of Peace desirable.

53. CHAP. LIII. Could the former terms of Peace be yielded to?

54. CHAP. LIV. The fourth Degree of Peace desirable.

55. CHAP. LV. The lowest Degree, that none but incarnate Devils one would think should resist.

PART II.

56. CHAP. I. Showing the Occasion and Reasons of this Writing, especially as from the Grotians; which are Vindicated from the frivolous exceptions of Mr. Tho. Pierce.

57. CHAP. II. The true State of the Controversy, and how much we grant.

58. CHAP. III. Our Arguments for the Negative.

59. CHAP. IV. Opening the true Grounds on which the Churches Unity and Peace must be sought, and the means that must be used to attain so much as is here to be expected.

60. Errata.

PREF. I. To his Highness.

To his Highness Richard Lord Protector of the Common-wealth of England, Scotland and Ireland, &c.

Sir,

These Papers presume to tender you their service, because the Subject of them is such, as it most nearly concerneth both us and you that you be well acquainted with. The Roman Canons that batter the Unity, Catholicism and Purity of the Church of Christ, are mounted on the frame which I have here demolished. The swords, and pens, and tongues that you are now engaged against, and which you must expect from henceforth to assault you, are whetted and managed by the senseless, tyrannous, ungodly principles, which I have here Detected. As unreasonable as they appear to the unprejudiced, they are such as have animated the studies and diligent endeavors of thousands to captivate the Princes and Nations of the Earth to the Roman yoke. As vain as they appear to us that see them naked, they are such as have divided and distracted the Churches of Christ, and troubled and dethroned Princes, and laid them at the feet of the Roman Pope; They

have absolved subjects from their Oaths and other obligations to fidelity: They have involved many a Nation in blood: O the streams of the blood of Saints that have been shed by these Roman Principles, in Savoy, France, Bohemia, Poland, Germany, Ireland, England, and many other Lands! As easy a war as here I manage, it is against those adverse Principles that have armed Thousands and Millions against the innocent, or against their lawful Sovereigns, whom God had bound them to obey: They have fastened knives in the breasts of the greatest Kings, as the lamentable case of Henry the third and fourth of France doth testify: They have in a few days time in Paris, and the adjoining parts of France, perfidiously butchered Nobles and other persons of eminency, and people of all sorts, to the number of near thirty thousand (as Thuanus reckoneth them, if not forty thousand, as Davilah.) The Doctrines which I here confound, have invaded England by a Spanish Armado, (whether by the Popes consent, and upon the account of Religion, I have after shown out of their own Writers:) they have prepared knives and poison for our Princes, which God did frustrate: they have laid Gunpowder to blowup King and Parliament, and hellishly execute the fury of the deluded zealots in a moment, and then to have charged the Puritans with the fact: They have in a time of Peace, by a sudden insurrection, murdered so many thousands in Ireland in a few days or weeks, as posterity will scare believe. They are dreadful Practical's, and not mere speculations that we dispute against. I beseech you therefore that you receive not this as you would do a Scholastic or Philosophical Disputation about such things as seem not to concern you; but as you would interest yourself in a Disputation upon the Question, Whether you should be deposed or murdered as a Heretic? And whether we should be Tormented and burnt as Heretics? And whether the lives of all the Princes and People upon earth

whom the Pope judgeth Heretics, should be at his mercy? &c. so do in this cause. I speak not this to provoke you to deal bloodily with them, as they do with the servants of the Lord! I abhor the thoughts of imitating their cruelty! It is only the Necessary Defense of your Life, and Dignity, and the Lives of all the Protestants that are under your Protection and Government, and the souls of men, that I desire. On what terms we stand with those men whose Religion teacheth them to kill us if they can; and to venture their lives for it, is easy to understand.

When we have no security from them for our lives, but their disability to destroy us, we must disable them or die. I utter no melancholy dreams nor slanders: I have here shown it in the too plain and copious Decrees of the approved General Council at Lateran, that the deposing of Princes, and absolving their Subjects from their fidelity and giving their Dominions to others, not only for supposed Heresy, but for not exterminating such as deny Transubstantiation, &c. is an Article of their Faith; and no man can disown it, without disowning Popery in the Essentials. If once they will renounce the Decrees of General Councils approved by the Pope, we shall be soon agreed. Saith *Costerus Enchirid. c. 1, p. 46. Quae sanc Decreta si veritatem, si obsignationem Spiritus Sancti, si praesentiam Christi spectes, idem habent pondus & momentum quod Sancta Dei Evangelia*. They believe these Decrees to be as true as the Gospel. I need not therefore tell you that Bozius Hostiensis, and many more of them make the Pope to be the Lord of all the World: Or that Bellarmine and the stronger side do carry it, as [The common judgment of all Catholic Divines, (see what a rabble he heaps up *De Pontif. Rom. li. 5, c. 1*.) that the Pope, *ratione spiritualis, habet saltem indirecte potestatem quandam, eamque summam in temporalibus*. Which c. 6, he saith, [is just such over Princes as the soul hath over the

body or sensitive appetite; and that thus he may change Kingdoms, and take them from one and give to another, as the chief Spiritual Prince, if it be but necessary to the safety of souls.] c. 78. He gives us his proof of this. And whether the Pope do take your Government to be for the good of souls, I need not tell you. It is the stupendous judgment of God on Christian Princes for their sins, that they have been so far blinded as to endure such a usurper so long, and have not before this blotted out his name from among the sons of men. [*Non licet*, &c. It is not lawful (saith *Bellarmine ib. c. 7*.) for Christians to Tolerate an Infidel, or Heretical King, if he endeavor to draw his Subjects to his Heresy or unbelief: but to judge whether a King do draw to Heresy or not, belongeth to the Pope, to whom the care of Religion is committed: therefore it belongs to the Pope to judge a King to be deposed, or not deposed.] You see here it is not Lawful for such Christians as the Papists to Tolerate you: which may help your judgment in the point of their Toleration. *Si Christiani* (saith *Bellar. ib.*) *olim non deposuerunt Neronem—Valentem Arianum & similes, id fuit quia deerant vires temporales Christianis*.] You have your Government and we our Lives, because the Papists are not strong enough. They tell you what to trust to. Saith Tollet (one of the best of the Jesuits, *li. 1, de Instruct. Sacerd. c. 13.*) [They that were bound by the bond of fidelity or Oath, shall be freed from such a bond, if he fall into Excommunication: and during that, Debtors are absolved from the obligation of paying to the Creditor that debt that is contracted by words —] These are no private ineffectual Opinions. Saith Pope Pius the 5th himself in his Bull against our Queen Elizabeth, [*Volumus & mandamus*, We will and command that the Subjects take Arms against that Heretical and Excommunicate Queen.]

But their cruelty to men's souls, and the Church of Christ, doth yet much more declare their uncharitableness. It is a point of their Religion to believe, that no man can be saved but the Subjects of their Pope, as I have after proved, and is to be seen in many of their writings, (as Knot, and a late Pamphlet called Questions for Resolution of Unlearned Protestants, &c.) and Bishop Morton hath recited the words of Lindanus, Valentia and Vasquez. (*Apol. lib. 2, c. 1.*) [defining is to be of Necessity to Salvation to be subject to the Roman Bishop.] And would not a man think that for such horrid doctrines, as damn the far greatest part of Christians in the world, they should produce at least some probable Arguments? But what they have to say, I have here faithfully detected. If we will dispute with them, or turn to them, the Scripture must be no further Judge then as their Church expoundeth it: The Judgment of the Ancient, yea or present Church, they utterly renounce; for the far greatest part is known to be against the Headship of their Pope; and therefore they must stand by for Heretics. Tradition itself they dare not stand to, except themselves be Judges of it; for the greatest part of Christians profess that Tradition is against the Roman Vice-christ. The internal sense and experience of Christians they gainsay; concluding all besides themselves to be void of charity or saving grace, which many a thousand holy souls do find within them, that never believed in the Pope. Yea when we are content to lay our lives on it, that we will show them the deceit of Popery, as certainly and plainly as Bread is known to be Bread when we see it, feel and taste it, and as Wine is known to be Wine when we see and drink it; yet do they refuse even the judgment of sense, of all men's senses, even their own and others. So that we must renounce our honesty, our Knowledge of ourselves, our senses, our reason, the common experience and senses of all men, the Judgment and Tradition

of the far greatest part of the present Church or else by the judgment of the Papists we must all be damned.

Whether such opinions as these should by us be uncontradicted, or by you be suffered to be taught your Subjects, is easy to discern. If they had strength, they would little trouble us with Disputing. Nothing more common in their Writers scarce, then that the Sword or Fire is fitter for Heretics then Disputes. This is but their after-game. Though their Church must rule Princes, as the soul, ruleth the body, yet it must be by Secular Power; excommunication doth but give fire: it is Lead and Iron that must do the execution. And when they are themselves disabled, it is their way to strike us by the hands and swords of one another. He that saw England, Scotland and Ireland a while ago in blood; and now sees the lamentable case of so many Protestant Princes and Nations destroying one another, and thinks that Papists have no hand in contriving, counseling, instigating, or executing, is much a stranger to their Principles and Practices.

Observing therefore that of all the Sects that we are troubled with, there is none but the Papist that disputeth with us with flames and Gun-Powder, with Armies and Navies at their backs, having so many Princes, and so great revenues for their provision, I have judged it my duty to God and his Church, 1. To Detect the vanity of their cause, that their shame may appear to all that are impartial; and to do my part of that necessary work for which Vell. Paterculus so much honored Cicero (*Hist. lib. 2, c. 34*.) *Ne quorum arma viceramus, corum ingenio vinceremur*] And 2. To present with greatest earnestness these following Requests to your Highness on the behalf of the cause and people of the Lord (wherein the Papists also shall see, that it is not their suffering, but only our Necessary Defense that we desire.)

1. We earnestly request that you will Resolvedly adhere to the cause of Truth and Holiness, and afford the Reformed Churches abroad the utmost of your help for their Concord and Defense, and never be tempted to own an Interest that crosseth the Interest of Christ. How many thousands are studiously contriving the extirpation of the Protestant Churches from the Earth? How many Princes are confederate against them? The more will be required of you for their aid. The serious endeavors of your Renowned Father for the Protestants of Savoy, discovered to the world by Mr. Morland in his Letters, &c. hath won him more esteem in the hearts of many that fear the Lord, then all his victories in themselves considered. We pray that you may inherit a tender care of the cause of Christ.

2. We humbly request that you will faithfully adhere to those that fear the Lord in your Dominions. In your eyes let a vile person be contemned; but honor them that fear the Lord, Psal. 15:4. Know not the wicked; but let your eyes be upon the faithful of the Land, Psal. 101:4,6. Compassionate the weak and curable, Punish the uncurable; restrain the froward; but Love and cherish the servants of the Lord. They are under Christ the honor and the strength of the Commonwealth; It was a wise and happy King that professed that his Good should extend to the Saints on earth, and the excellent in whom was his delight, Psal. 16:2,3. This strengthening the vitals is one of the chief means to keep out Popery and all other dangerous diseases. We see few understanding Godly people receive the Roman infection, but the profane, licentious, ignorant or malignant that are prepared for it.

3. We earnestly request your utmost care, that we may be ruled by Godly, Faithful Magistrates under you: and that your Wisdom and Vigilancy may frustrate the subtlety of Masked Papists or Infidels that would creep into

places of Council, Command, or Justice, or any public office. If ever such as these should have a hand in your affairs, or be our Rulers, we know what we must expect. The Reasons of our jealousies of such men are, because we know that the design is agreeable to their principles and interests: and we know it is their usual course: and we find that such men swarm among us: we hear their words, we read their writings, we see their practices for Popery and Infidelity. The jealousies of many wise men in England are very great concerning the present designs of this Generation of men; and not without cause. We fear the Masked Papists and Infidels, more than the bare-faced, or then any enemy. The men that we are jealous of, and over whom we desire you to be Vigilant, are these Hiders that purposely obscure and cover their Religion. He that willfully concealeth his Faith, alloweth me to suspect it to be naught: The chief of them are, 1. The Seekers that have not yet found a Church, a Ministry, Ordinances, or Scripture, nor some of them a Christ to believe in. 2. The Paracelsians, Behmenists, and other Enthusiasts, that purposely hide themselves in self-devised, uncouth, cloudy terms, and pretend to visible familiarity with spirits. 3. The Vani, whom God by wonders confounded in New England, but have here prevailed far in the dark. 4. The secret guides of the Quakers. 5. Those that make it their business to argue against the Religion of all others, but assert little of their own, endeavoring to bring all men to uncertainties, and loose them from the faith. 6. Those that are still vilifying or undermining the faithful Godly Ministry. 7. Those that do secretly or openly plead the cause of Infidels: (which are alas, too many: whether ex animo, or for promoting Popery, time will disclose:) that deride the Scriptures, and deny the Immortality of the Soul, the Resurrection of the body, or that there are any Devils, or is any Hell. 8. The Libertines, that would have liberty for all that they can call

Religion, though against the certain Principles of Christianity; and that tell us the Magistrate hath nothing to do with men's Religion (of which anon.) 9. The Democratical Politicians, that are busy about the change of Government, and would bring all into confusion under pretense of the Peoples Liberty or Power, and would have the Major Part of the Subjects to be the Sovereign of the rest; that is, the worst, that are still the most; and the ignorant, that cannot Rule themselves; and the vicious, that are enemies and hinderers of piety; and the worldlings, that mind nothing but what is under their feet, and have no time to think of Heaven, they have so much to do on earth; and as Augustine saith, had rather there were one Star less in Heaven, then One Cow loss in their Pastures: these must be our Sovereigns. 10. Those that under pretense of defending Prelacy, and of uniting us with Rome, do adhere to the course of Grotius and Sancta Clara, and Unchurch all the Reformed Churches, degrade all the Ministers that are not of their way, while they maintain the verity of the Church of Rome, and the validity of her Ordination, and would have the Pope to be the *Principium Unitatis* to all the Church, and the Western Parts to obey him as their Patriarch, yea and himself to be the Ruler of the whole, so he do it by the Laws of General Councils, and deprive not inferior Bishops of their Privileges. These ten sorts of men we are Jealous of; and if ever you advance them into places of Command or Power, it will increase our jealousies. God knows, I have no personal grudge to any of them. But the Gospel and the souls of men, and the hopes of our posterity, are not so contemptible as to be given away as a bribe to purchase these men's good will, or to stop their mouths lest they should reproach us. As it is the common, but a poor redress, that after the Massacres of thousands, the surviving Protestants have still had from the Papists, viz. to disclaim the fact, or cast it upon some rash discontented men

(which will not make dead men alive again.) So will it be a poor relief to us, when these men are our Masters, and have deprived us of all that was dear to us in the world, that we escaped their ill language while the work was doing.

4. We also humbly beseech you, that you will go on with the purging, and encouraging of the Ministry: Casting out the Ignorant and Ungodly; and countenancing those that are Able, and Faithful. They deny their ease, and dignity and the riches of the world (which other employments would afford) to encounter with Satan and the worlds corruptions, for the happiness of souls! And therefore the more oppose them and revile them, and unthankfully requite them, the more are you obliged for the sake of Christ, and men's salvation, to assist them. All their enemies contending to surpass the Devil in impudency, accuse them of Covetousness, Idleness and Ambition, as if these were the things that they seek after in the world. If our practice seconding our profession, be not enough to confute these calumnies of malignant men, let this be added to confute them, that we make it our earnest request to your Highness, that all such Ambitious, Idle, Covetous, or otherwise scandalous Ministers may be cast out. You have Commissioners in every County for this work: Require them to do it faithfully: If we desired this much against our Reproachers, they would say we persecuted them: We desire you therefore but to turn this persecution against ourselves. We also desire you, that you will not advance us to Temporal Honors, or Dignities, or Power; nor make us Lord Bishops, nor to abound with the riches of this world: These things agree not with our calling: We only desire food, and raiment, and necessaries to furnish us for our work, and express some charity to the needy that daily expect it from us; and we crave of you that we may be no richer. We also desire you, never to put the sword into

our hands, nor enable us to execute any of our private passions upon any, nor yet to touch men's Bodies or Estates; but only to manage the word and Keys of the Kingdom of Christ upon men's Consciences, and Guide his Church according to our office, and let it prevail as God shall bless it. This is all the advancement we desire. We have doubly renounced all the world, as Christians, and as Ministers of Christ; we have given up ourselves to a difficult flesh-displeasing work: we crave no more of you but so far to countenance us as Christ commandeth you, and the good of our people's souls requires. And God will be judge between us and our malicious reproachers, whether these requests are Covetous, Ambitious, or Unreasonable.

5. We also humbly crave your aid, for the procuring and maintaining a Union and Concord among all the Pastors and Churches in your Dominion. All that fear God are Agreed in the main: and they have a special Love to one another; and these are good preparatives to their fuller reconcilement. I know that there is no such distance in their principles, but that they may in blessed Concord carry on the work of God: Our poor people need this, that are offended at our smallest distances: All our strength united is too little to bear down the oppositions of Hell and Earth that we must daily encounter in our work. Your help may do much to procure our Concord, of which I shall presume to say more to you in another address.

6. Lastly we beseech you that Toleration may be limited by Execution as well as by Law; And therefore that as the Approved Ministers must have an Instrument of Approbation, and must be responsible before the Commissioners of ejection, for anything that forfeiteth it; so the Tolerated may be tried according to your Laws of Toleration, and may have an Instrument for their Toleration, before they have Liberty publicly to

propagate their Opinions to others: and that they may be as responsible before the Commissioners for ejection as we. And that publicly nor privately Papists, nor Infidels, nor any that deny the essentials of the faith may not be suffered to seduce the people. If any think that this is desired by us, because we fear the power of truth, or would deprive them of any just freedom of debate, I provoke them solidly to answer what is here said in the following Dispute; and we dissuade not your Highness if you were in any doubt (which we do not imagine) of the truth of the Christian or Reformed Doctrine, to invite us to an equal Disputation, and try whether we shall not open the shame of Infidelity and Popery (the two great evils that threaten this land) at any time. But if you are resolved of the wickedness of both these ways, we have reason to expect that you suffer not the poison to be administered to your people. Give not leave to every seducer to do his worst to damn men's souls; When you will not tolerate every Traitor to draw your Armies or people into Rebellion; nor to every wicked man to solicit others to whoredom, murder, theft or deceit. And verily if men have leave to preach against the Scripture, Churches, Ministry, Ordinances, yea and against the life to come under the name of Seekers, Quakers or such other Sects, we had far rather that they had leave to pull off their vizor, and do it openly in the name of Papists. For as Papists they will disown abundance of the abominations, which as Seekers, &c. they propagate on design: And as plain dealing in Religion is better than juggling, so we had rather that open quiet Papists were tolerated, then these juggling deceivers. They that pretend to know the Jesuits and Friars, do profess that they are more common in Princes Councils and Families, and in the houses, if not the closets of Noble men, Commanders, and persons of public trust or service, then we that live and mean simply do imagine. And who would have

thought that had not know it, that they had so insinuated into the several sects among us, and that they were so industrious in their work, as the Newcastle Scottish Jew was, to be circumcised or become Jew, and then rebaptized, &c. and all to deceive?

Judge I beseech you by these three Reasons, how far their seduction is to be tolerated. 1. That they preach Treason against Princes and States, I have shown undeniably, is part, and a principal part of their Religion.

2. Their doctrine corrupteth almost all Morality: What need we fuller clearer proof, then the Jansenian hath given us in his Mystery of Jesuitism? And much more may be added. Morton hath long ago produced enough to tell us what to expect from such men: *Apolog. Part. 1, l. 2, c. 13.* As from Tollet himself *l. 4, de instruct. sacerd. c. 9.* [*Quantum ad intentionem dilectionis, non tenemur sub praecepto Deum plus omnibus diligere*] *Stapleton l. 6, de justif. c. 10, and Valent. l. de Votis c. 3.* [*Hoc praeceptum diligendi Deum ex tota mente, doctrinale est, non obligatorium*] See here, a precept, and the greatest precept, even to Love God above all, is not Obligatory? A strange precept! And p. 322, he reciteth the words of Tollet, *ibid. l. 4, c. 21, and 22*, teaching Equivocation upon oath before a Magistrate, and so maintaining perjury. And p. 327, he citeth the same Author maintaining that Murder, and Blasphemy in a passion and not deliberate, is no mortal sin, unless in one that is used to Blaspheme. And p. 329, how Bellarm. Costerus, Valentia maintain that Fornication in a Priest is better, or a smaller sin then to marry. The like he shows of their doctrine of Theft, False witness, &c. p. 332,333, &c. This from him.

3. But above all their other mischiefs, the Propagating of Infidelity by them is the greatest: Which they do in two ways. 1. Under the Vizard of Infidels and Seekers they plead against Scripture and Christianity, in design

to loosen men from all Religion, and persuade them that they must needs be Infidels or Papists: Veron and his followers have given them full Directions to manage this design. And while (with debauched Consciences) they thus persuade men to be Infidels in jest, they have made abundance such in good sadness: so that upon my knowledge there are many such swarm among us, that sometime seemed pious persons, that plead against Christianity itself. 2. And no wonder, when some of the leading Papists do seem to be Christians in jest, and Infidels in good sadness themselves. I shall instance now but in their Champion, Tho. White, who in his *Euclid. Metaphys. Stoech. K. pr. 16*, maintaineth that in a manner, or almost all incorporated souls shall be saved by the world as the Instrument, or else the world were substantially evil, and the souls that fail of Blessedness, *non sint sufficientes ad partem considerabilem totius multitudinis constituendam*. He that believeth this, cannot believe Christ, nor well persuade men to believe in Christ. This happy news to the Pagans and Mohammedans, might somewhat affright the Christians being the fewest, lest they should be that inconsiderable number, but that he that talks of the damnation of so few, its like by his Arguments believeth it of none. The same he asserts in his Treatise of the middle state of souls, *Rat. 5, p. 41*. And *Rat. 10*, he disputeth against Vindictive Justice as a thing not becoming God: and p. 88, denieth that sinners injure God, forsooth because he suffereth it willingly. p. 95 (Translat.) he saith that souls are exempt from all such pains as may be caused by any outward agent: And p. 111. That God Governeth not the world as a Monarch, but as an Engineer; And p. 134, he saith [the punishment of sin whether external or internal, is nothing else but the increase and exaggeration of sins in those who are perverse, and the decrease and diminution of them in those who amend] And p. 90, that [the

defect of God's honor occasioned by Peter, was not supplied and repaired by any other] and so not by Christ. And p. 146. [that God's aim is always the utmost good of every creature] And he oft enough tells us that God attaineth all his will. And is this man a Papist? Or are Papists in good sadness, that tell the world that none but the subjects of the Pope can be saved? And yet now the number that perish will be inconsiderable; and God aimeth at the utmost Good of every creature. Sure he thinks that all the Toads must be made men: and all men made Angels; and every star must be made a Sun! I shall pass by the Books that are written against the Creation, and against Scripture, and against Hell, &c. which swarm among us; only advising your Highness to take heed that you venture not upon any worldly motives, to stand guilty before the living God of allowing or tolerating such Books to be published, and such doctrines as these to be preached to your People, to the everlasting undoing of their precious souls.

If you ask who it is that presumeth thus to be your Monitor? It is one that serveth so great a Master that he thinks it no unwarrantable presumption, in such a case to be faithfully plain with the greatest Prince. It is one that stands so near Eternity, where Lazarus shall wear the Crown, that unfaithful man-pleasing would be to him a double crime: it is one that rejoiceth in the present happiness of England, and earnestly wisheth that it were but as well with the rest of the world; and that honoreth all the providences of God by which we have been brought to what we are; but dare not own all the actions of men that have been the Instruments, as he hath thought meet to manifest in this writing, and leave upon record. And he is one that concurring in the Common Hopes of greater Blessings yet to these Nations under your Government, and observing your Acceptance of the frequent Addresses that from all parts of the Land are made unto you, was

encouraged to do what you daily allow your Preachers to do, and to concur with the rest, in the tenders (and some performance) of his service; and particularly the County of Wilts who have Petitioned you for the Sum of what I have here expressed; and whose Petitions I desire may be written upon your heart. That the Lord will make you a healer and preserver of his Churches here at home, and a successful helper to his Churches abroad, is the earnest prayer of,

Your Highnesses faithful Subject,

Richard Baxter.

PREF. II. To the Reader.

Reader,

If thou come hither with a practical esteem of Truth, desiring to know it that thou mayest obey it, and with an humble mind dost study and pray to the Father of Lights, and art impartially willing to receive the Truth in the Love of it that thou mayest be saved, and with diligence and meekness to read and weigh the Evidences that I bring thee, thou art then the person to whom I recommend these Papers with confident expectation of success. The Controversies here handled are those that have made, and still are making, the greatest combustions in the Christian world. And yet to almost all men of learning on both sides they seem exceeding easy. I seldom meet with a Learned Protestant but taketh Popery for such transparent fallacies, that he is little or no whit troubled with any doubting's in the business: And I seldom meet with a Learned Papist but is as confident on the other side, as if besides them, all the Christian world were blind and mad. Interest and prejudice must needs do much then on one side at least. And which side hath the greatest worldly interest to by as their

understanding, is soon discerned by one that knows the Papal-power, their Cardinals, Prelates, and the Riches, Honors and privileges of their Clergy, and that knows our state. And if thou wilt hear the Reasons of the confidence of both sides, I will tell it thee here as briefly and plainly as I can.

We are confident of our own Religion, because we believe the Gospel: and we have no other Rule and Test of our Religion: And we are confident that Popery is a deceit, because we both believe the Gospel and the judgment of the ancient and present Churches, and because we believe our sense itself: As sure as we know Bread from Flesh, and Wine from Blood, by seeing, tasting, &c. so sure know we that Popery is false. And if a Controversy is not at an End when it is brought to the judgment of all the senses of all the sound men in the world (it being about the object of sense) then we are past hope of ending controversies: And therefore as we will not waste our time with every fellow that will dispute with us that Snow is black, or the Fire cold, no more will we trouble ourselves with these men that tell us that Bread is not bread, and Wine is not wine.

And if you would know the Reasons of the confidence of the Papists, I know no more of them but what their Writings and speeches do express, and those I have hereafter given you. Two things they are still harping on: the first is, that in our way we have no assurance that the Christian Religion is true, or that Scripture is the word of God. Save me the labor of repetitions, and read but what I have witten in the Preface to the second Part of *the Saints Rest* (*Edit. 2*. &c.) where I give you the Resolution of our faith, and in my *Safe Religion, Disp. 3*, and then believe them if thou canst.

Their second is, that thread-bare Question [Where was your Church before Luther? Where hath it been successively in each age?] And here

mere Sophistry carrieth it through the Papal world, to the deluding of the simple that will be catched with chaff, and are not able to see things for Names. I have dealt with some of them that harped on this string, and never met with anything from them that should seem considerable to a discerning man, save only the two unanswerable arguments of Confidence (that I say not Impudence) and Loquacity. Though I have more fully shamed this Question in this Book, I will here also give you at the entrance, a short view of the case.

The men that ask us, where our Church and Religion was, either know not (through ignorance) or will not let others know (through wickedness) what our Church and Religion is. [Shew us (say they) a Church in all ages that held the thirty-nine Articles, or that held all that the Protestants hold, or else they were not Protestants?] Forsooth, we must receive from them a Definition of a Protestant, and then we must prove the succession of such. Know therefore before you dispute about the succession, what is the thing whose succession is questioned. [A Protestant is a Christian that holdeth to the holy Scriptures as the sufficient Rule of faith and holy living, and protesteth against Popery.] The Protestant Churches are Societies professing the Protestants Religion. [The Protestant Religion] is an improper speech, but [the Protestants Religion] is a phrase that we shall own. For [Protestancy] is not our Religion itself, but the Rejection of Popish corruptions of Religions or defiling Additions. If my Rejections of other men's Additions be themselves Additions, then is it in the power of any Heretic in the world to force me to Add to my Religion at his Pleasure. A thousand new Articles and Forms of Worship he may devise, and then must I add to my Religion by rejecting them all: even as I add to my Apple by wiping the dirt of it, or to my Clothes, by brushing them. The Protestants

Religion is only the Christian Religion the naked Christian Religion alone: The Papists the Christian Religion corrupted with abundance of additions. The Protestants ever disavowed any Confessions of men as pretended to be the Rule or Law of their Religion. The Protestants Religion is the Holy Scriptures alone] The Papists Religion is all that is decreed by the Pope and Councils. Our Religion contained in the Scripture hath its Essentials and Integrals. All the Essentials and as much of the Integrals as (in the use of means) we are able to understand, we believe particularly and explicitly: the rest we believe generally and implicitly to be all true. So that as the Papists will not give us leave to take the writings of Gretser, Bellarmine or any of their Doctors, yea the Articles of their Divines at Thoren, Ratisbone, &c. to be therefore Articles of their faith, but only those that are contained in General Councils approved by the Pope; so we require the same justice of them that they call Nothing the Articles of our Faith, but what is contained in the Holy Scripture, which is the only Rule of our Religion. Do they know our Religion better than we do? This is our Religion, and this we stand to.

Well! Consider now whether anything be easier than for a Protestant to show you a visible Church that hath successively been of his Religion.

1. The Christian Religion hath been in all ages since Christ in visible Societies: The Religion of Protestants is the Christian Religion: therefore the Religion of Protestants hath been in all ages since Christ in visible Societies.

2. That Religion which is contained in the Holy Scripture as its Rule or sufficient Revelation, hath been professed in all ages in visible Churches. But the Religion of Protestants is contained in the Holy Scriptures as its Rule or sufficient Revelation: therefore the Religion of Protestants hath been professed in all ages in visible Churches.

We name the Societies from the places of their residence: Our Church (as Augustine tells the Donatists) begun at Jerusalem, and thence was dispersed into Asia, Africa and Europe; it hath continued in Syria, Ethiopia, Egypt, India, Greece, &c. If I could name but one Nation that had been of my Religion, I should suspect it were not the true Religion. It is the Christian world that is instead of a Catalogue to us.

O but, say the Jugglers, This is a General answer, to say you are Christians: there are more sorts of Christians then One. I Reply; It is the General or Catholic that we are speaking of; and therefore if it were not such a General answer, it were not pertinent to the Question: There are no more sorts of Christians but One; that is, there is no Essential difference among them; but there is a gradual, integral and modal difference. But may not Christians of several Degrees of Knowledge be in the same Catholic Church? Our question is not, [Where any Sect, or any particular Church hath had its succession:] but [where that Catholic Church hath been, of which we are members.] And surely Christ hath but One Catholic Church.

O but, say they, would you make men believe that Ethiopians, Armenians, Greeks, &c. are Protestants? You may be ashamed of so gross a fiction.

I answer, Is it the Name of Protestants, or their Religion, that you would have us prove a succession of? These deceivers cheat abundance of poor souls by this one device, even supposing that the word [Protestant] doth denominate our Church from its Essential parts, and so call for a Catalogue of Protestants. But I would ask them, whether we or they do better know our Religion? And consequently what a Protestant is? If they know it at all, it is from our writings or expressions; For sure they will not pretend without signs to know our hearts, and that better then ourselves. You must take it from us, if you will know what our Religion is, as we must take it from you,

if we will know yours. And therefore delude not silly souls by persuading them that you know what our Religion is better then we. If you will believe our Books that tell you, believe our sayings also, and believe me that here tell you my own Religion. [A Protestant is a Christian that protesteth against Popery.] Christianity is our Religion: Protesting against Popery is our Negation or Rejection of your Corruptions of Religion. Men that never heard of the name of Papist or Protestants, may be of the same Religion with us. If many Nations of the world never received Popery, and we reject it; if they never knew it, and we know it and disown it, are we not both of one Religion, even in the Integrals? One man never heard of the Leprosy: another catcheth it and is cured of it; and a third flieth from it and preventeth it; And I think all these are truly men; yea and (in tantum) sound men. When you call to us for a proof of our succession, either you mean it, of the Essentials of our Religion and Church, or of the Negation of your Corruptions: Either you mean it of the points that we are Agreed in, or of those we differ in: Christianity is it that we are Agreed in; and that is our Religion, and nothing but that: Protestancy as such, is but our wiping off the dirt, or curing the scab that you have brought upon our Religion, Is he not a man as well as you that will not tumble with you in the dirt, or come into your Pesthouse? If we know not our own Religion, then we cannot tell it you; and then you cannot know it: And if we do know it, believe us, when we profess our own Belief: We still profess before men and Angels, that we own no Religion but the Christian Religion, nor any Church but the Christian Church, nor dream of any Catholic Church but one, containing all the true Christians in the world, united in Jesus Christ the Head. We protest before men and Angels that it is the Holy Scriptures that are the Law and Rule and Test of our Religion; And why are we not to be Believed in this

our own Profession, as well as you are in yours, when you make the Decrees of Popes and Councils to be your Law and Rule and Tests?

We perform therefore more then you demand. You ask us Where was our Church before Luther? And we answer, Where our Religion was. You ask us, Where was that? And we tell you Where ever the Christian Religion was, and the Holy Scriptures were received. This were enough for us in answer to your Question: But we do more: We tell you not only where our Church and Religion was, but where there were men that owned not your grand Corruptions, no more then we: What can you demand more of us, when you call for a succession of Protestants, then that we tell you of a succession of Christians (which are of our Religion) and which were no Papists, yea against Popery, (which therefore were of our integrity) And who knoweth not that the foresaid Abyssinians, Armenians, Egyptians, Greeks, &c. are against your Papal Sovereignty, Infallibility, and all that is by us renounced as Essential to Popery?

O but, say the Jugglers, these are not Protestants; they differ from you in many particulars.] I answer, Call them by what name you please; they are not only Christians, but also Anti-papists, or free from Popery, and then they are of our Religion and Church. But indeed, must the world be made believe that all that we Believe is essential to our Religion, and that no man that differeth from us can be of our Religion, be the difference never so small?

But say they, tell us of a Church that professes your 39 Articles. Silly deceivers! Do not those very Articles profess that [The Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation, so that whatever 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.] Art. 6. We never took these Articles instead of the Scripture, but the Articles and all Protestants profess the Scripture to be the only Rule and Test of their Faith and Religion. The substance of the 39 Articles may easily be proved to have been successively held by the Church from the beginning; but it is not incumbent on us to prove that every word in the writings of every Divine, or Church, hath been so continued; no more then you will own the writings of any Divines or Provincial Synods of your own, as being the Rule of your Faith. As you profess that the Decrees of Popes and general Councils approved by him, besides the Scriptures, are the Rule and Test of your Religion; so do we profess that the Scriptures alone (with the Law of Nature) is the Rule of ours.

But, what (say they) will you be of the same Church with Nestorians, Eutichians, and other Heretics? I *Answ.* 1. We will not take all for Nestorians, or Eutichians, that a railer can call such, that never knew them, nor can prove it. 2. Heretics indeed that deny any essential part of Christianity, are no Christians, and therefore none of the Church that we are of: but if you will call those Heretics that have all the essentials of Christianity, because they err in lesser points, we know that there are such in the Catholic Church: We will be none of them ourselves, if we can escape it (yet indeed have no hope of escaping all error till we are perfect in knowledge:) But we will not run out of the family of God, because there are children and sick persons in it: Nor will we forsake the Catholic Church because there are erring persons in it.

O but, saith the Papist, We acknowledge not your distinction of points Essential and not Essential; all points of Faith are Essential with us, and of necessity to Salvation.] *Answ.* Reader, thou shalt see here such impudent and faithless juggling, as may make thee blush to think that Christianity

hath such professors. 1. The Outside of their assertion damneth no less than all the world (that live to the use of Reason.) 2. The Inside of their deceitful meaning is almost clean contrary, and leaveth Heathens and Infidels in the Church, or in a state of salvation as well as Christians. 3. It leaveth no one Article of faith essential to a Christian, or to one that shall be saved; and leaveth the Church an Invisible thing, clean contrary to their own assertions of its Visibility. 4. And when they have thus wrangled themselves into a wood of contradictions and Unchristian absurdities, the wisest of them say as we say, in the main point. All this I will now manifest to thee.

1. The Out-side of their assertion is that Every point that we are bound to believe by a Divine faith, is fundamental, or essential to Christian faith, or of necessity to salvation. And if so, then no man breathing can be saved: For no man knoweth all that he is bound to know. And no man believeth that which he understandeth not: It is impossible to believe that such a Proposition is a truth distinctly and actually, when I understand not what the Proposition is. And that we all know but in part, even what we are obliged to know, no man will deny, but he that is mad by pride or faction: All that God hath revealed in his word, is the matter of our faith: There is to man can say, I have no culpable ignorance of any one Truth of God that I should believe. Had we been more perfect in our diligent studies, and prayers, and use of all means; and had we never sinfully grieved the spirit that should illuminate us, (to say nothing of our Original sinful darkness) there is not one of us but might have known more than we do. If sin of the will and life be consistent with true faith, then some sin in the understanding is consistent with faith. But the former is true: therefore, &c. But according to the outside of their doctrine, no man that hath any sinful ignorance (and consequently unbelief) in his understanding can be saved; that is, no man in

the world. If he that thinks he knowth anything, knoweth nothing as he ought to know, 1 Cor. 8:2, what shall be said of these men, that think they and all the Church do know all things that they ought to know, and that their understandings have no sin? And must we needs be of that faith that damneth all men, and of that Church where none are saved?

2. As the Out-side of their Assertions is made for a bug-bear to frighten fools, so that the In-side (as expounded by many of them) is that Heathens and Infidels may be of their Church or saved, and that nothing of the Christan faith at all is necessary to salvation, is plain: For they 'tell us that they mean, that all points are of necessity, where they are sufficiently proposed, and men's ignorance is not invincible; but where there is no sufficient proposal, but men's ignorance is invincible, or such as comes not from a willful neglect of means, there no ignorance of the articles of faith is damnable, and so no article absolutely necessary: so that the question indeed is not Whether men believe or not? But Whether they are Unbelievers or Heathens or ignorant persons, by a willful neglect of sufficiently proposed Truth, or not? So that all that part of the Heathen or Infidel world (O how great) that have no such proposals of the Gospel, may not only be saved, but be better and safer than most Christians (if not all) who certainly are sinfully ignorant of some truth which they ought to know.

*Obj. But (*say they) it will not stand with faith to deny belief to God in anything, sufficiently revealed: for he that believeth him in one thing, believeth him in all.]

Answ. Very true, if they know it to be the Word of God. And if this be all, the Protestants are ready to aver upon their most solemn Oaths, that they believe everything without exception which they know to be a Divine Revelation: and no wonder; for so doth every man that believes that there is

a God and that he is no liar. If this will serve your turn, you have no more to say against us; your mouths are stopped. But may it not stand with faith to be ignorant, and that through sinful neglect, of some revealed truth of God, or of the meaning of his word? If you are so proud as to think that all the justified are perfect and have no sin, yet at last consider whether a man that liveth in Heathenism till fourscore years of age, and then turns Christian, is not afterward ignorant through his former sinful negligence? But dare you say that you have no sinful ignorance to bewail? Will you confess none, nor beg pardon, or be beholden to Christ to pardon it?

That they make no point of faith necessary, while they seem to make all necessary, see but what I have after cited from *Frans. à S. Clara probl. 15,16,17*, and abundance more that are mentioned there by him.

3. And that by this Protean juggling, they make the Church invisible, is apparent. For what man breathing knoweth the secrets of the souls of others, whether they have resisted or not resisted the light? And whether they are ignorant of the articles of faith upon sinful contempt, or for want of some due means of faith, or internal capacity, or opportunity? We are as sure that all men are ignorant of something that God hath revealed to be known (in nature and Scripture) as that they are men: But now whether any one of these men be free from those aggravations of his ignorance (and that in every point) upon which the Papists make him an unbeliever, is unknown to others: When the Faith or Infidelity of men, and so their being in the Church or out of it, must not be known by the Matter of Faith which they profess, but by the secret passages of their hearts, their willingness or unwillingness, resistance or not resistance, and such like, the Church then is invisible; no man can say which is it, nor who is of it: He that professeth not the Faith, may be a Catholic; and he that professeth it, for ought they know,

may be an Infidel, as being sinfully yet ignorant of someone truth that is not in his express confession: thus by confusion the builders of Babel mar their work.

4. And that the wisest of them, say in the main as we say, see here in some proofs. *Bellarm. de Verbo Dei, lib. 4, c. 11*. [In the Christian Doctrine both of Faith and Manners, some things are simply necessary to salvation to all; as the Knowledge of the Articles of the Apostles Creed, of the ten Commandments, and of some Sacraments. The restore not so necessary, that a man cannot be saved without the explicit Knowledge, belief and profession of them—These things that are simply necessary and are profitable to all, the Apostles preached to all—All things are Written by the Apostles which are Necessary to all, and which they openly preached to all] see the place.

Costerus Echirid. c. 1, p. 49. Non inficiamur praecipua illa fidei capita quae omnibus Christianis cognitu sunt ad salutem Necessaria, perspicue satis esse Apostolicis scriptis comprehensa] That is; We deny not that those Chief Heads of the Faith which are to all Christians necessary to be known to salvation, are perspicuously enough comprehended in the Writings of the Apostles.] Judge by these two (to spare the trouble of citing more) whether they be not forced after all their Cavils, to say as we, in distinguishing of Articles of Faith. And they cannot be ignorant, that the Church hath still had Forms of Profession, which were called her Symbols, as being the Badge of her Members; and did not suspend all upon uncertain conjectures about the frame and temper of the Professors minds.

But if indeed it be not the want of Necessary Articles of Faith that they accuse us of, but the want of willingness or diligence to know the truth, let them prove their accusations, and let those persons that they prove guilty

bear the blame. Do they think we would not as willingly know the truth as they? And that we do not pray as earnestly for Divine illumination? Do we not read their Books? (I verily think incomparably more than they do ours,) and are we not willing to confer with the wisest of them that can inform us? I have often privately and publicly desired you that if any of them can say more then all these Schoolmen, Friars and Jesuits say, which I have read, they would let me hear it, that I may want no means they can afford me for my fuller information.

But yet they have not done with us. When we prove a succession of our Religion, by proving a succession of such as adhered to the Scriptures, which are the Doctrine of our Religion (an Argument that no Papist under heaven can confute,) they vainly tell us, that All Heretics pretend to Scripture, and therefore that will not prove the point.

But 1. Doth it follow that Scripture is not a sufficient Rule of our Religion, because Heretics may pretend to it? You take the 39 Articles for our Religion, and yet may Heretics that are far from our minds, pretend to them. It's the liker to be the Rule because all Heretics pretend it, and would borrow credit from it to their Heresies. The Law of the Land is the Rule of our Justice; and yet Lawyers and their Clients that are contrary to each other, do plead it for their contrary Causes. The Creed itself is pretended by Arians for their Heresy. What must we have no Rule or Test or discovery of our Religion which a Heretic can pretend for his impiety. What words of God or man are not capable of being misinterpreted? If we should give you every day a confession of Faith, some Heretics might pretend to hold the same: No wonder then if they do so by the Scriptures.

2. And can any Learned Papists be so ignorant, as not to know that the Arians pretended the Authority of General Councils? And so do many other

Heretics; and that the Authority of Pope and Councils are frequently pretended for contrary opinions among them, and may be pretended by many a Heretic? And will they therefore grant that the Decrees of Popes and Councils are no sufficient discovery of their Faith? If Heretics pretending to your Test of Faith, disprove not that to be your Faith, then Heretics pretending to our Rule and Test of Faith (which is the Holy Scripture) is no proof that it is not our Rule of Faith.

I do therefore conclude, that the Proof of a Succession of such Churches as have received the Holy Scriptures, is a valid proof of a succession of Churches of our Religion, seeing we have no Religion (doctrinally) but the Holy Scriptures. And this as far as modesty will permit, I challenge all the Jesuits on Earth to confute with any solid Reasons: yet adding that we do *ex superabundanti* prove a succession also of Churches that never owned Popery, even the greatest part of the Christian world. But let these men themselves but prove to us a succession of their Church, even such as they require of us; Let them prove that from the Apostles days the Catholic Church (or any one Congregation of twenty men) did hold all that now their Councils and Popes have Decreed, and are esteemed Articles of their Faith, and I am contented to be their bondslave forever, or to bear a fagot, or be used by them as cruelly as their malice can invent, or flames or their strappado's execute. Let my Head be at their Mercy if they can but prove that Succession of Popery, as they require us to do of Protestancy, or as I have produced of our Churches and Religion. In the 15th and 16th Detection I have more largely spoken to them of this point, to which I refer the Reader.

In the very principal point of their Papal Sovereignty, they have nothing but this gross deceit to cheat the world with: The Roman Emperors diverse

ages after Christ, did give the Bishop of Rome a Primacy in their Empire, and hence these men would persuade us, that even from Christ they have had a Sovereignty over all the Christian world. Wink but at these small mistakes, and they have won the Cause: 1. Suppose but Christ's Institution to stand instead of the Emperors. 2. Suppose diverse hundred years after Christ, to have been in the Apostles days. 3. Suppose Primacy to be Sovereignty or Universal Government. 4. But especially grant them, that the Roman Empire was all the Christian world; and then they have made good that part of their Cause.

That there were many Nations without the reach of the Roman Empire, that had received the Christian Faith, is past doubt. *Socrates lib. 1, c. 15*, saith that Thomas chose Parthia, Bartholomew chose India, Matthew Ethiopia, to plant the Gospel in; but the middle India was not converted till Constantine's days, by Frumentius and Edesius; and Iberia by a Maid.] So *Euseb. l. 3, c. 3*, tells us of Thomas his Preaching to the Parthians, and Andrew to the Scythians.] *Et in vit. Const. l. 4, c. 8*, that there were many Churches in Persia, and c. 91, how Constantine wrote for them to the King.] Godignus and others of them maintain that the Abyssinians did receive the Gospel from the beginning. Besides Scotland and many other Countries that were not under the Roman Power. And none of these were Governed by the Pope.

These three Arguments against the Papal Cause, I shall here premise to more that follow.

1. If all that part of the Christian world that was out of the reach of the Roman Empire, did never submit to the Sovereignty of the Pope, then hath he not been successively (or at any time) the actual Head of the Universal Church: But the Antecedent is most certain: therefore so is the Consequent.

How an old woman, the Emperors Mother of Habassia, did baffle their Jesuits, by asking them [How it came to pass, if obedience to the Pope be necessary to salvation, that they never had heard from him till now?] I have told you after from themselves.

If Primacy were Sovereignty, and Emperors and Councils were God's, yet the Indians, Abyssinians, Persians, and many more in the East, and the Scots, and Irish, and Danes, and Swedes, and Poles, and Muscovites, and most of Germany in the West and North, should be no subjects of the Pope.

2. If the Rule and Test of the Faith of Papists never had a Real Being, or no succession from the Apostles, then their Faith and Church hath either no Real Being, or no such Succession: But the Antecedent is true: as I prove.

It is either General Councils, or Popes, or the Church Essential (as they use to call it, that is, the Whole Body) that is the Rule of their Faith. If it be General Councils, 1. They had no being from the Apostles till the Council of Nice; therefore the Rule of the Papists Faith was then unborn. 2. Yea they never had a being in the world: There was never anything like a General Council since the days of the Apostles to this day. The first at Nice had none, (save one John of Persia, who its like was some persecuted Bishop that was fled, or if one or two more its not material), but the Bishops of the Empire, and out of the Western parts so few as was next to none: The following Councils, as Constantinople. 1. &c. were only out of one piece of the Empire: The Council of Trent I disdain to reckon among the modester pretenders to a Universality.

2. And if it be not General Councils, but the Pope that is the Rule of their Faith; then, 1. Their Faith hath been interrupted, yea and turned to Heresy and to Infidelity when the Pope hath so turned. 2. And why then do they tell our people, that they take not the Pope for the Rule of their Faith?

3. If it be the Major part of the Universal Church, 1. It's known that two to one are against them, or at least the Greater part: therefore by that Rule their Faith in the Papal Sovereignty is false. 2. And yet it would be hard, if a man must be of no Belief, till he have brought the world to the pole for it.

Argum. 3. If all the stir that the Papists make in the world for the Papal Government be but to rob Christian Princes and Magistrates of their Power, then are they but a seditious Sect: But the Antecedent is apparent: For there are but two sorts of Government in the Church: The one is by the Word applied unto the Conscience, which worketh only on the willing; either by General exhortations as in Preaching; or by personal application, as in Sacraments, Excommunication and Absolution: And this is the work of the present Pastors, and cannot be performed by the Pope: Nor would he be content with this, to govern Volunteers. The other is by Commands, that shall be seconded with force: And this is proper to the Magistrate. But if they will be deluded to give up their Crowns and Scepters to the Pope, let them stand as the objects of the compassion of Spectators.

Much more then I have here given you, I had prepared of the Testimony of Antiquity against them. But here is more than they are able solidly to answer, and I was afraid of over-whelming the capacity of ordinary Readers. I understand not the French Tongue; but by the Testimony of Learned men that understand them, and especially by the help of a Noble friend that hath vouchsafed to translate some part of them for my use, I am emboldened to a confidence, that the two famous Confutations of the great Perron, will stand to the perpetual shame of Popery, which none of them will be ever able to Reply to, without as great a dishonor to their Cause as will follow their not daring to Reply: I mean, Blondell's Book *De Primatu in Ecclesia* (which overwhelms them utterly with the witness of Antiquity)

and *Pet. Molinaeus de Novitate Papismi* (which I hope his Reverend Son of his name may live to help us to in English.) But if any of the Romanists that dare not meddle with those Champions, nor dash themselves upon those Pillars, shall yet vouchsafe an Answer to this smaller work, I do hereby assure him, that if he will do it soberly, in the fear of God, in a way of close and solid Arguing, he will perform a task that will be very acceptable to me. But nibblers, snarlers, cavilers, and senseless praters I shall contemn.

Richard Baxter.

PART I.

Monergism Books

CHAP. I. Popery no way to Unity.

The thoughts of the divided state of Christians have brought one of the greatest and constantest sadness to my Soul, that ever it was acquainted with; especially to remember, that while we are quarrelling, and plotting, and writing, and fighting against each other, so many parts of the world (about five of six) remain in the Infidelity of Heathenism, Judaism or Mohammedanism, where millions of poor souls do need our help; and if all our strength were joined together for their Illumination and Salvation, it would be too little. Oh horrible shame to the face of Christendom, that the Nations are quietly serving the Devil, and the Turk is in possession of so many Countries, that once were the Inheritance of Christ, and that his Iron yoke is still upon the necks of the persecuted Greeks, and that he stands up at our doors in so formidable a posture, still ready to devour the rest of the Christian world; and yet that instead of combining to resist him, and vindicate the cause and people of the Lord, we are greedily sucking the blood of one another, and tearing in pieces the body of Christ with furious hands, and destroying ourselves to save the enemy a labor, and spending

that wit, that treasure, that labor and that blood, to dash ourselves in pieces on one another, which might be nobly, and honestly, and happily spent in the cause of God.

These thoughts provoked me to many an hours consideration, How the wounds of the Church might be yet healed; And have made it long a principal part of my daily Prayers, that the Reconciling Light might shine from Heaven, that might in some good measure take up our differences; and that God would at last give healing Principles and dispositions unto men, especially to Princes and the Pastors of the Church. But the more I studied how it might be done, the more difficult, if not impossible it appeared, and all because of the Roman Tyranny, the Vice-Christ or pretended Head of the Church, being with them become an essential part of it, and the Subjection to him essential to our Christianity itself. So that (saith *Bellarmine de Eccles. l. 3, c. 5.*) No man, though he would, can be a Subject of Christ, that is not subject to the Pope; and this with abundance of intolerable corruptions they have fixed by the fancy of their own Infallibility, and built upon this foundation a worldly Kingdom, and the temporal Riches and Dignity of a numerous Clergy, twisting some Princes also into the Interest; so that they cannot possibly yield to us in the very principal points of difference, unless they will deny the very Essence of their New Christianity and Church, and pluck up the foundations which they have so industriously laid, and leave men to a suspicion that they are fallible hereafter, if they shall confess themselves mistaken in anything now; and unless they will be so admirably self-denying, as to let go the temporal advantages which so many thousands of them are interested in: And whether so much light may be hoped for in so dark a generation, or so much love to God, and self-denial in millions of men so void of self-denial, is easy to conjecture: And

we cannot in these greatest matters come over to them, unless we will flatly betray our Souls, and depart from the Unity of the Catholic Church, and from the Center of that Unity, to unite with another called the Roman Catholic Church, in another Center. And if we should thus cast away the Truth and Favor of God, and sin against our Knowledge and Conscience, and so prove men of no Faith or Religion, under pretense of desiring a Unity in Faith and Religion, yet all would not do the thing intended, but we should certainly miss of these very ends which we seek, when we had sold the Truth and our Souls to obtain them. For there is nothing more certain, then that the Christian World will never unite in the Roman Vice-Christ, nor agree with them in their Corruptions, against plain Scripture, Tradition, Consent of the ancient Church, against the Reason and common sense of Mankind, This is not by any wise man to be expected. Never did the universal Church, or one half of it center to this day in the Roman Sovereignty: And why should they hope for that which never yet was done? When they had their Primacy of Place (to be the Bishop of the first Seat, and first of the Patriarchs) it made the Pope no more a Sovereign and a Vice-Christ, then the King of France is Sovereign to the Duke of Saxony or Bavaria; or then the Senior Justice on the Bench is the Sovereign of the rest: and yet even this much he never had but from the Roman Empire: What claim did he ever lay in his first Usurpations, to any Church without those bounds? It was the Empire that raised him, and the Empire limited his own Usurpations. Saith their own Reinerius, (or whoever else) *Cont. Waldens. Catal. in Biblioth. Patr. To. 4, pag 773*. [The Churches of the Armenians, and Ethiopians, and Indians, and the rest which the Apostles converted, are not under the Church of Rome.] Yea in Gregory's days, they found the Churches of Britain and Ireland both strangers and adversaries to their

Sovereignty; insomuch as they could not procure them to receive their Government, nor change so much as the time of Easter for them, no nor to have Communion with them at last: Anno 614. Laurentius their Arch-Bishop here wrote this Letter (with Mellitus and Justus) to the Bishops and Abbots in all Scotland (that is, Ireland) [While the Sea Apostolic after its manner directed us to preach to the Pagan Nations in these Western parts, as in the whole world; and we happened to enter this Island, called Britain, before we knew them, believing that they walked after the manner of the universal Church, we reverenced both the Britons and the Scots in great Reverence of their Sanctity. But when we knew the Britons, we thought the Scots were better. But we have learnt by Daganus the Bishop in this forementioned Island, and by Columbanus the Abbot coming into France, that the Scots do nothing differ from the Britons in their Conversation. For Bishop Daganus coming to us, refused not only to eat with us, but even to eat in the same House where we did eat.] *Usher Epist. Hibern. 7, p. 18*.

Our most peaceable Bishop Hall was forced to write a [*Roma irreconciliabilis*.] While we are thinking of Reconciliation, they are about our ears with Plots and violence, and with swarms of Rome-bred Sects, and are day and night industriously undermining us; so that by their continual Alarms, I am called off to these defensive wars which here I have undertaken; yet still resolving that the Desperateness of the Cure shall not make me run from them into a contrary extreme, nor be out of the way of Peace, nor neglect any necessary means, how hopeless soever of success.

The Work that here I have undertaken, is, 1. To give you briefly those Grounds on which you must go, if you will keep your ground against a Papist. 2. To give a few invincible Arguments, which the weakest may be able to use, to overthrow the principal grounds of the Papists. 3. To detect

their Frauds, and give to the younger sort of Ministers, sufficient Directions for the Confutation of all the Papists in the world. 4. To propound (though in vain) such terms of Peace as we can yield to.

CHAP. II. Directions for them that will deal with a Papist.

Before I mention the Grounds or Cause that you must maintain, I must premise this Advice to the Common People.

1. Wrong not the Truth and yourselves by an unequal conflict. Enter not rashly upon Disputes with those that are Learned and of nimble tongues, if you be ignorant, or of weak capacities yourselves. Though I shall here show you that Scripture, Church, Tradition, Reason and Sense are on your side, yet experience tells us how the words of Jugglers have made millions of men deny belief to their eyes, their taste and other senses. An ignorant man is soon silenced by a subtle wit; and many think that when they cannot answer, they must yield, though they deny both Sense and Reason by it. If any of them secretly entice you, desire them to debate the case with some able, learned, experienced Minister in your hearing. It is the office of your Pastors to defend you from the wolves: If you once despise them or straggle from them and the Flocks, and trust to your own Reason that is unfurnished and unprepared for such work, you may take that you get by it, if you be undone. You need the help of Pastors for your souls, as well as of

Physicians for your Bodies, and Lawyers for your Estates: or else God would never have set them over you in his Church. Let them but come on equal terms, and you shall see what Truth can do. In this way we will not avoid a Conference with any of them. But alas! With ignorant unlearned people, what may not such Deceivers do? That can persuade so many thousand souls to give no Credit to their own eyes, or taste, or feeling, but to believe a Priest, that Bread is not Bread, and Wine is not Wine.

2. Yet I would have the weakest to endeavor to understand the reasons of their Profession, and to be able to repel Deceivers: And to that end, I shall here give you first some Directions concerning the cause which you must defend.

And concerning this, Observe these things following 1. Understand what the Religion is that you must hold and maintain: It is the ancient Christian Religion. Do not put every Truth among the Essentials of your Religion: Our Religion doth not stand or fall with every Controversy that is raised about it. That which was the true Religion in the Apostles days is ours now: that which all were baptized into the Profession of, and the Churches openly held forth as their Belief. Reformation brings us not a new Religion: but cleanseth the old from the dross of Popery, which by innovation they had brought in. A man that cannot confute a Papist, may yet be a Christian, and so hold fast the true Religion. It followeth not that our Religion is questionable or unsafe, if some point in Controversy between them and us be questionable or hard. The Papists would fain bring you to believe that our Religion must lie upon some of these Controversies: but its no such matter Perhaps you will say, That then it is not about Religion that we differ from them. I answer; yes: it is about the Essentials of their Religion, but it is but for the preserving the Integrity of ours against the Consequences and

additions of theirs. They have made them a New Religion (which we call Popery) and joined this to the Old Religion (which we call Christianity.) Now we stick to the old Religion alone; and therefore there is more essential to their Religion, then is to ours; so that our own Religion, even the ancient Christianity, is out of Controversy between us. The Papists do confess that the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, the ten Commandments are true, yea that all the Scripture is the word of God, and certainly true: so that our Religion is granted us as past dispute: And therefore it is only the Papists Religion that is in question between us, and not ours. If you will make those lower Truths to be of the Essence of your Religion which are not, you will give the Papists the advantage which they desire.

2. If the Papists call for a Rule, or Test of your Religion, and ask you where they may find it, assign them to the Holy Scriptures, and not to any Confessions of Churches, further then as they agree with that. We know of no Divine Rules and Laws of Faith and Life, but the holy Scripture (and the hearts of Believers have an imperfect Transcript of them.) The Confessions of Churches are but part of the Holy Scripture, or Collections out of them, containing the points of greatest weight: And if in phrase or order (much more in matter) there be anything human, we make it not our Rule, nor are we bound to make it good, no more than the Writings of godly men. A point is not therefore with us an Article of Faith, because our Churches or a Synod put it into a Confession, but because it is in the Word of God. For a Councils determinations do with us differ but gradually from the Judgment of a single man, in this respect. And therefore we give them the Scripture only as the full Doctrine of our Faith, and the perfect Law of God; And those points in it, which Life or Death is laid upon, and God hath told us,

we cannot be saved without, we take as the Essentials of our Religion, and the rest as the Integrals only.

If they ask, Why then we do draw up Confessions of Faith? I answer, 1. To teach and help the people by gathering to their hands the most necessary points, and giving them sometimes an explication of them. 2. To let our Accusers see that we misunderstand not the Scriptures. 3. To let Pastors and other Subjects know what sense of Scripture the Magistrate will own within his Dominions. 4. And to let the Pastors and the world know what sense in the principal Points we are agreed in. But still we take not our Confessions for our Divine Rule; and therefore if there be any error in a Confession, there is none in the Rule of our Religion, and consequently none in the Religion which we all agree in; but only in such a persons or Churches exposition of the Rule, which yet among Christians is not in any essential Point.

3. Understand well what is the Catholic Church, that when the Papists ask you what Church you are of, or call to you to prove its antiquity or truth, you may give them a sound and Catholic answer. The Catholic Church is the whole number of true Christians upon earth (for we meddle not now with that part which is in Heaven.) It is not tied to Protestants only, nor to the Greeks only, much less to the Romanists only, or to any other party whatsoever; but it comprehendeth all the members of Christ; and as visible, it containeth all that profess the Christian Religion by a credible profession. If the Christian Religion may be known, then a man may know that he is a Christian, and consequently a member of the Catholic Church. But if the Christian Religion cannot be known, then no man can know which is the Church, or which is a Christian. All Christians united to Christ the Head, are this Catholic Church. If you tie the Church to your own party, and make

a wrong description of it, you will ensnare yourselves, and spoil your belief, and your defense of it.

4. Run not into extremes: mix not any unsound principles with your Religion. For if you do, the Papists will cull out those, and by disgracing them, will seem to disgrace your Religion.

5. Use not any unsound Arguments to defend the Truth. For if you do, the truth will suffer, and seem to be overthrown by the weakness of your Arguments.

6. Join not with those men that cast out any Ordinance of God, because the Papists have abused it. Reformation of corrupted Institutions is not by the Abolition of them, but by the Restauration of them. There are few things in use among the Papists themselves as parts of worship, but may lead us up to a good original, or tell us of some other real Duty which did degenerate into these.

7. Join not with those ignorant, unpeaceable, self-conceited, womanish, rabious Divines, or private men, that pour out unworthy reproaches at godly men among ourselves, as if they were Heretics, or such as the Churches should dis-own. For these are they that please the Papists, and harden them in their Error, and offend the weak. They think they may call us Heretics or Blasphemers by authority, when we call one another so. Such Railers teach them what to say, and play their game more effectually than they could do their own. When they are alluring the simple people, how soon will they prevail, if they can but prove their charge against us from the pens of Protestants themselves?

Having told you on what grounds you must make good your cause against them, I shall next give you three or four easy Arguments (some of them

formerly given you) by which even the weakest may prove that Popery is but deceit.

CHAP. III. Against Popery, by which every honest godly man is secured from them.

A*rgum.* 1. If there be any godly honest men on earth besides Papists, then Popery is false and not of God. But there be godly honest men on earth besides Papists: therefore Popery is false, and not of God.

The Major is proved thus. It is an Article of the Popish faith, that there are no godly honest men on earth, besides Papists: therefore if there be any such, Popery is false, (By godly honest men, I mean such as have true love to God, and so are in a state of salvation.) The Antecedent I prove thus. 1. Their very definition of the Church doth make the Pope the Head, and confine the membership only to his subjects, making the Roman Catholic Church (as they call it) the whole. 2. But yet lest any ignorant Papists say, I may be a Roman Catholic without believing that all others are ungodly, and shall be damned, I will give it you in the Determination of a Pope and general Council. Leo the tenth, *Abrog. Pragm. sanct. Bull*. in the 17th General Council at the Lateran, saith [And seeing it is of necessity to salvation, that all the faithful of Christ be subject to the Pope of Rome, as we are taught by the testimony of divine Scripture, and of the holy Fathers,

and it is declared in the Constitution of Pope Boniface 7. &c.] And Pope Pius the second was converted from being Aenaeas Sylvius by this Doctrine of a Cardinal, approved by him at large, Bull. *Retract. in the Vol. 4, of Binius, p. 514*. [I came to the Fountain of Truth, which the holy Doctors, both Greek and Latin show; who with one voice say, that he cannot be saved that holdeth not the unity of the holy Church of Rome; and that all those virtues are maimed to him that refuseth to obey the Pope of Rome; though he lie in sack cloth and ashes, and fast and pray both day and night, and seem in the other things to fulfill the Law of God.] So that if a Pope and General Council be false, then Popery is false. For their infallibility is the ground of their faith, and they take it on their unerring authority. But if the Pope and a General Council be to be believed, then no man but a subject of the Pope can be saved: no, though he fast and pray in sack-cloth and ashes day and night, and seem to fulfill the rest of the Law of God. Its certain therefore that if any one of you that call yourselves Roman Catholics do not believe that all the world shall be damned save yourselves, you are indeed no Romance Catholics, but are Heretics yourselves in their account; for you deny a principal Article of their faith; and deny the Infallibility of the Pope with a General Council, which is your very Foundation.

And therefore we find that even in the great charitable work of reducing the Abyssinians, the Jesuit Gonzalus Rodericus in his speech to the Emperors mother laid so great a stress on this point, that when she professed her subjection to Christ, he told her, that [None are subject to Christ that are not subject to his Vicar,] [*Negavi Christo subjici qui ejus vicario non subjicitur*.] *Godignus de reb. Abassin. Lib. 2, c. 18, in Roderic. liter. p. 323*.

And Bellarmine saith (*de Eccl. l. 3, c. 5*.) that [no man though he would can be subject to Christ that is not subject to the Pope] that is, he cannot be a Christian. And therefore Card. Richlieu (then Bishop of Lusson.) tells the Protestants that they were not to be called Christians. And Knot against Chillingworth, with abundance more of them, asserting that Protestants cannot be saved, do easily learn to practice this Lesson of the Pope and Council. I come now to prove that your Pope, and Council, and Faith are false, and that others besides you may be in a state of Charity and Salvation. (For you confess yourselves, that he that is in a state of Charity, is in a state of Salvation.)

1. If a man may know his own heart, then there are others besides Papists that are in Charity, and are godly men: (and so in a state of Salvation) But a man may know his own heart: therefore, &c.

The Consequence of the Major is plain by inward experience to every godly, honest man that knoweth himself. If I can know my own heart, I must needs say I love God, and am not void of sincere Godliness and Honesty. And that I may know my own heart I can tell also by experience: For to know my own Knowledge and Will is an ordinary certain thing, if not by intuition itself. And if a man cannot know whether he believe and love God or not, then no man can give thanks for it, nor make Profession of it: nay men cannot converse together, if they cannot know their own minds. And Bellarmine confesseth that we may have a moral Conjectural certainty that we have true Love, and are justified. And then I have a moral conjectural certainty at least, that Popery is false; because I have at least such a certainty that I am not ungodly or unjustified. So that look what measure of knowledge or persuasion any Protestant hath that he is truly

honest and justified, that measure of knowledge must he needs have (if he understand himself) that Popery is a deceit.

So that from hence you may gather these four conclusions; 1. That all that have any knowledge or persuasion that they are not ungodly unjustified persons themselves, and void of the true Love of God, are quite out of danger from turning Papists, if they understand but what Popery is; and if they do not, they cannot turn to it, but in part.

2. That never any honest godly man did turn Papist in the world; and this the Papists themselves will justify: For they say (by a Pope and general Council) that no man can be saved but a Papist: and they generally hold, that all that have Charity and are justified, shall be saved if they so die. So that if Popery be true, then no man had Charity or true Godliness before he was a Papist: and therefore never did one godly man or woman turn Papist. And therefore let them take the honor of their wicked seduced Ones. What glory is it to them that none ever turned to them but ungodly people?

3. And it followeth that the Papists do not so much as desire or invite any godly man to turn to them. If you understand their meaning, they call you not to turn to them, if you are not ungodly persons.

4. And hence it follows that everyone that turneth Papist, doth thereby confess that he was a wicked man before, and that he had not the least true love to God; that he was not justified, but a graceless wretch.

In a word, all you that do but know or hope that you have any saving Grace, have an Argument here against Popery, which all the Jesuits in the world cannot confute. For you know your own hearts better then they: And they have no way to turn you to them, but by persuading you that you are not what you are, and that you know not what you know. So that plainly this is your Argument, [I know, or I have good persuasions that I am not utterly

void of Charity or saving Grace; therefore I know, or have the same persuasions that Popery is false, which determineth that none have Charity or saving Grace but Papists.]

2. But I proceed to a further proof of the Minor; A man may have a very strong Conjecture that many others that are no Papists have saving Grace; though he had no persuasion that he hath such Grace himself. And consequently he must have as strong a conjecture that Popery is false. What abundance of holy heavenly persons have we known of all ranks among us! Such as have lived in daily breathings after God, spending no small part of their lives upon their knees; and in the serious and reverent attendance upon God in holy worship, meditating day and night upon his Law; hating all known sin, and delighting in holiness, and longing for perfection; and living in constant Temperance and Chastity, abhorring the very appearance of evil, and making conscience of an idle word or thought, devoting their lives and labors, and all they have to God, giving all their Estates (some of them) to pious and charitable uses, except what is necessary for their daily bread, even mean clothing and food; taming their bodies, and bringing them into subjection, and denying themselves, and mortifying the flesh, and contemning all the Honors or Riches of the world, resolving to suffer death itself, (as many of their Brethren have done from the Papists) rather than sin willfully against God and their consciences: in a word, living to God, and longing to be with him, and manifesting these longings to the very death; grieving more at any time, if they have but lost the sense and persuasions of the love of God, then if they had lost all the world; and would give a thousand worlds, if they had them, for more of the Love of God in their souls, and fuller assurance of his Love and Communion with him. As far as words, and groans, and tears, and the very drift of a man's life, and the

expending of all that he hath, can help us to know another man's heart, so far do we know all this by others, that have lived among us. And may we not conjecture, and be strongly persuaded that these, or some of these, or someone of these, was a holy justified person?

And now Reader, if ever thou be tempted to be a Papist, I will tell thee what a task thou hast: Look on one side on the Lives of holy men among us, such as was Mr. Dodd, Mr. Paul Bayn, Mr. William Fenner, Mr. Arthur Hildersham, Mr. Robert Bolton, Mr. Greenham, Mr. Hooker, Dr. Sibbs, Dr. Preston, Dr. Stoughton, Mr. Perkins, with many hundreds more; Besides blessed Bradford, Glover, Sanders, Hooper, and the rest that laid down their lives in the flames in testimony against Popery; besides all the thousands that in other Nations have died by the Papists hands, because they durst not sin against God; and besides all the Learned holy Divines of other Nations, and the millions of Godly Protestants there; as also look upon all the godly that are now living, men or women, that live in most earnest seeking after God and serving him; look on those about you, inquire of others; read the writings of holy Divines: and then remember, you cannot turn Papist till you have concluded that all these are damned, and are utterly void of saving Grace and the Love of God; If there be but one Protestant that you know, or any one of all that have been, that you take to be in a saving state, you cannot possibly turn Papist, if you know what you do. For it is essential to Popery to contradict all this.

Nay, this is not all: but think of all the Greek Church that lieth under the tyranny of the Turk, and of all the Armenians, and Abasines, and other Christians in the world, that are more in number far then the Papists; and you must conclude, that not one of all these are saved before you can be a Papist. And is this an easy task to one that hath the heart of a man in his

breast? If you are no true Christians yourselves, dare you conclude that not one of these are true Christians? If you confess that you love not God yourselves, dare you say that among the far greater part of the Christians of the world, there is not one man or woman that loves God? This you must say if you will be a Papist.

And then on the other hand, Look on the words of Jesus Christ, and see what thanks he will give you for such a censure, Matth. 7:1-5. Judge not, that ye be not judged: for with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged: and with what measure you meet, it shall be measured to you again. And why beholdest thou the mote in thy brothers eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye?—Thou hypocrite! First cast out the beam out of thine own eye, and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye.] Jam. 4:12. There is one Law-giver that is able to save and to destroy: who art thou that Judgest another?] Rom. 14:1-4,10. [Him that is weak in the faith receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations. For one believeth that he may eat all things, another who is weak eateth herbs: Let not him that eateth despise him that eateth not; and let not him that eateth not judge him that eateth; for God hath received him. Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? To his own master he standeth or falleth; yea he shall be holden up, for God is able to make him stand. One man esteemeth one day above another, another esteemeth every day alike: Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind—But why dost thou judge thy brother, or why dost thou set at naught thy brother? We shall all stand before the Judgment seat of Christ. For it is written, as I live saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God; so then everyone of us shall give account of himself to God. Let us not therefore judge one another anymore.] Matth. 18:6. [But whosoever shall offend one

of these little ones which believe in me, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the Sea.] Matth. 25:34,40,45,41. [Come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the Kingdom—For I was hungry and ye gave me meat—Verily I say unto you, in as much at you have done it unto one of the least of these my Brethren, ye have done it unto me.] And ver. 41. [Depart from me ye cursed into everlasting fire—Verily I say unto you, in as much as you did it not to one of the least of these, you did it not to me.]

I will recite no more: Judge now by such passage as these, how Christ sets by one of the least of his servants: and consequently, how he will take it of you, to judge the far greatest part of his Church to be graceless and none of his Church, but such as shall be damned. And if you dare not venture on so unreasonable and inhumane a censure, against the experience of so much holiness as appeareth in them before your eyes, then you cannot be Papists: And if you dare venture on it, I leave you to consider, whether under pretense of being the only Christians, you have not done violence to the common reason and nature of man. So much for the second proof of the Minor.

3. But I have yet another proof, that many that are no Papists are good Christians, and consequently, that Popery is a deceit, and that is the Testimony of many of their own Writers. I will not call for their testimony concerning ourselves (for we know ourselves better than they do) but concerning other Churches whom they condemn as Heretics, or that are no subjects of the Pope of Rome. And I will at this time content myself with one of many that might be cited; and that is a Monk, Burchardus that lived in the Holy Land, and having wrote a Description of it, and those that inhabit it, saith of them as followeth, p. 325,326. [And for those that we

judge to be damned Heretics, as the Nestorians, Jacobites, Maronites, Georgians, and the like, I found them to be for the most part good and simple men, and living sincerely toward God and men; they are of great abstinence, &c.

And of the Roman Catholics he saith, p. 323. [There are in the Land of Promise men of every Nation under Heaven, and every Nation lives after their own Rites: and, to speak the very truth, to our own great confusion, there are none found in it, that are worse, and more corrupt in manners then Christians] (he means Papists.)

And p. 324, he tells us, that the Syrians, Greeks, Armenians, Georgians, Nestorians, Nubians, Jubeans, Chaldeans, Maronites, Ethiopians, Egyptians, and many other Nations of Christians, there inhabit; and that some are schismatics not subject to the Pope; and others called Heretics, as the Nestorians, Jacobites, &c. but (saith he) there are many in these sects that are very simple (or sincere) knowing nothing of heresies: devoted to Christ: macerating the flesh with fasting's, and clothed with the most simple garments, so that they far excel the very Religious of the Church of Rome.] so you hear an Adversaries testimony.

Well then, when a Papist can prove to me, that I love not God, contrary to my own experience of myself: and when he can make me believe that no one of all the holy Heavenly Christians of my acquaintance, Ministers, or people, are in a state of charity or Justification: and that no one Christian on earth shall be saved but a Papist, then I will turn Papist: And till then they do not desire me to turn. But I must solemnly profess that this belief is so difficult to me, and abhorred by my reason, and my whole heart, and so contrary to my own knowledge, and to abundant evidence, and to all Christian charity, that I think I shall as soon be persuaded to believe that I

am not a man, and that I have not the use of sense or reason, or that Snow is black, and the Crow white, as to believe this Essential point of Popery. I should a hundred times easier be brought to doubt whether I have the love of God myself, then to conclude all the Christians in the world save the Papists, to be the heirs of damnation.

CHAP. IV. The second Argument.

A*rgum.* 2. That Doctrine is not true nor of God which teacheth men to renounce all Christian Love and Works of Christian Love, towards most of the Christians upon earth: But so doth the Doctrine of Popery; therefore it is not of God.

If their Error were merely speculative, it were the less; but here we see the fruits of it, and whither it tends. The major Proposition is plainly proved from Joh. 13:35. [By this shall all men know that ye are my Disciples, if ye have love one to another.] Col. 1:4. It must be a [Love to all the Saints.] 1 Thess. 4:9. But as touching brotherly love, ye need not that I write unto you, for ye yourselves are taught of God to love one another.]

This special Love is the Commandment of Christ, the new Commandment; without this, no man can be a Lover of God, nor be loved of him as a Member of Christ, as you may see, 1 John 3:11,12,14,23, and 4:7,8,11,12,20,21; 2 Joh. 5, Joh. 13:34, and 15:12,17; 1 Pet. 1:22. He that loveth not a Christian as a Christian, with a special love you may see in these Texts is none of the Sons of God. And that the Papists teach men to

deny this special Christian Love to most Christians in the world, I prove. They that teach men to take most true Christians in the world for no true Christians, but for Heretics or ungodly persons that shall be damned, do teach them to deny the special love and works of love to most true Christians: But thus do the Papists; therefore, &c. How can a man love him as a Christian or a godly man, whom he must take to be no Christian, or an ungodly man? Its true they may yet love them as Creatures, and so they must the Devils; and they may love them as men, and so they must the Turks and Heathens: But no man can love him as a member of Christ, whom he believes to be no member of Christ, but of the Devil. And all Papists are bound to this uncharitableness by their Religion, even by the Pope and general Council. And so as Christ bindeth his servants to Love one another with a special Love; so the Pope and Council bind the Papists not to love the most true Christians with a special Christian love: they cannot do it without being Heretics themselves, or overthrowing the foundation of Popery.

And here you have a taste of the Popish Charity, when they boast above all things of their Charity. I must profess, it is their horrible inhumane uncharitableness that seems to me their most enormous crime. And also you may see here the extent of their Good works, which they so much Glory in. He that is bound not to love me as a Christian, is bound to do nothing for me as a Christian. So that they will not give a cup of cold water to a Disciple in the name of a Disciple, unless he be also a Disciple of the Pope: nor can they love or relieve Christ in his servants, when they are bound to take them as none of his servants: and so the special Love and Charity of a Papist extendeth to none but those of their own Sect: and such a Charity the Quakers, and Anabaptists, and Familists have as eminently as they. Let

them take heed lest they hear, In as much as you did it not to one of the least of these, you did it not to me.

CHAP. V. That deposing Kings that will not exterminate us, and absolving Subjects from their Allegiance, and giving their Dominions to others, is an Article of the Papists Faith.

A*rgum.* 3. That Doctrine which teacheth men to destroy or undo them whom Christ hath bound them to love as Christians, and absolveth Subjects from their Allegiance to their Princes, and requireth the deposing of them, and committing the Government of their Dominions to others, because they are judged to be Heretics by the Pope; yea or if they will not destroy and extirpate such as he calleth Heretics; I say this Doctrine is not of God, nor such as Christian Princes should smile upon. But such is the Doctrine of Popery: therefore, &c.

I know that a Paper entitled An explanation of the Roman Catholics Belief, and other the like, do seem to renounce the opinion of breaking faith with Heretics, and of promise breaking with Magistrates (It seems they think they owe no more obedience to their Magistrates then they promise.) But as I refer the Reader to what King James and his defenders have said on this point (besides many more) so I shall now give you but the words of one

of their own approved General Council 12, the fourth at the Lateran under Innocent 3, as Binius and others of their own record it. In the first Chapter they set down their Catholic faith, two Articles of which are, 1. That no man can be saved out of their Universal Church. And 2. That the bread and wine in the Sacrament of the Altar are transubstantiate into the Body and Blood of Christ, the appearances remaining. And in the third Chapter they say, [We excommunicate and anathematize every heresy extolling itself against this holy orthodox Catholic faith, which we have before exponed, condemning all heretics by what names soever they be called—And being condemned, let them be left to the present secular Powers, or their Bailiffs to be punished, the Clergy being first degraded of their Orders; and let the goods of such condemned ones be confiscate, if they be Lay-men, but if they be Clergy men, let them be given to the Churches whence they had their stipends. And those that are found notable only by suspicion, if they do not by congruous purgation demonstrate their innocence, according to the considerations of the suspicion and the quality of the person, let them be smitten with the sword of Anathema, and avoided by all men, till they have given sufficient satisfaction; and if they remain a year excommunicate, let them then be condemned as heretics. And let the secular powers, in what Office soever, be admonished and persuaded, and if it be necessary compelled by Ecclesiastical censure, that as they would be reputed and accounted Believers, so for the defense of the faith, they take an Oath publicly, that they will study in good earnest according to their power, to exterminate all that are by the Church denoted heretics, from the Countries subject to their Jurisdiction. So that when any one shall be taken into Spiritual or Temporal power, he shall by his Oath make good this Chapter. But if the temporal Lord, being required and admonished of the Church,

shall neglect to purge his Country of heretical defilement, let him by the Metropolitan and other Comprovincial Bishops be tied by the bond of Excommunication. And if he refuse to satisfy within a year, let it be signified to the Pope, that he may from thenceforth denounce his Vassals absolved from his fidelity, and may expose his Country to be seized on by Catholics, who rooting out the heretics, may possess it without contradiction, and may keep it in the purity of faith; saving the right of the principal Lord, so be it that he himself do make no hindrance hereabout, and oppose any impediment: and the same Law is to be observed with them that are not principal Lord's. And the Catholics that taking the sign of the Cross shall set themselves to the rooting out of the heretics, shall enjoy the same indulgences and holy privileges, which were granted to those that go to the relief of the holy land. Moreover we Decree, that the believers, receivers, defenders, and favorers of Heretics, shall be excommunicate; firmly decreeing, that after any such is noted by excommunication, if he refuse to satisfy within a year, he shall from thence forth be ipso jure infamous, and may not be admitted to public Offices or Councils, or to the choice of such, nor to bear witness. And he shall be intestate and not have power to make a will, nor may come to a Succession of inheritance. And no man shall be forced to answer him in any cause: but he shall be forced to answer others. And if he be a Judge, his sentence shall be invalid, and no causes shall be brought to his hearing. If he be an Advocate, his Plea shall not be admitted. If a Notary (or Register) the Instruments made by him shall be utterly void, and damned with the damned Author. And so in other the like cases, we command that it be observed.] Thus they go on further commanding Bishops by themselves, or their Arch-deacons, or other fit persons, once or twice a year to search every Parish where any Heretic is

found to dwell, and put all the Neighborhood to their Oaths, whether they know of any Heretics there, or any private meetings, or any that in life and manners do differ from the common conversation of the faithful, &c. And the Bishops that neglect these things are to be cast out, and others put into their places that will do them.

And Pope Gregory *7, l. 4. Epist. 7*, expressly stirs up the people to cast off their Princes, saying [And for the conspiracy of Heretics and the King, we believe it is not unknown to you that are near them, how it may be impugned by the Catholic Bishops and Dukes, and many others in the German parts: for the faithful of the Church of Rome are come to such a number, that unless the King shall come to satisfaction, they may openly profess to choose another King, and observing Justice, we have promised to favor them, and will keep our promise firm, &c.]

The sum of all is, that all that the Pope calls Heretics, must be condemned and destroyed, and all Kings, Princes or Lord's, that will not execute his sentence and root them out, must be dispossessed of their Dominions, and the subjects absolved from their fidelity (whatever Oaths they had taken) and all others that do but favor or receive them be utterly undone.

I fetch not these things out of the writings of the Protestants, nor from any private Doctors of their own, but from the very words of a General Council confirmed by the Pope, and unquestionably approved by them. And abundance the like might be produced. And many ages saw this doctrine put in execution, when the Emperors of Germany were deposed by the Pope, and the Subjects absolved from their Allegiance, as the many volumes written in those times, and published together by Goldastus testify. And the King of France, or any other that tolerate any of the supposed Heretics, may

see what a censure they are exposed to, if mere necessity were not their security.

Perhaps some will say, that this Decree was not de fide, but a temporary precept. *Answ.* When a precept requireth duty, it may be a point of Faith to believe it. Precepts are the Objects of Faith, at least as they are assertions, that the thing commanded is our duty. It is an Article of faith, that God is to be loved and obeyed, and our Superiors to be honored, and our Neighbor to be loved, and Charity to be exercised, &c. The Creation, the Incarnation of Christ, his death, resurrection, ascension, glorification, intercession, his future Judgment, the Resurrection of the body, &c. are all matters of fact, and yet matters of faith too. If practicals be not Articles of faith, then we have no Articles of faith at all: for all our Theology and Religion is practical. Do Papists murder poor Christians by the thousands, and yet not *fide divina* believe that it is their duty so to do? Either it is a duty, or a sin, or indifferent. If a sin, woe to their Pope and Council (and if this be no sin with them, I know not why the world should be troubled by them with the name of sin.) If it be indifferent, what then shall be called sin? If they can swallow such Camels, as the blood of many thousand Christians, what need they strain at Gnats, and stick at private Murders, or Fornication, or Lying, or Slandering, anymore then the Jesuit. Casuists do, that are cited by the Jansenian in his *Mystery of Jesuitism*? But if these Murders and deposing Kings be indeed a duty, how can they know it to be so, but by Believing? And indeed if a General Council and the Pope are to be believed, who give it us with a *Decernimus & firmiter statuimus*, then it is doubtless a point of faith: and if they are not to be believed, then Popery is all but a mere deceit.

Obj. 2. But may we not be Roman Catholics though we join not with them in this point? Have not many such renounced it? And so may we. *Answ.* If

you renounce the Decrees of a Pope and General Council, you renounce your Religion in the very foundation of it, and cannot be Papists, if you know what you do; but are in the Roman account as errant Heretics as those that they have tortured and burnt to ashes: though here in England where they cannot handle you as they would do, they dare not tell you so. And if you may renounce the Decrees of a Pope and General Council, when they say, [It is a duty, or lawful to exterminate all as Heretics, that believe not Transubstantiation, and to seize upon the Lands of Princes that will not do it, and to deliver them to others that will, and absolve their Vassals from their fidelity] I say, if you may renounce them in this, why may not we have as free leave to renounce them in other things, as groundless?

CHAP. VI. The Church of Rome unholy in its Essentials.

A*rgum.* 4. THE true Catholic Church is Holy: the Church of Rome hath for many generations been unholy: therefore the Church of Rome was not in any of those Generations the true Catholic Church.

The Major Proposition is an Article of the Creed professed by themselves, as much as by us, [I Believe the Holy Catholic Church.]

The unholiness of the Church of Rome, I prove undeniably, thus: If an Essential part of the Church of Rome, even its Head, hath been unholy through many Generations, then the Church of Rome hath been unholy for many Generations: but an Essential part, even the Head, hath been unholy: therefore, &c.

The Consequence of the Major is past denial. *Bonum est ex causis integris*. Though it will not follow that the Church is Holy, because one Essential part is Holy, yet it clearly followeth that the Church is unholy, because an Essential part is unholy. As it followeth not that the Body is sound, because the Head is sound; yet it followeth, that the man (or the body) is unsound or sick, because the Head is unsound or sick. As it is not a

Church without all its Essential parts, so it is not a Holy Church without the Holiness of all its Essential parts.

And that they make the Pope the Head of the Catholic Church, and an Essential part, I am loath to prove; I would I could but entice them to deny it: for it is the principal controversy between them and the true Catholics.

And that abundance of their Popes have been unholy, I have formerly proved, and they dare not I hope deny it; when their own Historians describe their Impieties, and their own Writers, even those that are bitterest against us, do freely confess it: yea General Councils have judged them and cast them out. The number of these Monsters is so great, that it would make a volume greater than I intend, but to name them and recite their crimes. I will give a brief instance of one of them.

Pope John the twenty third was accused and deposed by the General Council at Constance, upon about seventy Articles which in Binius take up about thirteen columns in folio: and therefore I suppose you would give me no thanks to trouble you with the recital of them all. The first Article was, that he was from his youth, a man of a bad disposition, immodest, impudent, a liar, a rebel and disobedient to his parents, and given to most vices, and then was, and yet is commonly taken for such a one by all that knew him. The second Article was, how by Simoniacal and unjust means he grew rich. The third Article, that by Simony he was promoted to be a Cardinal. The fourth Article, that being Legat at Bononia he governed Tyrannically, impiously, unjustly, being wholly alien from all Christian piety, and justice, divine and human, &c. The fifth Article, that thus he got to be Pope, and yet continued as bad, and as a Pagan despised the worship of God, and if he performed any, it was more lest he should be totally blamed of heresy and cast out of the Papacy, then for any devotion, and he

huddled it up like a Hunter or a Soldier. The sixth Article was, that he was the oppressor of the poor, the persecutor of righteousness, the pillar of the unjust, and the Simoniacal, a server of the flesh, the dregs of vices, a stranger to virtue, flying from public consistories, wholly given to sleep and carnal desires, wholly contrary to the life and manners of Christ, the mirror of infamy, and the profound inventor of all mischiefs; so far scandalizing the Church of Christ, that among Christian Believers that knew his life and manners, he is commonly called, The Devil incarnate. The seventh Article was, that being a vessel of all sins, repelling the worthy, he Simonically sold Benefices, Bishoprics and Church dignities openly to the unworthy that would give most for them.

Reader, I should but weary thee to add threescore more of these Articles. These were all proved to be Notorious by Cardinals, Archbishops, Bishops, and many more. Yet I will crave thy patience while I add but two or three of the last. Another was, that he came to be Pope by causing Pope Alexander and his Physician Dr. Daniel de Sophia to be poisoned. Another was, that he committed incest with his brothers Wife, and with the holy Nuns, and Whoredom with Virgins, and adultery with men's Wives, and other crimes of incontinency, for which the wrath of God cometh on the children of disobedience. Another, that he was a wicked man, notoriously guilty of Murder, Witchcraft and other grievous crimes, a dissipater of the Church goods, a notorious Simonist, and pertinacious Heretic. The next Article was, that often and often before diverse Prelates and other honest men, by the Devils persuasion, he obstinately asserted, dogmatized, and maintained, that there is no life everlasting, nor any other after this; Moreover, he said and obstinately believed that the soul of man doth die and is extinct with the body like the brute beasts, and that the dead shall not rise again at the last

day, contrary to the Article of the Resurrection. The last and some other Articles are about his perfidiousness.] And hereupon the Council deposed him.

And now Reader I leave thee to judge, whether the Roman Church had a holy Head, when it had a Heathen and a Devil incarnate?

So the general Council at Basil deposed Pope Eugenius 4th as being [A rebel against the holy Canons, a notorious disturber and scandalizer of the peace and unity of the Church, a Simonist and a perjured wretch, incorrigible, a schismatic, and an obstinate Heretic.]

Pope John 13th, alias 12th, was in Council convicted of ravishing Maids, Wives, Widows at the Apostolic doors, and committing many murders: he drunk a health to the Devil, and at Dice called to Jupiter and Venus for help, and at last was slain in the act of Adultery. Saith Plutina [he was from his youth a man contaminated with all dishonesty and filthiness; and if he had any time to spare from his lusts, he spent it in hunting, and not in praying.] And after he calls him [a most wicked man, or rather a Monster] and saith that [the life of this most wicked man being judged in a Council of Italian Bishops, for fear of them he fled and lived like a wild beast in the woods,] till at last he got the better again by the help of his friends at Rome; till an angry man that found him naught with his wife, got the better of him, and sent him to answer it in another world. And their own writers note that this was the first Pope that changed his name, whom his followers imitated. And do you think the Head of the Roman Church was then Holy?

If it were a disputable matter, I would prove out of abundance of their own writers, that many others of them have been most wicked wretches, common adulterers, and fornicators, yea Sodomites, poisoning their predecessors to get the Popedom &c. But its needless, because they deny it

not. Baronius their flattering Champion saith (*Annal ad an. 912.*) What then was the face of the holy Roman Church? How exceeding filthy, when the most potent, and yet the most sordid whores did rule at Rome? By whose Pleasure Sees were changed, Bishops were given, and which is a thing horrid to be heard, and not to be spoken, their Lovers (or mates) were thrust into Peters Chair, being false Popes, who are not to be written in the Catalogue of the Roman Popes, but only for the marking out of such times. And what kind of Cardinals, Priests, and Deacons think you we must imagine that these monsters did choose, when nothing is so rooted in nature as for everyone to beget his like?

And Genebrard that spleenish Papist (*li. 4. Sec. 10.*) saith [In this one thing that age was unhappy, that for near one hundred and fifty years about fifty Popes did wholly fall away from the virtue of their ancestors, being rather irregular and Apostatical, then Apostolical] So that the Church of Rome had not then either a Holy or Apostolical Head.

And Pope Adrian the sixth himself writeth (*De Sacram. Confir. Art. 4.*) that there have many Popes of Rome been Heretics. And two or three several General Councils did condemn Pope Honorius for a Heretic.

And if I should tell you but what their own writers say of the wickedness of the Roman Clergy, in many ages; and of the wickedness of the Roman people, of the large sums of money that the Pope hath yearly for the licensed or tolerated Whorehouses in Rome, you would think that the body of the particular Roman Church were near kin to the Head, and therefore not the Holy Mistress of all Churches.

But perhaps some will say, that the Pope was holy because his Office was Holy, though his person vicious. *Answ*. 1. If this be the Holiness of the Catholic Church, mentioned in the Creed, then the Institution of offices is it

that makes it Holy, and while the office continueth, the Holiness cannot be lost. 2. Then let them prove their Holiness by Saints no more. 3. Let them not then delude the people, but speak out, and tell them that they mean such Holiness as is consistent with Heathenism, or Infidelity, Murders, Sodomy, and may be in an incarnate Devil! Is this the Holiness of the Catholic Church?

*Obj. But y*ou may have unholy persons among you also, that yet say you are of the true Church.

Answ. But they are no Essential part of the Catholic Church which we believe; and therefore it may be a Holy Church, though they be unholy. But the Pope is an Essential part of the Roman Church which they believe in; and therefore it cannot be Holy, if he be unholy.

*Obj. By th*is means you leave no room for the Church of Rome or any Papist in the Catholic Church which is truly Holy.

Answ. Not as Papists: so they can be no members of it. But if with any of them Christianity be predominant, and prevail against the infection of Popery, so that it practically extinguish not Christianity, then as Christians they may be members of the Church, and be saved too, but not as Papists.

CHAP. VII. The Papists of more than One Church, yet each part pretending to be the Catholic Church.

A*rgum.* 5. THE true Catholic Church of Christ is but One: The pretended Roman Catholic Church is more than One: Therefore the pretended Roman-Catholic Church is not the true Catholic Church of Christ.

The Major is confessed. The Minor I prove thus, 1. Where there are two Heads or Sovereign Powers specifically distinct, there are two Societies, or Churches. But those called Papists, or the Roman Catholic Church, have two Heads or Sovereign Powers specifically distinct. Therefore they are two Churches.

The Major is granted by all Politicians, who do without contradiction specify Common-wealth's and other Political Societies from the Sovereign Powers: and so the Monarchical, Aristocratical and Democratical are several Species. The Belgian Common-wealth, and the French, be not specifically the same.

The Minor hath two standing proofs so visible that he must be blind indeed that cannot see them. First there are the many Volumes that are

written by both sides for their several forms: Bellarmine, Gretsor and the rest of the Italian faction proving that the Pope is the chief Power, and above a General Council, and the seat of Infallibility, and not to be judged by any, being himself the Judge of the whole world. And the other party proving that a General Council is above the Pope, and that he is to be judged by them, and may be deposed by them. If any say, that they are but few and no true Catholics of this Opinion, I answer, then a General Council are but few and no true Catholics, which yet is said by them to represent the whole Catholic Church: For the General Council of Constance and of Basil have peremptorily asserted it, and repeat it over and over; yea the Council of Basil say, *Ses. ultim*. that [Not one of the skillful did ever doubt but that the Pope was subject to the Judgment of a General Council, in things that concern faith. And that he cannot without their consent dissolve or remove a General Council; yea and that this is an Article of faith, which without destruction of salvation cannot be denied, and that the Council is above the Pope, *de fide*, and that it cannot be removed without their own consent, and that he is an heretic that is against these things] See Binius p. 43,79,96. And Pope Eugenius owned this Council ibid. p. 42. And for the Council of Constance, Martin the fifth was chosen by it, and present in it, and personally confirmed it in these words [*Quodomnia & singula determinata, conclusa, & decreta, in materiis fidei per praesens concilium, conciliariter tenere & inviolabiliter observare volebat, & nunquam contraire quoquo modo. Ipsaque sic conciliariter facta approbat & ratificat, & non aliter, nec alio modo*] (that is, what they did as a Council, and not what private members did) you see then even General Councils representing the Catholic Church do not only say that a Council is above the Pope, but make it an

Article of faith, and damn those that deny it. (What then is become of Bellarmine and the rest of their champions?)

But perhaps you will say, they are but few on the other side. I answer: yes: Not only most Popes, and the Italian Clergy, and the predominant party of Papists, but another General Council, even that at the Lateran, under Julius 2nd and Leo 10th, expressly determine on the contrary, that the Pope is above a General Council. So that here is not only an undeniable proof that General Councils are fallible by their contradicting each other, and that there is a Necessity of rejecting some of them, and consequently that the Foundation of Popery is rotten; but also here is one Representative Catholic Church against another Representative Catholic Church, and one Council for one Species of Sovereignty, and another for another Species of Sovereignty. So that undoubtedly it is not the same Church, that had two heads of several sorts.

2. And the Nations that are on both sides to this day, are a proof beyond denial of their division. The French on one side, and the Italians on the other; and other nations divided between both. So that the thing which they call by one name, is two indeed. But so is not the true Catholic Church.

Obj. What though some in England took the King to be the Sovereign, and some the Parliament, and soon thought it was in both Conjunct; did this prove that you were more than one Common-wealth?

Answ. Where the Sovereignty is mixed and not in either alone, if any one shall set up the one as the only Sovereign, and subject the other to them, they change the form of the Commonwealth, but do not set up two Commonwealths; but if half take one for the Sovereign, and the other half take the other for the Sovereign, they plainly divide the Commonwealth into two: if they do it only in mind, and the secret thoughts of their hearts,

this cannot be known to others, and so cannot be the ground of a Society: but if they do it by a public consent and practice, they evidently make two Commonwealths. What else brought us into a war which ended not till one party was subdued? It is not possible that one Political body should have two Sovereigns specifically distinct. Indeed it may have five hundred natural persons in the Sovereignty (as in a Senate;) but they are but one Political person, or one *summa potestas*.

2. But I prove the Minor by another Argument. Where there are two three or four Heads or Sovereigns at once numerically distinct, there are two or three or four Churches. But the Roman Church pretending to be Catholic, hath had two or three or four Heads at once numerically distinct; therefore it was two or three or four Churches.

The Major is a known truth to all that are verst in any degree in the doctrine of Politics. It is not only two species of Sovereignty, but two individual Sovereigns that are inconsistent with the numerical Unity of a Political body. Two, or ten, or two hundred may join in one Sovereignty, as one Political person (as I said) but if there be two Sovereigns, there are certainly two Societies: for if both be Supreme, neither is Subordinate. The Minor is not to be denied: for the Papists lay their very foundation on a supposed division: for sooth Peter and Paul were both at once their Bishops. And there is not many of them that adventure to tell us, that Peter only was the Supreme, and that Paul was under him: but they make them as equals, or coordinate; and some of them say, that Paul was the Bishop of the uncircumcision, and Peter of the Circumcision (and then Peters Church is confined to the Jews) And they do not tell us, that one Headship was divided between them: For then that example would direct them still to

have two Popes, or two Bishops to a Church: so that Peter being a Head, and Paul a Head, they had sure distinct bodies.

But whether they stand to this or not, they cannot deny their many following divisions. The twenty third schism (as Wernerus a zealous Papist in *fasciculo tempor*. reckons them) was between Felix the fifth and Eugenius: of which the said Wernerus speaking saith, [That hence arose great contention among the writers of this matter, pro and contra, and they cannot agree to this day: for one part saith, that a Council is above the Pope, the other part on the contrary saith, No, but the Pope is above the Council. God grant his Church peace, &c.]

Of the twenty second schism the same Wernerus saith thus, (*ad annum 1373*.) [the twenty second schism was the worst and most subtle schism of all that were before it. For it was so perplexed, that the most Learned and Conscientious men were not able to discuss (or find out) to whom they should adhere. And it was continued for forty years, to the great scandal of the whole Clergy, and the great loss of souls, because of Heresies and other evils that then sprung up, because there was then no discipline in the Church against them. And therefore from this Urbane the sixth to the time of Martin the fifth, I know not who was Pope]

After Nicolas the fourth there was no Pope for two years and a half, and Celestine the fifth that succeeded him resigning it, Boniface the eighth entered, that stilled himself Lord of the whole world in Spirituals and Temporals, of whom it was said, He entered as a Fox, lived as a Lyon, and died like a Dog, saith the same Wernerus.

The twentieth schism (saith the same Author) was great between Alexander the third, and four Schismatics, and it lasted seventeen years.

The nineteenth schism was between Innocent the second, and Peter Leonis: and Innocent get the better, because he had more on his side (saith he.)

The thirteenth schism (saith Wernerus) was between another and Benedict the eighth.

The fourteenth schism (saith the same Author) was scandalous and full of confusion between Benedict the ninth and five others, which Benedict (saith he) was wholly vicious, and therefore being damned, appeared in a monstrous and horrid shape; his head and tail were like an Asses, and the rest of his body like a Bear, saying, I thus appear, because I lived like a beast.] In this schism (saith Wernerus) there were no less than six Popes at once. 1. Benedict was expulsed. 2. Silvester the third gets in, but is cast out again, and Benedict restored. 3. But being again cast out, Gregory the sixth is put into his place; who because he was ignorant of letters (and yet infallible no doubt) caused another Pope to be Consecrated with him to perform Church Offices; which was the fourth; which displeased many, and therefore a third is chosen, (which was the fifth) instead of the two that were fighting with one another: but Henry (the Emperor) coming in, deposed them all, and chose Clement the second, (who was the sixth of all them that were alive at once)

But above all schisms that between Armosus and Sergius, and their followers, was the foulest, such saying and unsaying, doing and undoing there was, besides the dismembering of the dead Pope, and casting him into the water. And of eight Successors, saith Wernerus, [I can say nothing observable of them; because I find nothing of them but scandalous, because of the unheard of contention in the holy Apostolic See one against another, and together mutually against each other.]

Reader, wouldst thou be troubled with any more of these Relations? I tell thee nothing but from their own Historians, and that which multitudes of them agree in: I go not to a Protestant for a word. But one Pope in those contentious times, I find lived in some peace, and that was Silvester the second, of whom saith Wernerus (as others commonly) [This Silvester was made Pope by the help of the Devil to whom he did homage: that all might go as he would have it:—but he quickly met with the usual End, as one that had placed his Hope in deceitful Devils.]

Well! I shall now appeal to reason itself, whether this were one Church, that for forty (or say others fifty) years together had several Heads, some of the people following one, and some another, and the most Learned and most Conscientious not able to know the right Pope, nor know him not to this day. If England were forty years thus divided between two Kings, it were certainly two Kingdoms. But the true Catholic Church of Christ is but one.

CHAP. VIII. The Church of Rome hath discontinued.

A*rgum.* 6. The true Catholic Church hath never ceased or discontinued, since the founding of it to this day. The Church of Rome hath ceased or discontinued: therefore the Church of Rome is not the true Catholic Church.

I prove the Minor (for the Major they will grant.) If the Head which is an Essential part, hath discontinued, then the Church of Rome hath discontinued. But the Head hath discontinued: therefore, &c.

The Minor only needs proof: and that I prove 1. There have been many years interregnum or vacancy, when there was no Pope at all. And where then was the Church when it had no Head?

2. There have been long successions of such as you confess yourselves, were not Apostolical, but Apostatical. 3. Your own Popes and Councils command us to take such for no Popes. For example, Pope Nicolas in his Decretals (*see Caranza p. 393*.) saith [He that by money or the favor of men, or popular or military tumults is intruded into the Apostolical seat without the Concordant and Canonical election of the Cardinal and the

following religious Clergy, let him not be taken for a Pope, nor Apostolical, but for Apostatical.] And even of Priests, he commandeth, [Let no man hear Mass of a Priest whom he certainly knoweth to have a Concubine or woman introduced] *Caranza, p. 395, and ibid*. he saith, [Priests that commit fornication, cannot have the honor of Priesthood.]

4. But our greater Argument is from the authority of God, and the very nature of the office. An infidel, or notoriously ungodly man, is not capable of being a Pastor of the Church (*in sensu composito*, while he is such) But the Popes of Rome have been Infidels, and notoriously ungodly men: therefore they were uncapable of being Pastors of the Church (and consequently that Church was Headless, and so no Church.) The Major I prove. 1. Where there is not the necessary matter and disposition of the matter, there can be no reception of the form: But Infidels and notoriously ungodly men, are not matter sufficiently disposed to receive the form of Pastoral Power: therefore they cannot receive it.

The Minor is proved 1. As every true Church is a Christian Church (it being only a Congregation of Christians that we so call, in our present case) so every Pastor is a Christian Pastor: but an Infidel or notoriously ungodly man is not a Christian Pastor: therefore not a true Pastor. 2. Otherwise a Mahometan, Jew, or Heathen may be a true Pope; which I think they will deny themselves. 3. If any Disposition or Qualification at all be necessary to the being of the Pastoral Office (besides manhood) then is it necessary, that he own God the Father, and the Redeemer (that is, be not notoriously an Infidel, or ungodly.) But some qualification is necessary: therefore, &c. None can be named more necessary than this.

And that Popes have been such as I here mention, is proved before. Not to mention Marcellinus that sacrificed to an Idol, or Liberius that subscribed to

the Arian profession; (for I believe there is a hundred times more hope of their Salvation by Repentance, then of a hundred of their Successors) John the twenty second held that the soul dies with the body, of which the Parisians and others condemned him. John the twenty third, as I shown before, denied the life to come, and so was an Infidel. The Witchcraft, Poisonings, Simony, Sodomy, Adulteries, Incest, &c. of others, are sufficiently recorded by their own Historians.

CHAP. IX. From sense; securing all men from Popery that will believe their eyes, or any of their or others senses.

A*rgum.* 7. To the foregoing Arguments, I add the recital of one formerly mentioned, for the use of all that have the use of their wits and senses.

If a man may be sure, that he knows bread to be bread, and wine to be wine, when he seeth, feeleth, and tasteth them, then he may be sure that Popery is a deceit. (This Consequence they cannot question) But a man may be sure that he knoweth bread to be bread, and wine to be wine, when he seeth, feeleth, and tasteth them: therefore, &c.

Note that I speak of such a knowledge as belongs to men of sound wits and senses, and a convenient object and medium. It is the senses of the whole world that I appeal to, and not of one or two: it is bread and wine that are near us, in the hand or mouth that I speak of, and not at a miles distance: in the daylight, and not in the dark. So that take the bread and wine into your hand, and judge of it, and let this decide our Controversy. If you can tell whether that be bread or no bread, you may tell whether the Papists or we are in the right. Those therefore that be not learned and subtle enough to

judge by Disputations and writings of Learned men, may yet judge by their sight and feeling. Either you know bread and wine when you see it, taste it, feel it, or you do not. If you do, then the Controversy is at an end: for the senses of all sound men in the world, will be against the Papists that say the bread after Consecration is no bread, and the wine is no wine. But if you cannot know bread when you see, feel, and eat it, then see what follows. 1. Then we are sure that the Pope and all his Council are not at all to be trusted: for if sense be not to be trusted, then the Pope and his Council know not when they read the Scripture, and Canons, and Fathers, and hear Traditions, but that they are deceived. 2. Then we are uncertain of any Judgment that Pope or Council can give: for when they spoke or wrote it, we are uncertain whether our eyes and ears, or reason judging by them, are not deceived in the hearing or reading of their words. 3. How ridiculously then do they call for a Judge of Controversies? And what a foolish quarrel is it that they make, who shall be the Interpreter of Scriptures, or Judge of Controversies? For what can a Judge do but speak or write his mind? And when he hath done, you know not what it is that you hear or read, because your senses may deceive you. Its a far harder matter to understand a sentence or book of the Pope or Council when you read or hear it, then to know bread when you see, and feel, and eat it. Many thousands know bread, that know not the Popes sentence, nor a word of a book. 4. And by this rule, it is uncertain whether Scripture be true, or Christianity the true Religion. For we cannot know it but by our senses: and if they are so uncertain, all our Religion must needs be uncertain. 5. Yea we cannot tell what Revelation to desire that should end our Controversies and make us certain. For if God should send an Angel or other Messenger from heaven to decide the Controversies between us and the Papists, what could he do more but speak

it to us as from God? And we should still be uncertain of what we see or hear: so that we are left uncurably in our ignorance and Controversies, if Popery be true.

And here you may see upon what terms we dispute with Papists, and what hope there is of satisfying them. We dispute with men that will not believe their own senses, or the senses of the world. The damned man, Luk. 16, thought if one might have been sent to his brethren from the dead, they would have believed. And if Abraham say to them, If they will not hear Moses and the Prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rise from the dead; we may say of Papists, sure, if they will not believe their own eyes, and ears, and taste, and know not bread when they see, and feel, and eat it, how should they be persuaded, though one were sent to them from heaven to resolve them? Can we think by all our Arguments to make any matter plainer to a man then that Bread is Bread, when he seeth and eateth it? If this be uncertain to them, what can you prove to them, or what way can you devise to deal with them? For indeed, if sense be uncertain, we have no certainty of anything in the world.

But to this H.T. (they say H. Turbervile) in his Manual of Controversies saith thus. [*Answ.* Substance is not the proper and immediate object of sense, but color, quantity, &c. Nor can sense judge at all of substance though it be under sensible accidents, unless it be the subject of those accidents, and have a sensible and corporal manner of being, which the Body of Christ neither is, nor hath in that Sacrament. It hath a spiritual manner of being, and is not the subject of the accidents of bread; they are without a subject by Miracle; therefore no wonder, if sense be deceived in this matter. Here Sense and Reason must veil bonnet to faith, and submit to

the Authority of God revealing, and the Church propounding; they are no competent Judges what God can do by his Omnipotence.] Thus H.T.

Repl. And is this all that these Rabbis have to satisfy the world that it is not Bread and Wine which is seen, and felt, and tasted! Let us first take notice of the by-passages of his answer, and then reply to the substance. 1. Is not this like the rest of their contradictory imaginations? That Christ hath not a Corporal manner of Being in the Sacrament: and yet it is not Bread, but his Body that is there: yea before p. 207, he saith, [We maintain not his Corporal, but real and spiritual presence in the Sacrament. So that either they affirm that his Body is present, and yet deny his Bodily presence; or else they affirm his Bodily presence, but not his Corporal presence. Most learnedly! We shall at last be taught to distinguish between Bodily and Corporal! But is not the Juggle in the word [Manner?] Perhaps the Corporal presence is not denied, but the Corporal manner. *Answ.* 1. Yes, in terms its said [We maintain not his Corporal presence] 2. And can a Body be present, and not in a Bodily manner? And why is [Spiritually] put as contra-distinct? Sure when Paul said our Bodies shall be raised spiritual bodies, he thought that they were nevertheless bodies for being spiritual; and therefore it is nevertheless a Bodily manner of presence, for being a spiritual manner. But if by the Corporal presence or manner (denied) be meant nothing but the qualities and quantity by which it is fit to be the Object of our senses, why had we not this plainly without juggling? To say Christ is present in Body but not sensibly, is plainer English, then to say that he is present in Body but not Bodily present.

2. Note also that he calls them [The accidents of bread] and yet saith [they are without a subject] And so doth the Explanation of the Roman Catholic Belief, and their ordinary writers say that the Body of Christ is under the

forms of Bread and Wine, and yet say that Bread and Wine are none of the subject of those forms.

3. Note also that he professeth Transubstantiation is a Miracle, and so every ignorant, drunken, adulterous Priest of theirs hath the gift of Miracles, which he worketh as oft as he consecrateth: No wonder if Miracles be the glory of their Church, and the proof of their Infallibility; But let us come to the substance of his Answer.

1. He tells you that substance is not the proper and immediate object of sense, but color, quantity, &c. But 1. Is not the Mediate Object [Proper] as well as the Immediate? 2. But what gather you hence? Be it a Proper or improper Object, I hope we may yet have leave to believe that Reason by the help of sense doth judge as infallibly of Substances as Accidents. If you think otherwise, then all the forementioned consequences are undeniable. You know not whether the world saw Christ on earth: or whether he were crucified, dead, buried, rose, or ascended: It might be but color and quantity which men saw; and when Christ told them a spirit hath not flesh and blood as ye see me have, they might have answered, We see no flesh and blood, but color and quantity: And Thomas had then small reason to be convinced by seeing and feeling, when he saw but color and quantity, and felt but quantity and quality. By this reasoning the world is not sure that ever there was a Pope of Rome, but the Color of a Pope, or other accidents. And you know not that there is any earth under your feet, or that you are a man, or have a body, because your senses perceive but the accidents of it.

2. But what manner of men did H.T. imagine he had to deal with, when he puts off his Readers with such an answer as this? Mark Reader the unfaithful dealing of these men, and how grossly they abuse poor people that follow them with mere deceits. The Question or Objection which he

undertook to answer was, Whether sense telling us that it is Bread after the Consecration be deceived? To this he takes on him to give an answer, and cunningly speaks to another question, and passeth this by. Its one question, Whether sense can infallibly discern Christ in the Sacrament, if he were there, or discern that he is not there? And another question Whether sense can infallibly discern Bread and Wine, and know whether they be there? The last was the question in hand: but he slily answers to the first instead of it; and tells us, that sense cannot judge of substance, though under sensible accidents, unless it be the subject of those accidents, and have a sensible and corporal manner of being, which the body of Christ neither is nor hath in the Sacrament.] And so goes on. And what of all this? [therefore Christ may be in the Sacrament and you not discern him by sense] Well: and whats that to the question? O Sir, is it not the holy truth of God that you are about? And should you thus abuse it, and the souls of men? You knew the question is, Whether sense (and the intellect thereby) be infallible in judging Bread to be Bread when we see, feel and eat it? Had you never a word to say to this? To persuade men that they have eyes and see not, and hands and feel not, or that the world knoweth not certainly what they seem to know by seeing and feeling? I pray you hereafter deal by us as fairly as Bellarmine did (and yet we will thank you for nothing) who quite gave away the Roman cause by granting and pleading [that sense is infallible in Positives: and therefore we may thence say, This is a Body because I see it; (and so this is Bread or wine because I see, feel and taste it) but not in Negatives: and therefore we cannot say, this is not a Body because I see it not] I pray you give over talking of the Pope, or Church, or Religion, or Men, if you are uncertain of substances which are (suppose but *per accidentia*) the

Objects of your sense. And take nothing ill that I write of you, till you are more certain that you see it, and know what you see.

3. But you will say [Sense and Reason must here veil bonnet to faith. *Answ.* In the Negative case let it be granted, and any case where faith can be faith. But if sense (and the Intellect therewith) be fallible in Positives, so that we cannot know Bread when we see and eat it, faith cannot be faith then. What talk you of faith, if you credit not the soundest senses of all the men in the world, when sense and reason are presupposed to faith. How know you that faith here contradicteth sense? You will say, because the Church or Scripture saith: This is my Body: and that there is no Bread? But how know you that there is any such thing in Scripture? Or that the Church so holdeth? You think you have read or heard it: But how know you that your sense deceived you not? He that cannot know Bread when he seeth and eateth it, is unlikely to know letters and their meaning when he seeth them.

See more of my answer to such Objections in a Book entitled *The Safe Religion, p. 241, to 248*.

The simplest Reader that hath honesty and charity, is secured against Popery by the first Argument, which he may make good to his own soul against all the Jesuits on earth. And he that is unable to proceed on that account, may by the evidence of this last Argument confute any Papist living, if he be a man of sense and reason. And having brought all our controversy so low, that sense itself may be the judge, I shall go no further in Argument, as thinking it vain to use any reason with that man that will not believe his own eye-sight, nor the sight, and feeling, and taste of all the world besides.

CHAP. X. Prove them but guilty of one Error in Faith, and all Popery is confuted.

I come now to the next and principal part of my task, which is to open to you their Deceits, and give you Directions for the discovery and confutation of them, that by the help of these you may see the Truth.

Detect. 1. Remember this ground which they have given you, that If you prove them guilty but of any one Error in points of belief determined by their Church, you thereby disprove the whole body of Popery, as such. For you pull up the foundation which they build on, and the Authority into which they resolve their faith. They will grant you, that if they are deceived by the Church in one thing, they have no Certainty of anything upon the Churches credit. So that if you read Paul's discourse against Praying in an unknown tongue, or the many precepts for our reading and meditating in the Law of God, or the like, and can but perceive that the Popish Latin service, or their forbidding men to read the Scripture, &c. are contrary hereto, or if you find out but any one of their Errors, you cannot be a Papist, if you understand their Profession.

But it is not so with us: for though we know that the Scripture and all that is in it is of infallible Truth, and that every true Christian (while such) is infallible in the Essentials of Christianity; (for else he were no Christian) yet we profess that we know but in part, and that our own Writings and Confessions may possibly in some things be besides the sense of Scripture, and there being much more propounded in Scripture to our faith, then what is of absolute necessity to salvation, we may possibly after our studying and praying mistake in some things that are not of the Essence but the Integrity of Christianity, and are necessary to the *Melius esse*, the strength or comfort, though not to the being of a Christian. So that every Error in their faith destroys their grounds, and so their new Religion; but so doth not every Error of ours.

Or to speak more distinctly; let us distinguish between the *Fides quae & qua*; their Objective faith, and our Subjective faith. 1. Their Objective Faith hath Errors in it, but ours hath none by their own confession: For theirs is all the Decrees of their Popes and Councils: and ours is only the Holy Scripture, which they confess to be infallible. Our own writings do but show how we understand the Scriptures, and so whether our subjective faith be right or not. 2. We confess that it is not only possible but probable, that we are mistaken in some lower points, about the meaning of the Scriptures, and yet our foundation is still sure. But they have in a sort confounded their Subjective and Objective faith: and one believes it on that account because others do believe it; and so one age or part do but seek for the Object of their faith in the Actual faith of the other. Yea 3. They conclude that every point which is of faith, that is, thats determined by the Church to be so, is of such necessity to salvation that no man can be saved that denieth it, or that doth not believe it (if sufficiently proposed.) But we are assured, that

though all that is in Scripture be most true, yet through misunderstanding, some points there proposed to our faith, may possibly be denied and disputed against by a true believer; and yet his salvation not be overthrown by it. The Papists cry out against us for distinguishing between the Fundamentals (or essentials) of Religion and the Integrals: but we know it to be necessary.

CHAP. XI. A Doctrine so contrary to Scripture and itself, cannot be free from Error.

D*etect.* 2. When you have brought the matter thus far, and see that if they have one error in faith, their whole cause is lost, then consider, Whether it be Possible for that Doctrine which is so contrary to Scripture, and to itself, to be free from all Error. 1. How contrary it is to Scripture, 1. To forbid the reading of Scripture in a known tongue: 2. And their Public Praying in an unknown language: 3. And their administering the Lord's Supper to the People by the halves, denying them the Wine, and giving them the bread only: 4. And their affirming men to be perfect without sin in this life: 5. And their calling some sins venial which deserve a pardon, and yet are truly no sins: 6. And their absolute forbidding their Priests to marry, 7. And saying that there is no Bread and Wine left after the Consecration, with abundance the like: the very reading of the texts may satisfy you. As for the first, see Deut. 6:7,8,9; Deut. 11:18,19,20; Isa. 34:16; Psal. 1:2; Neh. 8; Jos. 8:34,35; Matth. 12:3,5, and 19:4, and 21:16, and 22:31; Mar. 12:10,26; Acts 8:28, and 13:27, and 15:21; 1 Thes. 5:27; Col. 4:16; Deut. 31:11; Eph. 3:4; Matth. 24:15; Rev. 1:3; 2 Tim. 3:16; John 5:39; Act.

17:2,11, and 18:28; Rom. 15:4; 2 Tim. 3:15; Isa. 8:16,20, and 42:4; Rom. 7:1; Jam. 1:25; Hos. 8:12.

For the second, read 1 Cor. 14. For the third, see Matth. 26,27,28; 1 Cor. 11:25-28; 1 Cor. 10:16. For the fourth, see Eccl. 7:20; Jam. 3:2; 1 Joh. 1:8; Phil. 3:12; Luk. 11:4. For the fifth, see Deut. 12:32; Gal. 3:10; 1 Joh. 3:4. For the sixth, see 1 Tim. 3:2,4,5,11,12; Tit. 1:6; 1 Tim. 43; 1 Cor. 9:5. For the seventh, see 1 Cor. 10:16; 1 Cor. 11:23,26,27,28; Act. 2:42; Act. 20:7,11.

2. And that they are contrary to themselves, appeareth: 1. In that (as I said before) not only several persons, but several Countries go several ways; the French are of one way, and the Italians of another, even in the Fundamentals of their Faith, which all the rest is resolved into. 2. Their Popes have ordinarily been contrary to one another in their Decrees; which made Platina say [Following Popes do still either infringe or wholly abrogate the Decrees of the former Popes] And Erasmus saith that [Pope John 22nd, and Pope Nicolas are contrary one to another in their whole Decrees, and that in things that seem to belong to matter of faith] Had we no instances but of Sergius and Formosus and their following partakers, it were enough. And Celestines case puts Bellarmine to silly shifts. 3. That their Councils contradict each other, I have formerly manifested. They confess that the Arians have had many Councils as General as most ever the Orthodox had: and if it be only the want of the Popes approbation that nullifieth their authority, then let them tell us no more of Councils and of [all the Church] but say plainly that is but one man that they mean.

But even their approved Councils have been contrary; As the sixth Council at Constantinople approved by Pope Adrian, is now confessed to have many errors. The Council of Neocasarea confirmed by Pope Leo 4th,

and by the Nicene Council (as saith the *Council of Florence Ses. 7*.) condemned second marriages, contrary to Scripture and the present Church. The Council at the Lateran under Leo the tenth determines that the Pope is above a General Council; and the Councils of Constance and Basil determine that the General Council is above the Pope, and that this is de fide, and its heresy to deny it.

CHAP. XII. Agree on the way of proof, before you dispute: Papists will take neither Sense, Reason, Scripture, nor the Tradition or Judgment of the greater part of the Church for judge or proof.

D*etect.* 3. If you enter into Dispute with any Papist, inquire first what he will take for sufficient Proof, and what common Principles you are agreed on by which the rest must be decided. For men that agree in nothing at all, are not capable of a dispute. For the Principles in which they are agreed, are those that the rest must be reduced to. And when you have made this enquiry, you shall find that the Popish way of Disputing is to forbid you to Dispute, unless you will first yield the cause to them as beyond dispute: and that they are not agreed with the rest of the world in any common principles to which the differences may be reduced for trial, and so that there is no sort of Proof that they will admit of as sufficient: For if there be any ground of Proof at all, it must be 1. From the senses. 2. Or from Reason. 3. Or from Scripture. 4. Or from the Church; but they will stand to none of all these.

1. Begin at the bottom of all, and know of them whether they will take that for a Valid Proof, which is fetched from sense, even from the soundest senses of all men in the world, supposing a convenient object and Medium? If they will not take this for Proof, how can you dispute with them? Or what Proof can be admitted, if this be not admitted? We have this advantage in dealing even with those Heathen that have blotted out much of the Law of nature itself, that yet they will yield to an Argument from sense.

But if they would yield to the Validity of this proof, then they give away their cause, seeing sense telleth us that it is bread which we see, and feel, and eat after the Consecration. They know this; and therefore they must disown and deny this sort of proof.

2. But will they then admit of Proofs from Reason? No, that cannot be, if proof from sense be not admitted. For Reason receiveth its object by means or occasion of the senses, and must needs be deceived if it be deceived: And Reason hath not a principle that it holds faster, then that sense is to be credited; that this is white or black which my own eyes and the eyes of all other men do see to be so: and so that this is bread which we all see, and feel, and taste to be so. And therefore the Papists tell us that Reason must stoop to faith, that is, they will not stand to Reason when it contradicteth the doctrine of their sect. It seems they are in some parts of their Religion unreasonable. But I would know, whether they have any Reason to be unreasonable. If they have, then why might not our Reason be valid as well as their Reason which they bring against Reason? By which they contradict themselves. For if Reason be vain, why Reason they to prove its Vanity or invalidity? But if they have no Reason against Reason, let them confess it, and offer us none, and then their disputes will do no harm. We easily yield, that we have Reason to believe God's Revelations, about those things which

we had no Reason to believe if they were not Revealed: And that many of those Revelations are above Reason, so far as that Reason cannot discern the truth of the thing without them; yea it would rather judge the things improbable: But yet Revelations are received by Reason, and inform Reason, and not destroy it; nor do they so contradict Sense or Reason, as to make that credible which Sense and Reason have sufficient ground to judge false.

So that here we must break with a Papist, even where we might join in dispute with a heathen. And how will Papists deal with Heathens if they will deny the proofs from sense and reason?

3. But will they stand to the Validity of Proofs from Scripture? No; For 1. They take it to be but part of God's word, so that we may nor argue Negatively, [It is not in the holy Scripture: therefore it is not an Article of faith or a Law of God] For they will presently appeal to Tradition. 2. And even so much as is in Scripture, though they confess it to be true, yet they confess it not to be by us intelligible, and will not admit of any proof from it, but with this limitation, that you take it in that sense as the Church takes it. For they are sworn by the Trent Oath [to take it in that sense as the Holy Mother Church doth hold, and hath held it in, and never to take or interpret it but according to the unanimous sense of the Fathers.] So that they must know what sense all the Fathers are unanimous in before they can admit a proof from Scripture. And before that can be done, above a Cart-load of books must be read over or searched: and when thats done, they will find that most texts were never meddled with by most of those Fathers in their writings; and in those that they did meddle with, they disagreed in multitudes, and where they disagree they are not unanimous; and there the Papists are sworn to believe no sense at all. And if they would have come

down to a Major vote, it is no short or easy matter to gather the votes. And if they know the Fathers unanimous consent, yet must they have the sense of the present Church too: And is it not all one to make your adversary the Judge of your cause, as the Judge of your Evidences and all your proofs?

4. Well, but at least may we not hope that they will stand to the Judgment of the Catholic Church? And if so, we will not take it for our adversary? No: they will not do so neither. For 1. When they deny proof from sense and reason, they must needs deny all thats brought from the Church: For the Church cannot judge itself but on supposition of the infallibility of sense. 2. And when you argue from the judgment and practice of the greater part of the Church, they presently disclaim them all as Heretics or Schismatics, and will have no man be a Valid witness but themselves. The Greeks, the Ethiopians, the Armenians, the Protestants, all are Heretics or Schismatics save they; and therefore may not be witnesses in the case. So that you see upon what terms we stand with the Papists, that will admit of no proofs upon the Infallibility of Sense or Reason, or the sufficiency of Scripture, or the testimony of the Catholic Church, but only from themselves.

CHAP. XIII. Understand what they mean, when they call to you for a Judge of Controversies. How far a Judge is necessary, and who.

D*etect.* 4. Understand what the Papists mean when they are still calling to you for a Judge of Controversies.

If you would dispute with them, they are presently asking you, [Who shall be the judge?] and persuading you that it is in vain to dispute without a living Judge: for every man will be the Judge himself; and every man's cause will be right in his own eyes, and all the world will be still at odds till we are agreed who shall be the Judge.

To help you to see the sense of this deceit, and then to confute it; 1. You may easily observe that this is the plain drift of all, to persuade you to make them your judges, and yield the cause instead of disputing it. For it is no other judge but themselves that they will admit. Yield first that the Pope or his Council is the judge of all controversies, and then its folly to dispute against them: so that if you will yield them the cause first, they will then dispute with you after.

2. But what is to be said to the pretense of the Necessity of a Judge? I answer, 1. Its against all reason and experience to think that all enquiries or

disputes are vain, unless there be a Judge to decide the case. A Judge is a Ruling decider; not to satisfy men's minds, so much as to preserve Order, and Peace, and Justice in the Society. But there are thousands of cases to be privately discussed, that we never need to bring to a Judge. Every Husbandman, and Tradesman, and Navigator, and other Artificer doth meet with doubts and difficulties in his way which he laboreth to Discern, and satisfieth himself with a Judgment of Discretion without a Ruling Judge. We eat, and drink, and clothe ourselves, and follow our daily labors without a Judge, though we meet with controversies in almost all, what meat or drink is best for quality or quantity, and a hundred like doubts. Men do marry, and build, and buy, and sell, and take Physic, and dispatch their greatest worldly business without a Judge. Judges are only for such controverted cases as cannot well be decided without them, to the attaining of the Ends of Government.

2. Is it not against the daily practice of the Papists to think or say that all disputes and controversies must have a Judge? Who is the Judge between the Nominals, Reals and Formalists, the Dominicans, Franciscans and Jesuits, in all those controversies which have Cartloads of Books written on them? Their Pope or Councils dare not Judge between them. Do they not daily dispute in their Schools among themselves without a Judge? And still write books against one another without a Judge?

3. Understand well the use and differences of Judgment. The sentence is but a means to the execution: and Judges cannot determine the mind and will of man: but preserve outward Order, if men will not see the truth themselves. Me thinks the Jesuits that are so eager for free will, should easily grant that the Pope by his definition cannot determine the Will of man. And they see that Heretics remain Heretics, when the Pope hath said

all that he can: And if he can cure them all by his determinations, he is much to blame that he doth not. And if a man's mind be to be settled, an Infallible Teacher is fitter than a Judge. Judgment then being for Execution, when you ask, Who shall be the Judge? I answer that Judgment is either total, absolute and final: or it is only to a certain particular end, limited, and subordinate, from which there is an Appeal. In the former case, there is no Judge but Christ, and the Father by him. No absolute decision can be made till the great Judgment come; and then all will be fully and finally decided. And for the limited present Judgments of men, they are of several sorts, according to their several Ends. When the question is, Who shall be corporally punished as a Heretic? The Magistrate is Judge; For coercive punishment being his work, the Judgment must be his also. But when the question is, Who shall be excommunicated as an Heretic, as God's Law hath told us who in specie, and so is the Rule of decision about individuals: so to try individual persons, and cases according to this Law, belongs to the Governors of the Church: but not to the Governors of other Churches a thousand miles off, that never received such an authority, and are not capable of the work: but to the Governors of the Church in which the party hath Communion, and into which he shall at any time intrude and seek communion. And all men have a judgment of discerning that are concerned in the Execution.

So that if a disputing Papist will say that his business is not to Dispute with you, but to Excommunicate, or hang, or burn you for a Heretic, then I confess, its all the reason in the world that you should first agree of the Judge. But why the Pope should be the Judge, I know not, unless it be in his own charge.

CHAP. XIV. They pretend, that in their way there is an End of Controversies, but in ours there is none.

D*etect.* 5. When you have proceeded on these grounds, the Papists will tell you, that in their way there is an End of Controversies, but in yours there is none: For if you will not stand to ones Judgment as infallible, you may dispute as long as you live before you come to an End.

To direct you in discussing this part of the Deceit also: 1. We confess that on earth there will be no End of all controversies among the best: nor of the great controversies which salvation lieth on, between the believers and the unbelievers: that is, there will be still Infidelity and Heresy in the world, and error in the godly themselves. 1. Hath it not been so in every age till now? And why should we expect that it should now be otherwise? 2. Doth not Paul tell us that here we know but in part, and prophesy in part? And when is it that that which is imperfect will be done away, but when that which is perfect is come? While we know but in part, we shall differ in part.

2. Hath your way put an End to controversies any more than ours? Are you not yet at controversy with Infidels, Whether Christ be the Redeemer: and with Heretics whether he be true eternal God? Are you not yet as full of

controversies among yourselves, as any Christians on the face of the earth? I do not believe but in the many Volumes of your Schoolmen, Casuists, and Commentators, I can show more controversies yet depending, then you can find amongst any sort of Christians in the world; yea then you can find among all other Christians in the world set together.

3. And is there anything in your way that better tendeth to the deciding of controversies then in ours? Nothing at all; but contrarily, you have made more Controversies than you have ended. For, 1. We have a Certain infallible Rule to decide our controversies by, even such as you confess yourselves to be infallible; Even the Holy Scriptures: but you have an uncertain Rule, even the Decrees of your Popes and Councils, and the many Volumes of the Fathers, which are at odds among themselves; your very Rule is self-contradicting, and your Judges are together by the ears (as hath been shown.)

2. Our Faith consisteth in those points which are granted by yourselves, and so are beyond Controversy between us and you. But yours lieth also in a mixture of men's corruptions, which will ever be controverted and condemned.

3. Our Faith consisteth in the few ancient Articles by which the Church was always known (as to its essentials.) But you confound the Essentials with the integrals: and the Number of your necessary Articles is so great, as must needs be matter of more controversy than ours.

4. We know our Religion, and where to find it: For it is perfect at the first, and receiveth no additions or diminutions. One generation cometh, and another goeth, but the word of the Lord endureth forever. But you never know when you have all, because you know not when your Pope will have

done defining: that is an article of faith to you one year that was none the year before nor ever before.

5. We need no Judge to decide any controversies among us in the points of Absolute necessity to salvation: both because the Scripture is so plain in those points, as to serve for decision without a Judge; and because we abhor to make a controversy of any of them; and where there is no controversy, there needs no Judge. We are all agreed, through the plainness of the Scripture, that there is but one, Eternal, most Wise, and Good, and Omnipotent God; and that there is one Mediator between God and man, who is himself both God and man, that was crucified, dead, buried, went to ᾅδης, rose again, ascended, intercedeth for us, and is King and Head of the Church: and will raise the dead, and judge the world, some to Heaven, and some to Hell: These and all the rest of the Essentials of our faith, and many more points that are not essentials, are so plain in Scripture that we are past making them matter of Controversy. If any man deny an Essential point of faith, he is none of us, no more than of you. But you are it seems so deep in infidelity, that you must have a judge to decide your Controversies in the necessary Articles of Faith. For whatever is de fide, you make to be of such equal necessity, that you deride our distinguishing the Fundamentals from the rest, (as may be seen in Knots Infidelity unmasked against Chillingworth) Seriously tell us, Do you think Christians need a Judge, or must put it to a Judge to decide, whether Christ be the Messias or not? Whether he died and rose again or not? Whether he will judge the world or not? Or any such points. If he be a Judge, he must have power to oblige you to stand to his Determination on which side soever he determine. And what if John 22nd, determine that the soul is not immortal, or John 23rd, that

there is no resurrection or life to come, but a man dieth like a beast: would you stand to this decision?

6. If you say that your Judge hath power to oblige you only on one side, that is, when he judgeth right (and so make no Judge of him, but a Teacher) we have such Judges as well as you, even Teachers to show us the Evidence of truth.

7. If you say that you have a Judge to determine of heresies in order to the Punishing of them by the sword: So have we as well as you, and better than you. For your Pope is a Priest that hath nothing to do with the sword, (at least out of his own Principalities): but our Princes and other Rulers are lawful Magistrates, that are appointed to be a terror to evil doers, Rom. 13:4,6.

8. If you say that you have a Judge to determine of heresy in Order to Excommunication, so have we in every Church: even the Pastors of the Churches, who are bound to unite and assist each other in such works. What is to be accounted Heresy, the Law of God sufficiently determineth: And what particular persons are to be Judged heretics and excommunicated according to that Law, the particular Pastors that are on the place can better decide then a Pope that is a thousand, or five thousand miles off, and cannot hear the witnesses. And do you not yourselves decide almost all such cases through the world (that is of your subjection) by the present Pastors or Bishops, and not by the Pope? And why may not we do so then as well as you?

9. But if you lay all upon your Popes or Councils Infallibility, I desire you but to read my third Disputation in a Book against Popery, called the Safe Religion; and then believe that Infallibility if you can. I should think myself a miserable man, if I were not myself more Infallible then many of your

Popes have been. Every Christian (while such) is infallible in his belief of the Christian faith; And the Scripture is an infallible ground of our belief.

10. Is it not a plain Judgment of God upon you, that while you make the Scripture so dark and not intelligible, and cry up the Necessity of a living Judge, you should not only swarm with differences among yourselves, but should be utterly disagreed, and at a loss to know who is this Judge of Controversies, one saying it is the Pope, and another that its the Council; and what the better are you for saying, There must be a Judge, as long as you cannot tell Who it must be? Its not only uncertain among you Whether Pope or Council be the Infallible Judge, but also which is a true Pope, and which is a lawful General Council? For forty years at least together, the Church could not know the true Pope, but the more learned and conscionable men were divided: Nor is it known to this day. Frequently the strongest hath carried it, and success been his best title. Nay General Councils themselves knew not the right Pope. The Council at Constance and Basil knew not the right Pope. They of Basil thought Felix the fifth the true Pope, and Eugenius no Pope: But friends and strength confuted a General Council, and proved deposed Eugenius the Pope. And for Councils themselves, who knows which to take for currant and of Authority? What Catalogues have you of reprobated Councils, and of doubtful Councils, and partly approved, partly reprobate, and who knows which and how far; but only that is approved, that pleaseth the Pope, and that reprobate that displeased him, and yet perhaps approved by a former Pope: So that you are all in a confusion and uncertain about your true Popes and General Councils.

And if you knew them, yet what a loss are you at to know their Decrees and Canons? What a Fardel of false Decretal Epistles have you thrust upon

the world, as Blondell, Dalleus, Reynolds and others have fully proved. Forsooth decretals that use a translation of the Scripture that was formed a long time after the death of the supposed Authors of those Epistles: And Decretals which make mention of persons and things that were many score or hundred years after the death of the said Authors. These are your new Scriptures, and by these our faith must be regulated, and our controversies decided.

And your Canons are abundance of them as uncertain: some of your own will have but twenty Canons of the first General Council at Nice: some will have the new found rabble of additions. Much more uncertainty or certain forgery there is in the Canons called the Apostles: and the like we may say of abundance more.

And now I appeal to all the impartial Reason in the world, whether your voluminous, apocryphal, uncertain faith that needs a living Judge, and cannot find one, or agree upon him, and that leaves your controversies still undecided, be a liker way to peace and unity, then our short and plain Articles and infallible Scripture faith, that hath less matter of contention, and better means to prevent it, even faithful Teachers and Judges in every Church and Commonwealth, which shall so far determine as may preserve the peace of those societies, leaving the final full Decision of all to the Eternal Judge that is even at the door.

11. Yea and is not God's hand of Judgment yet more observable against you, that when your Popes and Councils have past their judgment, the several Sects are unable to understand them? Witness the late sentence against the Jansenists, of which the persons that seem to be condemned, say, that there is no such thing or words in all Jansen writings, as the Pope saith are in him, and condemneth as his: and the Controversy is as far from a

decision, as if the Pope had held his peace. Yea your great Disputer here in England, Thomas White the Novelist, is the same for all the Popes determination.

Take another instance in the forementioned Case, Whether the Pope or Council be supreme: The Councils of Constance and Basil determined it one way as de fide, and yet that made no end of the Controversy. The Council of Lateran and Pope Leo determined it the other way; and yet it is a Controversy after two contrary decisions: and some say one way, and some the oath: and some say, It is yet undecided (for fear of angering the French by casting them off as Heretics.) Another instance. The *Council at Basil Sess. 36*. (*p. 80, in Binius*) hath fully determined the Controversy between the Franciscans and Dominicans about the Virgin Mary's immaculate conception: and yet it is undetermined still; and Thomas White presumes to affirm, that [Certainly there is no Tradition for it, nor any probability that ever the Negative will be defined. *Apolog. for Tradit. p. 64,65,66*, yea he carrieth it as boldly out, as if never Council had made or meddled with it. I will therefore recite the words of the Council, which are these [A hard question hath been in diverse parts, and before this holy Synod, about the Conception of the glorious Virgin Mary, and the beginning of her Sanctification; some saying that the Virgin and her soul was for some time or instant of time actually under Original sin: others on the contrary, saying, that from the beginning of her Creation, God loving her, gave her grace by which preserving and freeing that blessed person from the Original spot—we, having diligently look into the authorities and reasons, which for many years past have in public relation on both sides been alleged before this holy Synod, and having seen many other things about it, and weighed them by mature consideration, do Define and Declare, that the doctrine affirming

that the glorious Virgin Mary the Mother of God, by the singular preventing and operating grace of God, was never actually under Original sin, but was ever free from all Original and actual sin, and was holy and immaculate, is to be approved, held and embraced of all Catholics as godly and Consonant to Church-worship, Catholic faith, right reason, and sacred Scripture: and that henceforth it shall be lawful for no man to preach and teach the contrary] Is not this plain Defining?

*Obj. But t*his was not an approved Council. *Answ.* 1. It was owned by Pope Eugenius himself. And here once for all I prove that the Council of Basil was approved by the Pope: for Pope Felix the fifth (one of the best Popes that ever Rome had this thousand years) approved it in this point: not only by accepting their election, but in express terms [professing firmly to hold the faith of the Councils of Constance and Basil, and to keep it inviolate to a tittle, and confirm it with his soul and blood: promising faithfully to labor to defend the Catholic faith, and for the execution and observation of the Decrees of the Councils of Constance and Basil, swearing to prosecute the celebration of General Councils, and confirmation of Elections, according to the Decrees of the Holy Council of Basil] See Binius *Ses. 40, p. 87*. If they say that Felix was not a true Pope: I answer, then Martin the fifth chosen by the Council at Constance was no true Pope; and then where is your succession? These things are plain and cannot be denied, though unconscionable shifters, that argue according to their Wills, may find words to be guile the simple.

2. It seems then your Catholic Church representative is nothing if one man like it not.

One more instance: How largely hath the Council of Trent dealt about original sin: And yet the foresaid Thomas White ibid. saith thus [If the

People were taught Original sin is nothing but a Disposition to evil, or a natural weakness, which unless prevented brings infallibly sin and damnation: and that in itself it deserves neither reproach nor punishment, as long as it proceeds not to actual sin, the heat of vulgar devotion would be cooled, &c.] See here a mere Pelagian issue of all the Determinations about Original sin, which they should swear to believe.

CHAP. XV. Their boast of Unity, and reproaching us with Divisions.

D*etect.* 6. And by this that hath been said, you may see what to think of their glorying in their Unity, and accusing our Divisions. One of the principal arguments that they prevail by, is by telling the people into how many sects we are divided, and that the Catholic Church is but one: but we are many: and here they will tell you of all the names they can reckon up, Presbyterians, Independents, Anabaptists, Antinomians, Arminians, Socinians, Quakers, and what not. And they will tell you that all this Division comes by departing from the Roman Catholic Church; every man being left to be of what Religion his fancy leadeth him to, for want of a universal Judge of controversies. And they will ask you what reason you have among all these Sects to believe one of them rather than another? So that they would persuade you that there is no way for Unity but by turning to be Papists, that we may be united in the Pope of Rome.

To all this deceit (for it is no better) we give them our full answer in these Propositions. 1. It is not every kind of unity that is desirable: but Unity with truth, and honesty, and safety. Its easier to agree in evil then in good: for

evil findeth more friendship with corrupted nature, and hath more servants in the world. The wicked are more agreed, and far more in number, of one mind, then the Godly are. The Mohammedans are far more agreed; and that in a far greater number, then the Papists are. The Devils have some agreement in their way: They are all agreed to hate Christ and his members, and to seek night and day whom they may devour. It is easier to agree in a Papists work then in ours: To center carnally in a sinful (and oft a most wicked) man; to agree in certain forms and ceremonies, which flesh and blood is glad to delude themselves with, instead of the Life of faith and Love; its easy to agree in such a carnal religion. To spare the labor and time of study and searching after truth, and to cast their souls upon the faith of others, even the Pope or a Council, this is an easy thing for lazy ungodly men to agree in: But to make the Truth our Own, and get the Law of Christ written in our own hearts, and to live upon it, and walk in the light, and embrace all those truths that are most against our fleshly inclination and interest, this is not so easy for corrupted nature to agree upon.

2. Christ hath told us that it is a little flock to whom he gives the Kingdom, Luk. 12:32, and that the gate is strait, and the way narrow that leads to life, and few there be that find it; and the gate is wide and the way broad that leads to destruction, and many there be that enter at it. And therefore it is no great wonder if error and sin have the greater number.

3. And yet for all this I dare boldly say that there is a far more excellent Unity and Concord among the true Reformed Catholics, then among the Papists, and that they do but cheat poor souls with the false pretense of unity. And this I shall make appear to you as followeth.

1. As I have said before, they are utterly divided and disagreed about that very power in which they should unite, and which they pretend must agree

them in all other things. One half of them are for the Sovereignty of a Pope, and the other of a General Council: and that as a point of faith. So that there is no possibility of Union with them, that are divided in the very point in which they invite us to Unite with them. If the eye be dark how shall the body see? If they cannot agree about that power that they say must agree them in all things else, what hope of an agreement with them?

But for our parts we are all agreed that Christ only is the head of the Church, and in him we all unite.

2. With us, they are usually but here and there a straggling person, or some few half-witted self-conceited Novices that fall off and disagree from us in anything that destroyeth salvation: But with the Papists, Princes are against Princes, and Nations against Nations, and which is much more, General Councils against General Councils, even in the Foundation of their faith. So that let the General Councils be never so full and learned, and justly called, yet if they be against the Popes Sovereignty over them, the other party call them but *Conciliabula*, false Councils and Conventicles. Of how great moment this difference is, let the learned Cajetan be a witness, who in his Oration in the Council at the Lateran, under Leo 10th, inveighing against the Councils at Pisa, Constance and Basil, makes one to be Babel, and the other Jerusalem.

3. As I proved before, the Papists are divided into two several pretended Catholic Churches by making themselves two Sovereigns: but so are not we: For we have but one Head Jesus Christ. That they are two Churches (besides what is said) hear the words of Cajetan in the foresaid Oration (in *Bin. p. 552*.) [This Novelty of Pisa, sprung up at Constance, and vanished. At Basil it sprung up again and is exploded: and if you be men, it will now also be repressed as it was under Eugenius the fourth. For it cometh not

from heaven, and therefore will not be lasting. Nor doth it embrace the Principality of that One, who is in the Church triumphant, and preserveth the Church militant; and which the Synod of Pisa ought to embrace if it came from heaven, and not, as it doth, to rely on the Government of a multitude. The Church of the Pisans therefore doth far differ from this Church of Christ. For one is the Church of believers: the other of Cavilers: One of the household of God; the other of the Erroneous: One (is the Church) of Christian men: the other of such as fear not to tear the coat of Christ, and divide the mystical members of Christ from his mystical body.] This was spoken in Council with applause. And can there yet be greater divisions then these?

4. They have been utterly divided about the very power of choosing their Pope, in whom they must unite. In one age the People chose him: In another the Clergy chose him; sometime both together: For a long time the Emperors chose him: At last only the Cardinals chose him. And sometime a General Council hath chosen him. Our Catholic Church hath no such uncertain Head, but one thats the same yesterday today and forever.

5. They have often had two or three Popes at once, and one part of the Church hath followed one, and another the other: yea (as is said for forty years together, none knew the true Pope) saith *Cajetan ubi sup*. [Of the Schism of that time there were three so accounted Popes, that none of them might be esteemed the Successor of Peter either certain, or without ambiguity.] For many ages one part hath been running after one, and the other after the other, or striving about them. But we are all agreed in our Head without Controversy.

6. They have killed multitudes of persons in their divisions about the choice of their Pope (as in Damasus choice) And they have had many

bloody wars to the dividing of the Church about their Popes and between Pope and Pope. This was their Unity. It would make a Christian ashamed and grieved to read of the lamentable wars and divisions of Christendom, either between or about their Popes.

7. Their Popes and Christian Emperor, Kings and Princes, have been in yet longer and more grievous wars.

8. They have set Princes against Princes, and Nations against Nations in wars about the Causes of the Popes for many ages together: and it is too seldom otherwise.

9. They have set Kings and their own subjects together in wars, as England and almost all Christendom hath known by sad experience.

10. They have Excommunicated Princes, and encouraged their subjects to expel them, and to murder them: hence were the inhumane murders of Henry the third, and Henry the fourth, Kings of France; and the Powder Plot, and may Treasons in England: This is their Unity.

11. They center and unite the Church in an impotent, insufficient Head, that is not able to do the Office of a Head, to the hundredth part of the Church, and therefore cannot possibly preserve unity. But our Head is all-sufficient.

12. They set up not only a Controverted head, which all the Churches never agreed to, nor ever will do, but also a false usurping Head, which the Churches dare not and ought not to unite in. Whereas Jesus Christ is beyond controversy the just and lawful Head of the Church.

13. Your Agreement and Unity is with none but your own sect: and is this so great a matter to boast off? You divide yourselves from most of the Catholic Church, and cast them off as Heretics, or Schismatics; and then boast of a Unity among yourselves. And so may the Quakers, the

Anabaptists, the Socinians, as well as you: Or if you magnify your Unity from the greatness of your number that agree, the Greek Church also is numerous: and yet in this we far exceed you. For the true Catholic is in Union with all the Members of Christ on earth. We lay our Unity on the Essentials of Christianity, and so are united with all true Christians in the world: even with many of them that reproach us: when you laying your Unity on I know not how many doubtful points, yea, on you know not what yourselves, can extend it no further then to your sect. Which is the more notable and glorious Unity? To be United to the truly Catholic body, containing all true Christians in the world, or to be at Unity with a sect, which is the lesser and more corrupted part of the Church?

14. With what face can Papists glory in their Unity, that are the greatest Dividers of the Church on earth? Who is it that condemneth the greatest part of the Church, and prosecuteth that condemnation with fire and sword, or so much vehemence, as the Papists do? When they have most audaciously divided themselves from all others, and arrogated the title of Catholics to themselves, they call this abominable Schism by the name of Unity. If you say that the Reformers have divided themselves from all others too: I answer, not as from Heretics, or no members of the same body with us, as you do: but only as from unsound mistaken Brethren: And therefore properly we are not divided from them, but only from their mistakes. We think it not lawful to join with the dearest Brethren in sinning, or in that worship (by personal local communion) where we cannot keep our innocence: But yet we hold the unity of the Spirit with them in the bond of Peace: and are one with them in all the substance of Christianity, and holy worship. Even where distance of place, or circumstantial differences keep us from Communion in the same Assemblies: yet our several

Assemblies have communion in faith, and Love, and the substance of worship as to the kind, so that our division from other Christians is nothing to the Papists.

15. But yet when any differ from us in any point Essential to our Religion (that is, to Christianity,) they are none of us, nor owned by us; and therefore you cannot say that we are at difference among ourselves, because some Apostates have fallen off from us. You will not allow us to say you have many sects, because some of you have turned Socinians, or because thousands of yours have turned to the Reformers, in the days of Luther, Calvin, &c. And why then should those sects be numbered with us that are not of us, but went out from us? If men turn Infidels, Seekers, Quakers, Socinians, &c. they are not of us no more than of you. If you say that we bred them: I answer, no more than you breed them, when they turn to the same sects from you: Nor no more then you bred the Lutherans, far better men. They went out from you, and yet you bred them not: But on the other side, you cherish those as part of your Church, which differ from you in your fundamentals; so that the Pope dare not unchurch or disown them (as the French, &c.) but so do not we.

16. Our Unity is in Positives, and theirs is in Negatives: Ours is a Unity in faith; and theirs is in not believing the contrary: And so dead men, may have a fuller Unity in the grave then the Papists have.

17. Our Union is Divine, having a Divine Head and Center, and Divine Doctrine and Law in which we agree. But the Papists is human, having a carnal Head and Center, and Human Decrees and Canons for its matter and Rule.

18. They have not so sure a means of retaining men in their unity as we have: Let experience be Judge of this: For where one hath forsaken our

Unity and Communion, I suppose hundreds, if not thousands, have forsaken theirs, as France, Belgium, Germany, Sweden, Denmark, Poland, Hungary, Transylvania, England, Scotland, Ireland, &c. can witness: and if themselves might be believed, the Greek Church, and all, or almost all the Christians else in the world have gone from their unity. And yet will they glory in the effectualness of their means of unity? Why then did they not retain all these Nations in their unity?

19. Moreover, indeed they have very little Religious unity at all among them; for its force and terror that keeps men in their Church: And who can tell under such violence how many stick to them in Conscience and willingly? He that will forsake their Religion in Spain, must be tormented and burnt at a stake, and in other Countries where they have full power, he must be at least undone. So that 1. Theirs is a unity of bodies more than of minds: 2. And their union is not procured by the Pope as Pope; but by the temporal sword, which the Pope hath usurped over some countries, and which deluded Princes use by his persuasion in other Countries. What a juggling deceit then is this, to persuade poor souls, that the only way to unity is to Center in the Pope of Rome, and that this is the most effectual means of ending differences! When in the mean they make so little use of it, and place so little confidence in it themselves, but uphold their unity by the Magistrates sword? And if this be the way, we have Magistrates among us as well as they, that can as effectually compel men to unity, as far as their Judgments tell them it is fit: And besides this force, it is the riches and preferment of their Clergy, with their immunity from secular power, and the like, that is the means of their unity. But it is the light of holy Scripture opened by a faithful Ministry, and countenanced by Christian Magistracy without tyranny, that is our means of unity.

If the Papal Headship be so effectual a means of unity as they pretend, and if they are so much of a mind as they say, let them give us leave but to preach one 12 months in Spain and Italy if they dare: or let them give men leave without fire and sword to choose their Religion.

20. And yet besides all this, and after all this tyranny, they have more difference among themselves then we have, or then all the Christians that I hear of in the world. And to hide the Infamy of their differences, they tolerate them, and extenuate them. For differences in Discipline, and order of Worship they allow abundance of sects called Orders, that men and women may choose which they please. And the voluminous differences of their Schoolmen, Casuists and Commentators, they say are not in matters of faith. But call them what you will, they are many of them greater differences then are with us. I pray read over the Jansenians Mystery of Jesuitism, and take notice of the differences between the Jesuits and them in Case- Divinity, and judge whether they be small. And let it not offend your ears if I recite some of their Differences in that Papists own words, as he cites the Jesuits, and tells you where to find what he saith.

Pag. 89. Filintius the Jesuit holds, that if a man have purposely wearied himself with satisfying a whore, that he might be dispensed with from fasting on a fasting day, he is not obliged to fast, But the Jansenians think otherwise.

Basilius Pontius and Bunny the Jesuits teach, that a man may seek an opportunity of sinning *primo & per se*, when the spiritual or temporal concernment of ourselves or our neighbors inclineth him thereto, But the Jansenists think the contrary: p. 91.

Eman. Sa the Jesuit holds, that [a man do what he conceives lawful according to a probable opinion, though the contrary be the more certain:

and for this the Opinion of one grave Doctor is sufficient.] And Filintius the Jesuit held [that it is lawful to follow the less probable opinion, though it be the less certain, and that this is the common opinion of modern authors] p. 95. And yet the Jansenists are against it.

Layman the Jesuit holds, that [If it be more favorable to them that ask advice of him, and more desired, it is Prudence to give them such advice as is held probable by some knowing person, though he himself be convinced that it is absolutely false.] But the Jansenists are against this. p. 96.

Bunney the Jesuit holds [that when the patient follows a probable opinion, the confessor is bound to absolve him, though his judgment be contrary to that of the penitent: and that he sins mortally if he deny him absolution] *Myster. of Jesuit. p. 97*. But the Jansenists deny this.

Father Reginaldus and Cellot hold, that [the modern Casuists in questions of Morality are to be preferred before the ancient Fathers, though they were nearer the Apostles times] p. 98. But the Jansenists think otherwise.

Pope Gregory the fourteenth declareth Murderers unworthy to have Sanctuary in Churches. But the Jesuits and Jansenists agree not who are the Murderers. The *29 Jesuits in their Praxis p. 600*, by murderers understand those who have taken money to kill one treacherously: and that those who kill without receiving any reward, but do it only to oblige their friends, are not called murderers.] But the Jansenists think otherwise. (No marvel if you cannot understand the Scripture without a judge, when you can no better understand your judge, no not what he means by a murderer.)

Vasquez the Jesuit saith [that in this Question, rich men are obliged to give alms out of their superfluity; though the affirmative be true, yet it will seldom or never happen, that it is obligatory in point of practice] p. 105. But the Jansenists think otherwise.

Valentia the Jesuit, *Tom. 3, p. 2042*, holds, that [If a man give money not as the price of a Benefice, but as a Motive to resign it, it is not Simony, though he that resigns do look at the money as his Principal end] and so *Tannerus, p. 115*. But the Jansenists think otherwise.

Father Gaspar Hurtado saith [that an Incumbent may without mortal sin wish the death of him that hath a pension out of his living, and a son his fathers death; and may rejoice when it happens, so it proceed only from a consideration of the advantage accruing to him thereby, and not out of any personal hatred] p. 136. But the Jansenists believe not this.

Layman the Jesuit, and Pet. Hurtado: thinks that a man may lawfully fight a duel, accepting the challenge to defend his honor or estate, p. 138. But the Jansenist thinks otherwise.

Sanchez and Navarrus allow a man to murder his adversary secretly, or dispatch him at unawares to avoid the danger of a duel: p. 140. And Molina thinks you may kill one that wrongfully informs against us in any Court: and Reginaldus, that you may kill the false witnesses which the prosecutor brings; And Tannerus and Immanuel Sa, that you may kill both witnesses and judge which conspire the death of an innocent person] But so think not the Jansenists.

Henriquez saith [one man may kill another who hath given him a box on the ear, though he run away for it, provided he do it not out of hatred or revenge, and that by that means a gap be open for excessive murder, destructive to the State. And the reason is, a man may as well do it in pursuance of his reputation, as his goods; and he that hath had a box on the ear is accounted dishonorable till he hath killed his enemy.] And Azorius saith, Is it lawful for a person of quality to kill one that would give him a box on the ear, or a bang with a stick? Some say not—But others affirm it

lawful, and for my part I think it probable, when it cannot be avoided otherwise: For if it were not, the reputation of innocent persons were still exposed to the insolency of the malicious.] p. 142,143,144, many other are of the same mind, in so much that Father Lessius saith [It is lawful, by the consent of all Casuists, to kill him that would give a box on the ear, or a blow with a stick, when a man cannot otherwise avoid it p. 145. Father Boldellus saith It is lawful to kill him that saith to you [thou liest] if a man cannot right himself otherwise.] And Lessius saith [If you endeavor to ruin my reputation by opprobrious speeches before persons of honor, and that I cannot avoid them otherwise then by killing you, may I do it? According to modern Authors I may; nay though the crime you lay to my charge be such as I am really guilty of, it being supposed to have been so secretly committed, that you cannot discover it by ways of justice. It is proved, if when you would take away my reputation by giving me a box on the ear, it is in my power to prevent it by force of arms, the same defense is certainly lawful, when you would do me the same injury with your tongue. Besides, a man may avoid the affront of those whose ill language he cannot hinder. In a word, honor is more precious than life, but a man may kill in defense of his life, ergo, he may kill in defense of his honor] p. 146. But the Jansenists are against all this.

Escombar saith, that regularly it is lawful to kill a man for the value of a crown, according to *Molina. p. 151*. Father Amicus saith [It is lawful for a Church-man, or a Religious man to kill a detractor that threatens to divulge the scandalous crimes of his community or himself, when there is no other means left to hinder him from doing it, as if he be ready to scatter his calumnies, if not suddenly dispatched out of the way] p. 152,153. And Caramovel in his *Fundamental Theology* takes it for certain, and thence

concludes, that [a Priest not only may kill a detractor on certain occasions, but sometimes ought to do it] And yet the peevish Jansenist believeth none of this.

But I must stop: you may read in the said Jansenians *Mystery of Jesuitism*, a volume of such passages of the Jesuits, allowing men to give and receive the Sacrament when they come that day from Adultery: and allowing a man to eat and drink as much as he can with his health: and discharging men from a Necessity of Loving God, unless it be once in their lives, or as others say, upon Holy-days, or as Hurtado de Mendoza, once a year, or as Conink, once in three or four years, or as Henriquez, once in five years, or as Anthon. Sirmond, not at all, so we do not hate him, and do obey his other commands, with abundance more.

Now Reader I would here leave it to thy consideration, whether all these differences among the Papists are so small as to be no matters of faith. And I entreat you to read over the forementioned Book, (the Mystery of Jesuitism) and then judge whether Papists or the Reformed Catholics are more at unity among themselves.

Well! But suppose the loving of God, the avoiding murder, bribery, and the like, be no matter of faith at Rome, yet I have not done with them so. I desire to know whether the holy Scripture be matter of faith or not? They dare not deny but it is. Well! And what is the Scripture, but the words *ut signa*, and the sense or matter *ut res significata*? And are the Papists agreed among themselves about either of these? No: For the words, its well known how some of the best Learned of them have stood for the preeminence of the Hebrew and Greek Texts: and others, and the most, for the vulgar Latin. And that vulgar Latin Translation hath been altered and altered again by them. And after many others comes Pope Sixtus the fifth, and makes it so

complete, that the Church is required to use his Edition; yet after him comes Pope Clement the eighth and mends it in many hundred, if not thousand places, and imposes this upon the Church; which of these Popes was Infallible? I am sure they much differ in their Translations.

And for the sense of scripture, though men must swear to take Scripture in the Churches sense, yet will not any Pope or Council to this day, tell us the sense of them, either by giving us an infallible Commentary, or by deciding the many thousand differences that are among their Commentators. Do not all these Commentators forswear themselves, having sworn (those that lived since the Council of Trent) to expound Scripture in the sense of the Church, and only according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers. And why doth not the Pope decide these controversies? Seeing it is their happiness to have such a Judge of Controversies to keep them all of a mind?

But perhaps they will say, that all these Scriptures be not matters of faith. No! Where are we then? What is matter of faith if Scripture be not? And if all be not, how shall we know which is? But at least, tell us, Is no one of all those many hundred or thousand Texts which your Commentators differ about any matter of Faith? If not, then sure you have no Faith. If it be, then surely the Papists differ among themselves in matters of Faith. It is not a few Texts that Lyra's excepter and Burgensis differ about, to name no more. And of the foresaid Editions of the Bible by Pope Sixtus, and Clement, see *Dr. Jame's Bellum Papale, vel Concordia discors*.

CHAP. XVI. Their confounding the Essentials and Integrals of Christianity.

D*etect.* 7. By what hath been said, you may discern how to deal with them, when they would industriously confound the Essentials and the Integral parts of our Faith: for this is another of their juggling's.

They cannot endure to hear us distinguish the fundamentals (that is, the Essentials) of our Religion from the rest: and therefore they call out to us for a Catalogue of our fundamentals; and would persuade us that whatsoever is matter of faith, is of Necessity to salvation to be believed, and those are damnable Heretics that deny them, and therefore we must not make any such difference. See Knot against Chillingworth. Their design in this is to persuade people that the world must be wholly of their mind in matters of faith, or else they cannot be saved. And by this trick they would prove that the Protestants and many other Churches are all Heretics, and therefore have no place in General Councils, and are no parts of the Catholic Church. But let us consider how judiciously they proceed.

1. We must desire the Papists to tell us whether Christianity be anything or nothing? If anything, it hath its Essence: and 2. Whether this Essence of

Christianity be Knowable or not? If not, then they cannot know a Christian from another: and they cannot know the Church from other Societies. If it be knowable, then its Essence must needs be knowable. 3. And we would be informed by them, whether all true Christians in the world are of the same stature or degree of knowledge and explicit belief? If they be, then there's no difference between Fathers and Babes, Strong and Weak, Priest and People; and then the Jesuits have no more Knowledge or Faith then the simplest woman of their Church: but if there be a difference, then 4. We would know whether the Essence of Christianity be varied according to these degrees. If so, then there are as many sorts of Christianity in the world, as there be degrees of Faith; which they have more wit, I suppose, then to affirm. If not, then the Essence of Christianity is distinguishable from the Integrity or superadded Degrees, which is the thing that we contend for. 5. We desire also to know whether the Apostles did not go on to teach their people more, after they had made them Christians, in a state of salvation. And whether the Priests, Friars, and Jesuits will give men up, and teach them nothing more when they have made them Christians. I know they will say, There's more to be taught. And if so, then the Essentials of Christianity are distinguishable from the Integrals or Degrees. 6. And we would know else how they will understand that in Heb. 5:10,11,12,14, and 6:1,2. [For when for the time ye ought to be Teachers, ye have need that one teach you again which be the first principles of the Oracles of God, and are become such as have need of milk and not of strong meat. For everyone that useth milk is unskillful in the word of righteousness, for he is a babe. But strong meat belongeth to them that are of full age, who by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern good and evil: therefore leaving the Principles of the doctrine of Christ, let us go on to perfection, not laying

again the foundation, &c.] Tell us now whether the Apostle do not here distinguish between babes and strong men; milk and strong meat; the principles or foundation and perfection? 7. And we would know of them whether all that is Revealed by God be of absolute Necessity to every man's salvation that do or may hear it? If so, then no man can be saved that knoweth not all that God hath revealed; and then no one in the world can be saved: for here we know but in part. And their own Commentators differ about the word of God, which showeth that they are imperfect in the Knowledge of its sense. And their Pope knows it not, or else he is shamefully to blame, that will not tell it the world, and reconcile his Commentators and Disputers. But if all revealed be not of Absolute Necessity, then we may have leave to distinguish between points absolutely Necessary, and the rest.

8. And we would know whether all shall be damned, that know not as much as the most Learned and Wise? If not, then still we may have leave to distinguish. 9. Further we demand, whether any ignorance or error that is culpable, will stand with Charity and Salvation? If not, then who shall be saved? If yea; then we may still distinguish the points of Absolute Necessity from the rest. 10. We demand also, whether the whole holy Scripture be the word of God? If so, then whether we ought not to believe it all as far as we can understand it? And if so, whether it be not all, de fide matter of Faith? If not, they must tell us, what part of God's word is to be believed, and what not. If yea; then certainly men may err *de fide* in points of Faith, and yet have Charity, and be saved: as their disagreeing Commentators, Casuists and Schoolmen do. 11. We would know whether the matters that their Divines are disagreed in, be Revealed by God, or things unrevealed? If not revealed, do they not deserve to be kicked out of the world, for troubling

the world so with unrevealed things? If they be Revealed, are they not Revealed to be believed, and so are *de fide*? 12. And we would know whether there be not some things Essential to true Obedience, and some things not Essential? If not, then no sinner hath sincere Obedience, and can be saved: If yea; then why may not the same be said of faith? 13. Also we would know, when they baptize the Adult, whether they require any profession of the faith from them or not? If not, they may as well baptize Infidels or Heathens. If they do, then what is that profession? Is it a profession of every particular truth that God hath revealed to be believed? No sure: for then none but Doctors must be baptized. Nor they neither. Or is it a profession of some particular Truths only? If of some only, why of those more than the rest, if they be not the Essentials distinguishable from the rest? And do they make men true Christians by baptizing them, or not? If they do, then sure the Baptismal faith must contain all that is Essential to Christianity. 14. We desire also to be informed by them, what is the use of the Churches Creed, and why they have used frequently to make confession of their faith? Was it not the whole faith Essential to Christianity which they confessed? If not, then it was not fit to be the badge of the Church; or of the Orthodox: if yea; then it seems those Creeds had in them the essentials distinguished from the rest. 15, we would know whether everything delivered or defined by any General Council, be of such necessity to salvation, that all must explicitly believe them all that will be saved? If so, then whether any Papist can be saved, seeing they understand them not all? If not, then sure a distinction must be made.

16. And we would know how they can countenance ignorance so much as they do, if all things revealed be of equal necessity to salvation. 17. And what mean they to distinguish of Implicit and Explicit faith? Is it enough to

believe as the Church believes, and not know what in any particular? Then it is not de fide, or necessary to salvation to believe the resurrection of Christ, or of man, or the life to come. For a man may believe that the Church is in the right, and yet not know that it holdeth any of these. Is it enough to believe the formal object of faith (which with us is God's veracity) without the material? Or is it enough to remain Infidels, and only believe that the Church are true Believers? If you hold to this, you make no act of faith, but one (the believing that the Church, that is, the Pope or Council are true believers) to be of Necessity to salvation. But if there be something that is Necessary to be actually (that is explicitly) believed, then must not that be distinguished from the rest and made known? 18. Whence is it that you denominate men *fideles*, believers with you? Is it from a Positive faith, or for not holding the contrary? If the latter, then Stones, and Beasts, and Pagans, and their Infants may be believers. If the former, then that Positive faith from whence all believers are denominated must be known. 19. Is not that true faith and all that is essential to Christianity, which doth consist with saving grace or (to use your phrase) with true Charity? If not, then either Infidels and no Christians may have true Charity, or else true Charity may be in the unjustified; or both: If yea, (which doubtless you will yield) then sure men of lower knowledge and faith then Doctors, may have true Charity; and therefore true faith. 20. Lastly, I appeal to your own confessions. Bellarmine often distinguisheth between the points that all must of Necessity explicitly believe, and the rest. And Suarez in three parts. *Thom. Disp. 43. Sect. 4*, saith of the Article of Christ's descending into Hell [If by an Article of faith we understand a truth which all the faithful are bound explicitly to know and believe, so I do not think it necessary to reckon this among the Articles of faith, because it is

not altogether necessary for all men] Here you see that Suarez distinguisheth between Articles of Necessity to all, and those that are not: and that he excepts even the Descent into Hell from this number of Articles Necessary to all I might cite many more of your writers; but the thing is well known.

But perhaps you will say, that though all that is de fide, be not necessary to be believed explicitly by all, yet implicitly it must. I *Answ*. 1, that which you call Implicit believing is no believing that point, but another point: yea a point that doth not so much as infer that: for it followeth not [the Church is infallible, therefore Christ descended into Hell.]

2. And we believe all that is de fide with an Implicit faith as well as you: But it is an Implicit Divine faith, and not human: For we are sure that All that God saith is true; and this Divine veracity is the formal object of our faith. And we believe that all that is in Scripture is true, and that all that was ever delivered by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost is true.

Obj. *But a*ll that is de fide is so necessary, that it will not stand with salvation to believe the contrary, or deny or dis-believe any point of faith. *Answ.* 1. That cannot be true, For no man can prove that a point may not be denied and disputed against by a true Believer as long as he is ignorant that it is true, and from God: the same ignorance that keeps him from knowing it, may cause him to deny it, and gainsay it. 2. Do not your own differing Commentators, Schoolmen and Casuists (on one side at least) dispute voluminously against some Truths of Divine revelation? If you change a man's mind from the smallest error by dispute, do you take that to be a change of his state from death to life? Aenaeas Sylvius thought a General Council was above the Pope: but when he came to be Pope Pins the second, he thought the Pope above a General Council; was this a change from death

to life? It seems by his Bull of Retractation, he thought so, but so did not several General Councils: was the Catholic Church Representative at the Council of Basil, or Constance, or Pisa in a state of death and damnation for believing the Pope to be subject to a General Council? Or was the Council at Lateran (another Representative Catholic Church) in a state of death for holding the Contrary? Must either Pope John the twenty second, or Pope Nicolas be damned because of the contrariety of their Decrees? If the Council of Toletane the first ordain that he that hath a Concubine instead of a wife, shall not be kept from the Sacrament, doth it prove them all in a state of death? If Bellarmine confess that the sixth General Council at Constantinople have many errors, doth it follow that the Catholic Church representative was in a damnable state? If the second Council at Nice maintain the corporeity of Angels, and the first Council at the Latarane maintain the contrary, doth it follow that one of them was in a state of death? I think not: (though I am sure it proves a General Council fallible, when approved by the Pope, and therefore Popery a deceit.) Bellarmine sometime tells us of the change of his own mind.

And the Retractations of Austin (a better man) tell us of the change of his mind in many things: And yet it followeth not that he was in a state of death and unjustified before.

*Obj. But a*ll that is *de fide* is of Necessity to the Salvation of some, though not of all. *Answ.* 1. If that be granted, yet you must grant us leave to distinguish between Points necessary to be believed by all, and points that are not thus necessary to all. 2. But in what case is it that you mean, that other points are of Necessity to some? 1. Is it to those some that know them to be of Divine Revelation? We easily grant you that: But that is not because the Things themselves are simply necessary to Salvation, but

because a Belief of God's veracity, and the Truth of all that he Revealeth in general, is of necessity: and he that Believeth that God is True (*verax*) cannot choose but believe all to be True which he knows God revealeth. He that thinketh God to be a Liar, in one word, doth not believe his veracity, and so hath no Divine faith at all. And therefore you need not fear lest any one should be guilty of not believing that which they know is the word of God, but those that take God to be a Liar, and that is those that take him not to be God, and so are Atheists. But still the thing of Absolute necessity is but first to believe in General that God is true in all his word, secondly and to believe the truth of the essential points of Christianity in particular (embracing the Good propounded in them.) Now its true that secondarily all known Truths are of necessity to be believed, because else our General belief of God's veracity is not sincere. But yet we must say that antecedently even to that person, these superadded truths were not of Necessity to his Salvation to be believed, because they were not of such Necessity to be Known; and if they had not been known, you would say yourselves there had not been such Necessity of Believing them.

But if you go further, and say, that all that were obliged to know them, or that had opportunity, or the Revelation if the truth, and yet did not, and thereupon deny them culpably, are in a state of death; I deny that, and shall prove it false. Its true, that a willful refusing the Light, because men love darkness rather than light, is a certain sign of a graceless wretch. But every culpable ignorance and unbelief is not Damning ignorance or unbelief.

1. Otherwise no man should be saved: For no man is void of culpable ignorance, and consequently of culpable unbelief. Had we never been wanting in the use of means, there's no man but might have known more then he doth. Is there any one of you that dare refuse to ask God forgiveness

of your ignorance, unbelief, or the negligence that is the culpable cause of them, or that dare say, you need no pardon of them? 2. If you plead for venial sin, how can you deny a venial unbelief upon venial ignorance? But then I pray you learn more wit and piety, 1. Then to say that your venial unbelief or sin is no sin, save as Analogically so called; or 2. Then to say it deserves a pardon, or deserves not everlasting punishment. But if you will call it venial, because being consistent with the true Love of God and habitual Holiness, and saving faith, the Law of Grace doth pardon it, and not condemn men for it, thus we would agree with you that there is venial sin; but then you must yield us that there is venial unbelief.

3. And we easily prove all this from the Law of God. It is the nature of the preceptive part to constitute Duty only, and the violation of that is sin: But it is the sanction, the promise and threatening that Determines of the Reward and Penalty: Now it is only the old Law of works that makes the Threatening as large as the prohibition, condemning man for every sin: but so doth not the Law of Grace. The precept still commandeth Perfect obedience, and so makes it a duty; but the promise maketh not perfect obedience the condition of Salvation; but Faith, Repentance and sincere Obedience, though imperfect. The Law of Nature still makes everlasting Death due to every sin: But it is such a Due as hath a Remedy at hand provided and offered in the Gospel; and is actually remedied to all true believers. So that as it is not every sin that will damn us, though damnation be due to it (because we have a present Remedy;) so it is not every culpable ignorance or unbelief that will damn us, though it deserve damnation, because the Gospel doth not only not damn us for it, but pardons it, by acquitting us from the condemnation of the Law. All this may teach you, not only to mend your abominable doctrine about Mortal and venial sin, but

also to discern the reason why a man may deny some points of faith that are not of the essence of Christianity, and yet not be damned for it, because the Law of Grace doth not condemn him for it, though he be culpable, because the Law of Grace may command further then it peremptorily condemneth in case of disobedience. It is the Promise that makes faith the Condition of Life, though it be the Precept that makes it a duty: Now it saveth not as a performed Duty directly, (because the precept gives not the Reward) but as a performed Condition: And therefore unbelief condemneth not effectually as a mere sin directly, but as such a sin as is the violation or non-performance of that condition. But it is not a belief of everything that is preceptively *de fide*, which is made the condition of life.

CHAP. XVII. Their extolling the judgment of the Catholic Church.

D*etect.* 8. Another of their Juggling's is, to extol the judgment of the Catholic Church as that which must be the ground of faith, and the decider of all Controversies: And to this end they plead against the sufficiency of Scripture, and bend all the force of their arguing's and designs, as if all their hope lay in this point, and as if it were a granted thing that the day is theirs, and we are lost, if the Catholic Church be admitted to be the Judge. Hence it is that they cry out against private faith and opinions, and call men to the faith of the Church, and persuade the poor people, that the Church is for them, and we are but branches broken off.

Well, we are content to deal with them at their own weapon, and at that one in which they put their trust. For our parts we know that the true Catholic Church (nor any member of it, in *sensu Composito*) cannot err in any of the Essentials of Christianity (for then it would cease to be the Church:) But we have too much reason to Judge that it is not free from error in lesser things. But yet for all that in the main cause between the Papists and us, we refuse not their judgment. Nay we turn this Canon against the

Canoneers, and easily prove that the Papists cause is utterly lost, if the Catholic Church be Judge.

But is it the Ancient Church, or the present Church that must decide the cause? Well! It shall be which you will. For the most Ancient Church in the Apostles days, we are altogether of its belief, and stand to its decision in all things; and if you prove we mistake them in anything, we shall gladly receive instruction and be reclaimed. To them we appeal for our Essentials and Integrals. And for some following ages, we will be tried by them in the articles of our faith, and in the principal controversies we have with the Papists.

Yea, but this will not serve their turn: It is the present Church that must judge or none: For say they, if the ancient Church had power, so hath the present: and if the ancient Church had possession of the truth, how shall we know it but by the present? I answer, 1. We may know it by the Records of those times far surer then by the reports of men without writing: Controversies or numerous mysterious points are sorrily carried in the memories, especially of the most, even of the Teachers. And for the Records, one diligent skillful man will know more than ten thousand others. One Baronius, Albaspinaeus, Petavius, among the Papists, and one Usher, Blondell, Salmasius, Gataker, &c. among the Protestants, knew more of the mind of antiquity, then a whole Country besides, or perhaps then some General Councils.

2. Well! But if you appeal to the greater number, to them shall you go. You must be tried by the present Church; Why then you are condemned. Is it the lesser number, or the greater, or the better that must be judge? You will not say the lesser, as such: If you do, you know where you are. If you say, the Better part shall be judge: who shall be Judge which is the Better

part? We are ready to prove the Reformed Churches the Better part: and if we do not, we will give you the day, and lose our cause. But I suppose you will appeal to the Greater part. Content! Then the world knows you are lost. The Greeks, Muscovites, Armenians, Abyssinians, and all other Churches in Asia, Africa and Europe are far more than the Papists; and your own pens and mouths tell us that these are against you. Many of them curse you as Heretics or Schismatics; the rest of them know you not, or refuse your government. They all agree against your Popes universal Headship or Sovereignty, and so against the very form of your new Catholic Church: So that the world knows the Judgment of the far greatest part of Christians on earth to be against you in the main, so that you see what you get by appealing to the Catholic Church.

But I know you will say, that all these are Schismatics, or Heretics, and none of the Catholic Church: But they say as much by you, some of them, and all of them abhor your charge; and how do you prove it? And who shall be Judge whether they, or you be the Catholic Church? You tell us of your succession, and of twenty tales that are good, if you may be Judges yourselves; but so do they say as much which is good if they be Judges. When we offer to dispute our case with you, you ask us Who shall be Judge, and tell us the Catholic Church must be Judge: But who shall be Judge between you and them which is the Catholic Church? You will not let us be Judges in our own cause, and why then should you? Are we Protestants the lesser number as to you? So are you to all the rest that are against you. And what reason have we to let the lesser number Judge over the Greater? If still you say, because you are the Better, let that be first tried; but no reason you should there also be the Judges.

So that the case is plainly come to this, Either the Papists must stand to the Greater number, and then the controversy is at end: or they must shamefully say, we will not dispute with you, unless we may be the Judges ourselves, though the fewer. Or else they must lay by their talk of a Judge, and dispute it equally with us, by producing their evidence, which we are ever ready for.

CHAP. XVIII. Some of their deluding Ambiguities.

D*etect.* 9. The most common and prevalent Deceit of the Papists is, by ambiguous terms to deceive those that cannot force them to distinguish, and to make you believe they mean one thing, when they mean another, and to mock you with cloudy words. I shall here warn you to look to them therefore especially in three terms, on which much of their controversies lies, that is, the words Church, Pope, and Council. For there's but few understand what they mean by any one of these words.

1. When you come to dispute of the Church with them, see that you agree first under your hands of the Definition of that Church of which you dispute. And when you call them to Define it, you will find them in a wood, you will little think how many several things it is that they call [the Church:] For example, sometime they mean the whole Body, Pastors and People: but more commonly they mean only the Pastors, which are the far smallest part. And sometime they mean the Church Real: and sometimes only the Church Representative, as they call it in a General Council. But whether they mean the Pastors or People, they exclude all saving the Pope

of his subjects, and so by the [Church] mean but a part or sect. Sometime in the Question about Tradition, some of the French take the [Church] for the community, (as fathers deliver the doctrine of Christ to their children, &c.) And sometime they take it in its Political sense, for a holy society, consisting of a visible Head and members: But then they agree not of that Head, some setting the Pope highest, and some the Council. But frequently they take the word [Church] for the supposed Head alone, as in most questions about Infallibility, Judging of Controversies, expounding Scripture, keeping of Traditions, defining points of faith, &c. They say, The Church must do these: but commonly they mean the supposed Head: And one part mean a General Council: and the Jesuits and Italians, and predominant part do mean only the Pope: so that when they talk of the whole Catholic Church, and call you to its Judgment, and boast of its Infallibility (you would little think it) they mean all this while but one poor sinful man: and such a man as sometime hath been more unlearned then many of your school boys of twelve or fourteen years of age; and sometime hath been a Murderer, Adulterer, and (if General Councils, or the common vote may be believed) an Heretic, an Infidel, an Incarnate Devil. This man is their Church, as Gretser, Bellarmine, and the rest of that strain profess.

So that if you do but force them to define and explain what they mean by the Church, you will either cause them to open their nakedness, or find them all to pieces about the very subject of the Dispute.

2. So also when they use the name of [a Pope] in disputation, make them explain themselves, and tell you (in a Definition) what they mean by [a Pope.] For, though you would think this term were sufficiently understood, yet you shall find them utterly at a loss, and all to pieces about it. Let us consider distinctly of the Efficient, Matter, and Form. 1. As to the efficient

cause of their Pope, there must concur a Divine Institution (which they can nowhere show) and a call from man (& *Nemo dat quod non habet*, what man or men have power to make a Head to the Catholic Church.) But whether they will call it an Efficient Cause, or only a *Causa sine qua nen*, Election and Ordination must go to make a Pope. Now either they will put these into their Definition, or not. If not, know of them whether a man without Election and Ordination may be Pope: If so, what makes him one? If Possession, then he that can conquer Rome, and sit down in the chair is Pope: If not possession, what then? And why may not any man say, I am Pope? Well: but doubtless they will tell you that Election, or Ordination, or both, is Necessary. If so, then first for Election, is it Necessary to the being of a Pope, that some certain persons Elect who have the Power, or will any Electors serve whosoever? If any will serve, then every Monastery or every Parish may choose a Pope: If there must be certain Authorized Electors, see that those be named in the Definition: or at least declared. And then first know whether these Electors are impowered to that work by Divine Law, or by Human: If by Divine, let them show it if they can. In Scripture they can never find who must choose the Pope. And their Tradition (if that were a Divine law) hath no such precept, as appeareth by the alterations and diverse ways. And if it be but by a Human Ecclesiastical Canon, then it seems the Papacy is so too: for the Power received can have no higher a cause then the Power giving or authorizing.

2. When you come to know who these Electors must be, you open their nakedness. For first if they say, It must be the Cardinals, ask them, where then was the Pope when there were no Cardinals in the world? And whether that were a Pope or not that was chosen by the whole Roman Clergy? Or whether those were Popes or not that were chosen by the People? Or those

that were chosen by the Emperors? Or those that were chosen by Councils? If they tell you that it must be the Roman Clergy; Know whether the Cardinals be the whole Roman Clergy, who are Bishops of other Churches, or whether they are not merely Titular, at least many of them? And whether the People, the Council, or the Emperors were the Roman Clergy? If they would persuade you, that either the people, or the Emperor, or Council did not elect the Pope, but only show whom the Roman Clergy should elect, interposing exorbitantly some unjust force, with the Due Election, then all currant History crieth shame against them, and we will lay the Dispute on that with them readily, though it were with Baronius himself. Nothing almost is more evident in the Papal History, then that there have been at least these five ways of election among them. Let them put it upon this issue with us when they will.

If they allow of any of these as valid, which ever it be (as they must, or give up their succession) then 1. We would know by what Law of God the Emperor of Germany may choose a Head for the Catholic Church, anymore then the Emperor of Habassia, or the King of France or Spain? 2. And we would know when the Emperor hath chosen one, and the Clergy another (if not some others a third) whether both were not true Popes, if both parties were authorized Electors? And if yet the People choose one, and the Roman Clergy another, and the Cardinals alone a third, and the Emperor a fourth, and the Council a fifth, must all these stand, or which of them, and why? Or if they tell you that it must be the particular Roman Church; then 1. If the people of that Church choose one, and the Clergy by major vote another, and the Cardinals a third, which is the true Pope? 2. And then the succession is gone however: For they were no Popes that Emperors or Councils chose.

2. If they shall tell you that it is not Election but Consecration that makes a Pope, yea or that Consecration is of Necessity with Election; then 1. Demand of them whether it be any one whosoever that may Consecrate, or whether this high power be confined to certain hands? If any may serve, or any Bishops, then he that can get three drunken Bishops to consecrate him may be Pope. And then there may be a hundred Popes at once. But if it be confined to certain hands, 2. Let it be put down in the Definition, or at least declared who those are that must ordain or consecrate him. 3. And if they say, that It must be only the Italian Bishops that must consecrate, then 1. Know of them by what Law of God they have power to consecrate a Head to the universal Church, when all nations are agreed that *quod pertinet ad omnes, ab omnibus tractari debet*. 2. And by what Law they can create or Generate a creature of a more noble species then themselves, as if a beast should beget a man? Or whether this prove not, that as a Bishop at first was but Presbyter *primae sedis*, (like the fore man of a Jury) and thence sprung an Archbishop, who was *Episocopus primae sedis*, and thence a Patriarch, who was *Archiepiscopus primae sedis*; so in process of time, when Pride grew riper, the Pope grew to be *Patriarcha primae sedis*; but not till long after, the Head or Governor of the universal Church, nor *Patriarcha Patriarcharum*; no more than the Archbishops or Bishops were at first *Episcopy Episcoporum*.

But if they can show us no law of God empowering these special consecrators, any more than others, then where is the Papacy that dependeth on it? There is nothing in Scripture to empower the Italian Bishops anymore then the Gallicane, Germane, or Asian, to Consecrate a Head for the Catholic Church.

3. But suppose there were, yet we must be resolved whether it be some or all the Italian Bishops that must do it? If but some, which be they? And how is their power proved? If all or any, then 1. What shall we do when some of them consecrate one Pope, and some another, and some a third, which hath fallen out: which of these is the Pope? If Consecration give the Power, then all are Popes. 2. And still the Papal succession is overthrown while many Popes had no Consecration by Italian Bishops.

Thus you may see what a case the poor Jesuits or Friars will be in, if you put them but to insert the necessary Electors and Consecrators in their Definition of a Pope.

2. But thats not the worst, you must require them to put his necessary Qualification in the Description. For if no Disposition of the Matter be necessary, but *ex quolibet ligno fit mercurius Romanus*, then a Jew or other Infidel may be Pope: which they will deny. And if any Disposition of the subject be of necessity to the Reception of the form, then cause them to put it down. And then 1. It is either true Godliness: and then farewell Papacy. 2. Or it is common honesty and sobriety: and then still farewell Papacy. 3. Or it is learning and knowledge: and then Alphonsus à Castro, and others of their own will bear witness that some Popes understood not their Grammar, and one good man being (saith Wernerus) *rudis literarum*, was fain to get another Compope to say his offices, (though it happened that they could not agree, and so a third was chosen, and his choice disliked, and a fourth chosen, till there was six chosen Popes alive at once.) 4. If age be necessary, then the Children Popes (one at least) have interrupted the succession. 5. Yea, if the Masculine Gender be but Necessary, Pope Joan hath interrupted the succession, unless between forty or fifty of their own Historians deceive us. 6. But all this is the smallest part, the Question is whether faith in Christ

be of Necessity to a Pope? If so, then what will you say to John the twenty third, that denied the life to come, and to those that have been guilty of Heresy? So that by that time they have put the necessary Qualification of a Pope into their Definition, you shall find them hard put to it.

3. But yet the worst is behind. They be not agreed about the very form of the Papacy: For some say, He is the Head of all the Catholic Church But others with the General Councils of Constance and Basil say, that he is the Head only of the singular members, but a subject to the Catholic Church represented in a Council, which receiveth its power immediately from Christ, so that you may see what a case they will be in, if they be but forced to tell you what they mean by a Pope, and to Define him.

3. And if they use the name of a General Council, call them to Define what they mean by a General Council: some of them will say, It must be a true Representative of the whole Catholic, Church: so that Morally they are all Consenting to what is there done. But then the doubt remaineth whether there be a Necessity of any certain Number of Bishops? If not; it seems the whole Church may agree that twenty, or ten, or two, or one shall represent them, and be a general Council. But if this must not hold, then Must All the Bishops of the world be there, or only some, and how many? *Binius saith, Vol. 1, p. 313*, that [a General Council is that where all the Bishops of the whole world may and ought to be present, unless they be lawfully hindered, and in which none but the Pope of Rome by himself or his Legates, is wont to preside.] And vol. 3, p. 229. It is when all the Church is morally Represented, the Pope presiding.] But what a loss are we here at? 1. How prove they that only Bishops should be members of a Council, and not Presbyters?

2. But if that were granted them (without proof and contrary to practice) yet we are at a far greater loss to know what a Bishop is that must here be a member? Is he only the *Primus Presbyterorum* in a presbytery? Or is he the Ruler of a Presbytery, (they Ruling the people?) Or is he the sole Ruler of Presbyters and people? And is he to be in every Parish where are diverse presbyters? Or only in every Classis or lesser Synod? Or only in every County, or Province? Or shall the old Rule stand, that every City must have one? If so, then are not all our Corporations true Cities? And so by any of these Rules, there have been few General Councils in the world. And what word of God is there why London, Worcester, Canterbury should have Bishops; and Shrewsbury, Ipswich, Plymouth and hundreds such should have none? So that if the very matter of your Councils be so human and disordered, what is the Council composed of such? As most of them use the term Bishop, you would put them as hard to it to Define a Bishop almost, as to define a Pope.

3. But suppose they help you over this rub, yet by their Definition they null many General Councils, because the Pope presided not there: even the first General Council itself at Nice (whatsoever they boldly feign to the contrary.)

4. And by this Rule, either we never had a General Council, or but few: For instance, At the first Session of the Council of Trent (the last and most famous Council) there were but four Archbishops, and twenty-two Bishops, taking in the Titular Bishops of Upsal, Armach, and Worcester. And at diverse other Sessions after, but eight, or nine, or very few more. In the fourth Session which Decreed to receive Tradition with equal pious affection and reverence as the holy Scriptures, and which gave us a false Catalogue of the Canonical Books, there were but the Popes Legates, two

Cardinals, nine Archbishops (titular and all) and forty-one, or forty-two Bishops (titular and all.) Now we would fain know whether this was the whole Church morally represented? And whether these twenty-two, or forty-one were all the Bishops of the world, or the hundredth part of them? Yea whether all the Bishops of the African, Asian, and other Churches could and ought to have been there?

If they say that most of the Bishops of the world are Heretics or Schismatics, and had nothing to do to be there, we are sure that this is but the impudent censure of a sect, that unchurcheth most of Christ's Church, for far less faults than itself is guilty of: But how is this heavy censure proved?

5. Nay to make short of it, its plain by this Definition, that a General Council is but a name (at least since the days when the Church lay in a narrow room) and that no such thing is to be expected in the world. For 1. If all Bishops, or half come thither, what shall their poor flocks do the while? 2. How many years must they be travailing from America, Ethiopia, and all the remote parts of the Christian world? 3. So much shipping, and provision, and so many thousand pound a man is necessary for the Convoy of many, that alas the poor Bishops be not able to defray the hundredth part of the charge. 4. Abundance of them are so aged and weak, that they are unfit for the journey. 5. Their Princes are some of them Infidels, and some at wars, and will never give them leave to come. 6. They must pass through many Kingdoms of the enemies, or that are in wars, that will never suffer them to pass. 7. The tediousness, and hazards of the journey, with change of air is like to be the death of most of them, and so its but a plot to put an end to the Church. 8. The length of General Councils is such (some of them being ten years, and some (as that at Trent) eighteen years) that so many

Bishops to be so long absent from home, is but to give up the Church to Infidelity or Impiety (unless the Bishops be such things as the Church can spare.) 9. When they come together, they cannot many of them understand one another, because of the diversity of their languages. 10. And the Number would be so great, that ten or twenty Council-houses or rooms would not hold them: so that they could not Converse in one Assembly: so that a true General Council now, is but a name to amuse those that think the world is no bigger than a man may ride over in a weeks journey.

6. And yet even this Definition of Binius is ridiculous: For he makes it enough that all the Bishops of the world may and ought to be there, whether they be there or not. But then what if laziness or danger deter them or detain them? Is that a Council where Bishops ought to be and are not? How many must de facto be present, any or none? Prove if you can that forty Bishops are a General Council, because the rest ought to be there. And who shall be judge of each man's case, whether he could or ought to have been there? Will you judge men before they are heard, or their cause known? Your saying that they ought to have been there, is no proof.

And yet Binius hath one exception [unless lawfully hindered] Good still! If all the Bishops in the world be lawfully hindered, it seems it is a General Council when nobody is there: You see now what you put the poor Papists too, if you put them to define a General Council, or tell you what they mean by that word.

And therefore I again advise you; let them not befool you with empty or ambiguous words. And when they are all to pieces among themselves, let them not make you believe they are united by agreeing in One word, when they are several things that are meant by that one word.

CHAP. XIX. Their Confounding 1. A human Ordinance, and a Divine. 2. Mere Primacy with Sovereignty. 3. An alterable Order with an unalterable Essential.

D*etect.* 10. When they go about from Councils or other History to prove the Sovereignty of the Pope, let them not cheat you by confounding, 1. A human Ordinance with a Divine: 2. And an alterable point of Order with an unalterable essential part of the Church: 3. Or a mere Primacy in the same Order or office with a Governing Sovereignty, or a different Order or office.

First therefore we would learn of them, whether the preeminence and order of the five Patriarchal Sees, began not about the first General Council to be looked after, but was settled some while after: For till there were General Councils (such as were so called) there was no great occasion of determining which should have the first, second, or third seat.

2. Or whenever the time was, yet we inquire, whether these other Sees as of Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, or some of them were not Patriarchal as soon as Rome? And whether Councils that speak of priority or posteriority, do not in the same manner, and on the same grounds, and to the same ends give Alexandria, and Antioch, their places, as they give to Rome the first

place? Surely we find them speaking of them as matters of the same Order and nature, saying, Rome shall have the first place or seat, Constantinople the second, Alexandria the third, Antioch the fourth, and Jerusalem the fifth. 4. And therefore we inquire whether all these have not the same kind of right to their preeminence, whether it be Divine or Human. And that the very foundation of this Patriarchal order, yea of Rome's Patriarchal Primacy, (which was the preparative to its universal Sovereignty) was a mere human invention, given on occasion of the Imperial seat at Rome, and not any institution of Christ to Peter and his Successors, I desire you not to take from my word; but all that will not be fooled out of all Historical verity by Popish audacity, let them take it from the express words of the fourth great approved General Council, viz. of Calcedon, which the poor Jacobites and other Churches of the East and South are so reproached for rejecting. In *Act. 16. Binnii p. 134*, these are their words [*Definitiones Sanctorum Patrum sequentes ubique & Regulam, & quae nunc relecta sunt 150. Deo amantissimorum Episcoporum, qui congregati sunt sub piae memory Imperatore majore Theodosio in Regia civitate Constantinop. Nova Roma, cognoscentes & nos eadem definivimus de privilegiis ejusdem Sanctissimae Constantinop. Ecclesiae novae Romae. Etenim sedi Senioris Romae, propter Imperium civitatis illius (N. B.) patres consequenter privilegia reddiderunt. Et eadem intention permoti 150. Deo amantissimi Episcopy aequa sanctissimae sedi novae Romae privilegia tribuerunt, rationabiliter judicantes Imperio & Senatu Urbem ornatam aequis Senioris Regiae Romae privilegiis frui*.] i.e. [We following always the Definitions of the holy fathers, and the Canon, and knowing those that now have been read of the hundred and fifty Bishops, most beloved of God, that were Congregated under the Emperor of pious memory Theodosius the Greater, in the Royal

City Constantinople (new Rome,) have ourselves also defined the same things, concerning the Privileges of the same most holy Church of Constantinople, new Rome. For to the seat of old Rome, because of the Empire of that City, the Fathers consequently gave the Privileges. And the hundred and fifty Bishops most beloved of God, being moved with the same intention, have given equal Privileges to the most holy Seat of New Rome: reasonably judging, then the City adorned with the Empire and Senate, shall enjoy equal Privileges with old Regal Rome.]

I do not stand to note that this Council was called by Martian: that his Lay Officers were called the Judges, or how light the Council made of Rome when they said [*Qui contradicunt Nestoriani sunt: qui contradicunt Romam ambulent] Bin. p. 98*. Nor do I stand so much on it, that they gave Constantinople equal privileges. But it may confound all the Papal Jugglers on earth to find an approved General Council affirming, 1. That Rome's Privileges (even its mere primacy) were given by the Fathers. 2. And that because it was the Imperial City. 3. And therefore on the same reason they do the like by Constantinople. 4. And that the General Council of Constant. had gone before them on these grounds: so that you have the vote of two of the first four great General Councils, that it was not so from the beginning, nor an Apostolical Tradition, but the act of the Fathers, because of the Imperial City. If a General Council can err, Popery is a deceit. If it cannot err, then the very Primacy of order in the Pope was then but new, and human, on a Carnal ground, done by man, that might do the like by others, and therefore undo this again.

But say they, Pope Leo confirmed not this. *Answ.* 1. Still then the Church Representative it seems may err, and the Pope only is infallible. 2. Leo and his Delegates were offended at Anatolius his rising, and the equaling him

with Rome: but they never excepted one word (that ever I found) against the saying, that it was because of the Empire that Rome by the Fathers had the Primacy given it.

And the Reason given by themselves *Council. Constant. Can. 5*, is, [because Constantinople is new Rome] But Binius saith that Rome receiveth not the Canons of this Council neither, but only their condemnation of Macedonius. And he saith [that every Council hath just so much strength and authority as the Apostolic seat bestoweth on it. For (saith he) unless this be admitted, no reason can be given why some Councils of greater numbers of Bishops were reprobated; and others of a smaller number confirmed] *Bin. Vol. 2, p. 515*.

What would you have more Sirs? Do you not see yet what the Popish Catholic Church is; and what they mean when they mouth it out to you, and ask you whether your private Judgment be safer or wiser than that of the whole Church, or of all the Christian world? You see they mean all this while but one man, whom Gretser and others plainly confess they call the Church. So that indeed it is General Councils, and all the Christian world or Church that are the ignorant, fallible, and oft erring part; and it is one man, (that sometime is reputed an incarnate Devil by a General Council too) that is the unerring Pillar of the Church, and wiser than all they. Do you not see that they make a mere nothing or mockery of General Councils, any further than they please the Pope? And can you expect that anything should please them that is against his Greatness, or, as Julius the second calls it, [his holding the place of the great God, the Maker of all things, and all Laws?] What a vile abuse is it then of the Pope to trouble the world by the meetings and Consultations of General Councils, when he can sit at Rome and contradict them infallibly, and, Good man, is fain to save the Catholic

Church from the Errors that General Councils (the Representative Catholic Church) would else lead them into: and therefore could he not with less ado infallibly make us Laws, Canons, and Scriptures without them? For sure that which the Pope can do against a General Council, he can do without them. If he can Infallibly contradict a General Council, and Infallibly Rule us contrary to their Judgment, he may no doubt Infallibly Rule us without them. And therefore of late times they have learnt so much wit, that you may look long enough before you see a General Council. And I think the Council of Constance were no better Prognosticators then William Lily, nor no more effectual Lawgivers then Wat Tyler, when they Prognosticated or Ordained Decennial Councils: And I will be judged by all the world.

And here also you may see what account the Papists make even of the first General Councils. Its all one with them to judge others Heretics for contradicting especially the four first General Councils (compared to the four Evangelists) as the Scripture itself: and yet (who would have thought it) they profess themselves to reject the Canons or Decrees of both these, the first of Constantinople, and that of Calcedon in part.

And, now I think on it, by this privilege I cannot see but the Pope is privileged from all possibility of being a Heretic personally. But these things are on the by, I return to the point in hand, which is to prove to you, that not only the Romish Universal Monarchy and Vice-godhead, but even its Patriarchal Primacy was no Apostolical Tradition, but a Human Institution, founded on this Consideration, that Rome was the Imperial Seat and City.

5. And Human it must needs be. 1. For we find that Councils did not declare it as any part of the Law of God, but Ordain it as an act of their own. 2. We find them adding the Patriarchate of Constantinople, which was

a new seat, neither Patriarch nor Bishop residing there in the Apostles days, or long after. 3. Yea we find them giving this new Patriarch the second place, and once making him equal with old Rome, which they would never have presumed to do, if they had thought that the Patriarchship of Alexandria, Antioch, or Rome had been of Divine Institution: for what horrible arrogancy would that have been, when the Holy Ghost by the Apostles had made Alexandria second, and Antioch third, and Rome first, for a Council to set Constantinople before two of them, and equal with the first?

6. And therefore we have reason to think that if Patriarchs be desirable creatures, there may more and more new ones now be made, as lawfully as Constantinople was.

7. And we do not think that a General Council or Pope can make a man of one Nation to be Patriarch of the Church in another Nation, that perhaps may be in wars with the Prince of the first Nation: but that each Prince with the Church under their Power, hath more to do in it then either Pope or Council. And if Portugal and France set up Patriarchs at home, they do as lawfully as the Patriarch of Constantinople was set up.

8. And therefore we must needs judge, that to disobey the Pope, or withdraw from his subjection (if he had never forfeited his Patriarchship by the claim of an Universal Headship) were no greater a sin, then to disobey or withdraw from the Patriarch of Alexandria, Antioch, or Constantinople: either the Government by Patriarchs and Arch-bishops is of God's ordaining and approving, or not: if not (as most of the Protestants hold) then it is no sin to reject any of them. If it be of God, then to reject any of them (though in simple error) is a sin of disobedience through ignorance, but is far from

proving a man to be no member of the Catholic Church: for sure Patriarchs are far from being Essential parts of the Catholic Church.

For, 9. We conclude, as in the Papists own Judgment, the Catholic Church may be without the Patriarch of Constantinople, Alexandria, or Antioch; so may it therefore without the Pope of Rome.

CHAP. XX. The vanity of their pretending Tradition detected. How far we are for Tradition. Tradition confoundeth Popery.

D*etect.* 11. The great endeavor of the Papists is to advance Tradition: The Council of Trent *Ses. 4*, hath equaled it with the Scriptures, as to the pious affection and reverence wherewith they receive it. On pretense of this Tradition they have added abundance of new Articles to the faith, and accuse us as Heretics for not receiving their Traditions: And this is a principal difference betwixt us, that we take the Scriptures to be sufficient, to acquaint us with the will of God, as the Rule of faith and holy living: and they take it to be but part of the word of God, and that the other part is in unwritten Tradition, which they equal with this (as afore.) For the maintaining of Tradition it is that they write so much to the dishonor of the holy Scripture, as you may find in Rushworths Dialogues, and Tho. Whites Defense of them, and many others; so like to the Arguments and Language of the Seekers and Infidels, that we can scarcely know whom we hear when they speak to us.

For the discovery of their desperate fraud in this point, and the right confuting of them: 1. You must distinguish them out of their confusion: 2.

You must grant them all that is true and just, which we shall as stiffly defend as they: 3. You must reject their errors and confute them: And 4. You may turn their own principal weapon against them, to the certain destruction of their cause.

Of all these briefly in course.

1. For the first two I have spoke at large in the Preface to the second part of the Saints Rest, and in the determination in the first part of my Book against Infidelity. But briefly to touch some of the most necessary things here, 1. We must distinguish the Tradition of the Scriptures, or the Scripture doctrine, from the Tradition of other doctrines, pretended to be the rest of the word of God. 2. We must distinguish between a certain proved Tradition, and that which is unproved and uncertain, if not grossly feigned. 3. We must distinguish between the Tradition of the whole Catholic Church, or the greater part, and the Tradition of the lesser more corrupted selfish part (even the Roman part.) 4. We must distinguish between a Tradition of necessary doctrine or practice, and the Tradition of mutable Orders. 5. And we must distinguish between Tradition by way of Testimony, or History, or by way of Teaching Ministry, and Tradition by way of Decisive Judgment, as to the Universal Church: suffer them not to jumble all these together, if you would not be cheated in the dark.

2. And then concerning Tradition, we grant all these following Propositions, (so that it is not all Tradition that we deny.)

1. We grant that the Holy Scriptures come down to us by the certain Tradition of our fathers and Teachers; and that what the seeing and hearing of the Apostles was to them that lived with them, that Tradition and belief of certain Tradition is to us, by reason of our distance from the time and place: So that though the Scripture bear its own evidence of a Divine

author, in the Image and superscription of God upon it, yet we are beholden to Tradition for the Books themselves, and for much of our knowledge that these are the true writings of the Apostles and Prophets, and all, and not depraved, &c.

2. We thankfully acknowledge that the Essentials of the faith, (and more) hath been delivered even from the Apostles in other ways or forms, besides the Scriptures: as 1. In the Professions of the Churches faith. 2. In the baptismal Covenant and signs, and whole administration. 3. In the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. 4. In Catechisms or Catechizing's. 5. In the prayers and praises of the Church. 6. In the hearts of all true believers, where God hath written all the Essentials of the Christian saith and Law: So that we will not do as the Papists perversely do: when God delivereth us the Christian Religion with two hands, Scripture (completely) and Verbal Tradition, (in the essentials) they quarrel with the one hand (Scripture) on pretense of defending the other: so will not we quarrel with Tradition (the other hand:) but thankfully confess a Tradition of the same Christianity by unwritten means, which is delivered more fully in the Scripture: and this Tradition is in some respect subordinate to Scripture, and in some respect co-ordinate, as the spirits left hand as it were, to hold us out the truth.

3. We confess that the Apostles delivered the Gospel by voice as well as by writing, and that before they wrote it to the Churches.

4. By this preaching we confess there were Christians made, that had the doctrine of Christ in their hearts, and Churches gathered that had his ordinances among them, before the Gospel was written.

5. And we confess that the Converted were bound to teach what they had received to their children, servants and others.

6. And that there was a settled Ministry in many Churches ordained to preach the Gospel as they had received it from the Apostles before it was written.

7. And that the said ordinances of Baptism, Catechizing, Professions, Eucharist, Prayer, Praise, &c. were instituted, and in use before the Gospel was written for the Churches.

8. And that when the Gospel was written, as Tradition bringeth it to us, so Ministers are commissioned to deliver both the Books, and the doctrine of this Book, as the Teachers of the Church, and to preach it to those without, for their conversion.

9. And that Parents and Masters are bound to teach this doctrine to their children and servants: yea if a Minister or other person were cast into the Indies or America without a Bible, he must teach the doctrine, though he remembered not the words.

10. We grant that to the great benefit of the Church, the writers of all ages have in subserviency to Scripture delivered down the Sacred Verities, and Historians the matters of fact.

11. And that the unanimous Consent of all the Churches, manifested in their constant professions, and practices, is a great confirmation to us.

12. And so is the suffering of the Martyrs for the same truth.

13. And the Declarations of such consent by Councils is also a confirming Tradition.

14. And the Confessions of Heretics, Jews and other Infidels, are Providential and Historical Traditions, for confirmation.

15. And we profess that if we had any Certain proof of a Tradition from the Apostles of anything more than is written in Scripture, we would receive it: All this we grant them for Tradition.

3. But in these points following we oppose them. 1. We take the holy Scriptures as the Compleat universal Rule or Law of faith and Holy living, and we know of no Tradition that containeth another word of God; Nay we know there is none such because the Scripture is true, which asserteth its own sufficiency. Scripture, and unwritten Tradition are but two ways of acquainting the world with the same Christian doctrine; and not with diverse parts of that Doctrine, so as that Tradition should add to Scripture: yea contrarily it is but the substance of greatest verities that are conveyed by unwritten Tradition: but that and much more is contained in the Scripture, where the Christian doctrine is complete.

2. The manner of delivery in a form of words, which no man may alter, and in so much fullness and perspicuity, is much to be preferred before the mere verbal delivery of the same doctrine. For 1. The Memory of man is not so strong as to retain as much as the Bible doth contain, and preserve it safe from alterations or Corruptions; Or if one man were of so strong a memory, no man can imagine that all or most should be so: Or if one Generation had such wonderful memories, we cannot imagine that all their posterity should have the like. If there were no statute Books, Records, or Law-books in England, our Laws would be but sorrily kept, and obeyed and executed.

2. If all the world had such miraculous memories, yet men are apt to be negligent either in learning or keeping of holy doctrine; All have not that zeal that should excite them to such wonderful diligence without which such a treasure could not be preserved.

3. When matter and so much matter, is committed to bare memory without a form of unalterable words, new words may make an alteration before men are aware: The change of one word sometimes doth make a whole discourse seem to have another sense.

4. There are so many carnal men in the world that love not the strictness of that doctrine which they do profess, and so many heretics that would pervert the Holy Doctrine, that it would purposely be altered by them if it could be done; and it might much more easily be done, if it lay all upon men's memories: For one party would set their memory against the others, and (as it was about Easter a public matter of sect) tradition would be set against tradition: especially when the far greater part of the Church turn Heretics, as in the Arians days, then Tradition would be most at their keeping and interpretation; and if we had not then had the unalterable Scriptures, what might they not have done?

5. A whole Body of Doctrine kept only in Memory, will be soon disjointed and dislocate; and if the matter were kept safe, yet the method and manner would be lost.

6. And there could not be such satisfactory Evidence given to another of the Integrity or Certainty of it, as when it is preserved in writing. We should all be diffident that the Laws of England were corrupted, or that Lawyers might combine to do it at their pleasure, if there were no Law Books or Records, but all lay in their memories. If they were never so faithful, yet they could not give us such evidence of it.

I do not think any man of common reason can heartily believe, that all the holy Truths of God, Historical, Doctrinal, Practical, Prophetical, &c. could (without a course of miracles, or extraordinary means) have been kept through all ages, as well without writing, as with it.

7. And if writing be not necessary, why have we so many Fathers, Histories, and Canons? And why do they fetch their Tradition from these, and ridiculously call them unwritten verities? Are they unwritten, when they turn us to so many volumes for them? And if man's writing be necessary for

their preservation, me thinks men should thankfully acknowledge that God hath taken the best way in giving it us in his own unalterable phrase.

3. If they do prove that some matters of fact are made known to us by Tradition that are not in the Scripture, or that any Church Orders or Circumstances of worship then used are so made known to us, (which yet we wait for the proof of) it will not follow that any of these are therefore Divine Institutions, or universal Laws for the unchangeable obligation of the whole Church. If there be some things Historically related in the Scripture, that were obligatory but for a season, and ordained occasionally, and ceased when the occasion ceased (as the Love-feasts, the Kiss of Love, the washing of feet, the abstaining from things strangled and blood, the anointing the sick, the Prophesyings one by one, mentioned 1 Cor. 14:31, miraculous gifts and their exercise, &c.) then it will not follow, if they could prove that the Apostles fasted in the Lent, or used the sign of the Cross in Baptism or holy Ordinances, or confirmed with a Cross in Chrysme, &c. that therefore they intended these as universal Laws to the Church, though I suppose they will never prove that they used the things themselves.

4. We will never take the Popes Decision or bare word for a Proof of Tradition: nor will we receive it from pretended Authority, but from rational Evidence. It is not their saying, we are the authorized keepers of Tradition, that shall go with us for proof.

5. And therefore it is not the Testimony of the Papists alone, (who are not only a lesser part of the Church, but a part that hath espoused a corrupt interest against the rest) that we shall take for certain proof of a Tradition: but we will prefer the Testimony of the whole Catholic Church before the Romish Church alone.

6. They that can produce the best Records of Antiquity, or rational proof of the Antiquity of the thing they plead for, though they be but a few Learned Antiquaries, may yet be of more regard in the matter of Tradition then millions of the vulgar, or unlearned men: so that with us, universal Tradition is preferred before the Tradition of the Romish sect, and Rational proof of Antiquity is preferred before ignorant surmises. But where both these concur, both universal consent, and records or other credible evidence of Antiquity, it is most valid.

And as for the Romish Traditions which they take for the other part of God's word: 1. In all Reason they must produce their sufficient proof that they came from the Apostles, before we can receive them as Apostolic Traditions. And when they have done that, they must prove that it was delivered by the Apostles as a perpetual universal doctrine or Law for the whole Church: and when they have well proved both these, we shall hearken further to them.

2. Either these Traditions have Evidence to prove them Apostolical, or no Evidence. If none, how can the Pope know them? If they have Evidence, why may not we know it as well as the Pope? At least, by the helps that his charity doth vouchsafe the world.

3. If there be any Proof of these Traditions, it is either some Antient Records or Monuments; and then our Learned Antiquaries may better know them then a multitude of the unlearned: Or it is the Practice of the Church: And then 1. How shall we know how long that practice hath continued, without recourse to the writings of the ancients? The reports of the people is in many cases very uncertain. 2. But if it may be known without the search of Antient Records, then we may know it as well as they.

4. If the Pope and Clergy have been the keepers of it, have they in all ages kept it to themselves or declared it to the Church? (I mean to all in common) If they have concealed it, 1. Then it seems it belonged not to others. 2. Or else they were unfaithful and unfit for the office. 3. And then how do succeeding Popes and Clergy know it? If they divulged it, then others know it as well as they. We have had abundance of Preachers from among the Papists, that were once Papists themselves, as Luther, Melancthon, Zwingli, Calvin, Beza, Peter Martyr, Bucer, &c. and yet these knew not of your truly Apostolical Traditions.

5. And it mars your credit with us, because we are able to prove the beginning of some of your traditions, or a time when they had no being, since the death of the Apostles.

6. And also that we are able to prove the death and burial of many things that have gone long under the name of Traditions.

7. And when we find so lame an account from yourselves of the true Apostolical Traditions: You are so confounded between your Ecclesiastical Decrees and Traditions, and your Apostolical Traditions, that we despair of learning from you to know one from the other: and of seeing under the hand of his Holiness and a General Council a Catalogue of the true Apostolical Traditions. And sure it seems to us scarce fair dealing that in one thousand and five hundred years time, (if indeed there have been Popes so long) the Church could never have an enumeration and description of these Traditions, with the proofs of them. Had you told us which are Apostolic Traditions but as fully and plainly, as the Scriptures which you accuse of insufficiency and obscurity, do deliver us their part, you had discharged your pretended trust.

8. And it is in our eyes an abominable impiety, for you to equal your Traditions with the holy Scripture, till you have enumerated and proved them. And it makes us the more to suspect your Traditions, when we perceive that they or their Patrons have such an enmity to the Holy Scriptures, that they cannot be rightly defended without casting some reproach upon the Scriptures. But this we do not much wonder at: for it is no new thing with the applauders of Tradition. We find the eighth General Council at Constantinople, *Can. 3*, decreeing, that [the Image of Christ be adored with equal Honor with the Holy Scripture,] But whether that be an Apostolical Tradition, we doubt.

9. And if General Councils themselves, and that of your own, should be for the sufficiency of Scripture; what then is become of all your Traditions? Search your own *Binius, p. 299*, whether it past not as sound doctrine at the Council of Basil (*in Ragusii Orat.) Sup. 6*. [that faith and all things necessary to salvation, both matters of belief, and matters of practice, are founded in the literal sense (of Scripture,) and only from that may argumentation be taken for the proving of those things that are matters of faith, or necessary to salvation; and not from those passages that are spoken by allegory, or other spiritual sense] *Sup. 7*. [The Holy Scripture in the literal sense soundly and well understood, is the infallible and most sufficient Rule of faith] Is not here enough against all other Traditional Articles of faith? A plain man would think so. Yea, but Binius noteth that he meaneth that explicitly or implicitly it is so. Well! I confess the best of you are slippery enough: but let us grant this; (for indeed he so explaineth himself afterward: yet thats nothing for Tradition. He there maintaineth that Scripture is the Rule of faith (not part of the Rule) [For (saith he) when the intellect happeneth to err, as in heretics, its necessary that there be some

Rule, by the deviation or conformity to which the intellect may perceive that it doth or doth not err. Else it would be still in doubt and fluctuate—it appeareth that no human science is the Rule of faith. It remaineth therefore that the Holy Scripture is this Rule of faith. This is the Rule, Joh. 20, where he saith, these things are written that you might believe, that Jesus is the son of God, and believing might have life in his name. And 2 Pet. 2. You have a more sure word of prophecy to which ye do well that ye attend as to a light, &c. And Rom. 15. Whatsoever things were written, were written for our learning, &c. —And its plain that the foresaid authorities are of holy Scripture; and speak of the holy Scripture, &c. The second part also is plain, because if the holy Scripture were not a sufficient Rule of faith, it would follow that the Holy Ghost had insufficiently delivered it, who is the author of it: which is by no means to be thought of God whose works are all perfect. Moreover if the Holy Scripture were wanting in any things that are necessary to salvation, then those things that are wanting might lawfully and deservedly be superadded from something else (aliunde) or if anything were superfluous, be diminished. But this is forbidden, Rev. 22. From whence its plain that in Scripture there is nothing defective, and nothing superfluous, which is agreeable to its author, the Holy Ghost, to whose Omnipotency it agreeth that nothing diminutely; to his Wisdom that nothing superfluously; and to his Goodness that in a congruous order, he provide for the Necessity of our salvation, Prov. 30:5,6. The word of God is a fiery buckler to them that hope in him: Add thou not to his words lest be reprove thee, and thou be found a liar.] How like you all this in a Popish General Council? And in an Oration against the Sacrament in both kinds.

Well! But perhaps the distinction unsaith all again? No such matter; you shall hear it truly recited. He proceeds thus [But for the further declaration

of this Rule as to that part, it must be known, that the sufficiency of any doctrine is necessarily to be understood two ways; one way Explicitly, another way Implicitly. And this is true in every Doctrine or science, because no doctrine was ever so sufficiently delivered, that all the Conclusions contained in its principles, were delivered and expressed explicitly and in the proper terms: and so it is in our purpose: because there is nothing that any way or in any manner (N.B.) pertaineth to faith and salvation, which is not most sufficiently contained in the holy Scripture explicitly or implicitly. Hence saith Austin [every truth is contained in the Scriptures, latent or patent, as in other sciences Speculative, or Moral and Civil, the Conclusions and determinations are contained in their principles, &c. and the deduction is by way of inference or determination—] This is the plain Protestant Doctrine. There is nothing any way necessary to faith or salvation, but what is contained in the Scriptures, either expressly, or as the Conclusion in the premises. Good still! We desire no more. Let holy Reason then discern the Conclusion in the premises, and let us not be sent for it to the Authority of Rome; nay sent for something else, that is no Conclusion deducible from any Scripture principles: we grant Tradition or Church practices are very useful for our better understanding of some Scriptures. But what is this to another Traditional word of God? Prove your Traditions but by inference from Scripture, and we will receive them.

Yet let us hear this Orator further clearing his mind [Adding to a Doctrine may be understood four ways. 1. By way of explication or declaration. 2. By way of supply. 3. By way of ampliation. 4. By way of destruction, or contrary. The first way is necessary in every science and doctrine, and specially in Holy Scripture; not for itself, which is most sufficient, and most clear in itself, but for us: (This we all yield) The second way is necessary to

sciences diminutely and insufficiently delivered by their authors, for their supplement: so Aristotle is supplemented by Albertus Magnus, &c. The third way, specially if it be not excessive, is tolerable to the well-being, though it be not necessary. The fourth way—assertively is to be rejected as Poison—Thus are the authorities to be understood, that forbid to add to, or diminish from the Scripture, Deut. 12:32.

Well! By this time you may see, that when such doctrine as this for Scripture sufficiency and perfection as the Rule of faith and life, admitting no addition as necessary but explication, nor any other as tolerable, but moderate ampliation (which indeed is the same,) I say, when this doctrine past so lately in a Popish General Council, you may see that the very Doctrine of Traditions equaled with Scripture, or being another word of God, necessary to faith and salvation, containing what is wanting in Scripture, is but lately sprung up in the world. And sure the Traditions themselves be not old then, when the conceit of them came but lately into the world.

4. Well: I have done the three first parts of this task: but the chief is yet behind, which is to show 1. How little the Papists get by their Argument from Tradition. 2. And how much they lose by it: even all their cause.

1. Two things they very much plead Tradition for: the one is their private doctrines and practices, in which they disagree from other Christians: and here they lose their labor with the judicious. 1. Because they give us no sufficient proof that their Tradition is Apostolical. 2. Because the dissent of other Churches showeth that it is not universal: with other Reasons before mentioned.

2. The other Cause which they plead Tradition for, is the Doctrine of Christianity itself. And this they do in design to lead men to the Church of

Rome; as if we must be no Christians, unless we are Christians upon the credit of the Pope, and his Subjects. And here I offer to their Consideration these two things, to show them the vanity of their arguing.

1. We do not strive against you in producing any Tradition or Testimony of Antiquity for the Scripture, or for Scripture Doctrine: we make as much advantage of such just Tradition as you. What do such men as White, Vane, Cressy, &c. think of, when they argue so eagerly for the advantage of Tradition to prove the Scripture and Christian faith? Is this anything against us? Nothing at all. We accept our Religion from both the hands of Providence that bring it us; Scripture and Tradition: we abhor the contempt which these partial Disputers cast upon Scripture; but we are not therefore so partial ourselves as to refuse any collateral or subordinate help for our faith. The more Testimonies, the better. The best of us have need of all the advantages for our faith that we can get. When they have extolled the Certainty of Tradition to the highest, we gladly join with them, and accept of any certain Tradition of the mind of God. And I advise all that would prove themselves wise defenders of the faith, to take heed of rejecting Arguments from Providences, or any necessary Testimony of man, especially concerning matter of fact, or of rejecting true Church History, because the Papists over value it under the name of Tradition, left such prove guilty of the like partiality and injuriousness to the truth as the Papists are. And whereas the Papists imagine, that this must lead us to their Church for Tradition, I answer that in my next observation, which is,

2. We go beyond the Papists in arguing for just Tradition of the Christian faith, and we make far greater advantage of it then they can do. For 1. They argue but from Authoritative Decision by the Pope, under the name of

Church-Tradition (excepting the French party) whereas we argue from true History and certain Antiquity, and prove what we say.

Where note 1. That their Tradition is indeed no Tradition: for if it must be taken upon the credit of a man as supposed Infallible by supernatural (if not miraculous) endowment, this is not Tradition but Prophesy. And if they prove the man to be such a man, its all one to the Church whether he say that [This was the Apostles doctrine, or, This I deliver myself to you from God.] For if he were so qualified, he had the power and credit of a prophet or Apostle himself. And therefore they must prove the Pope to be a Prophet, before their kind of Tradition can get credit: and when they have done that, there is no need of it: this their honest Dr. Holden was ware of, upon which he hath so handsomely canvassed them.

2. Note also that such as Dr. Holden, Cressy, Vane, White and other of the French way that plead for Tradition, mean a quite other thing then the Jesuited Italian Papist means; and while they plead for universal Tradition, they come nearer to the Protestants, then to their Brethren, if they did not contradict themselves, when they have done, by making mere Romish Tradition to be universal.

3. Note also, that when Papists speak of Tradition confusedly, they give us just reason to call them to Define their Tradition, and tell us what they mean by it, before we dispute with them upon an ambiguous word; seeing they are so divided among themselves, that one party understands one thing by it, and another thing; which we must not suffer these juggler's to jumble together and confound.

2. Another advantage in which we go beyond the Papists for Tradition, is, that as we argue not from the mere pretended supernatural Infallibility or Authority of any, as they do, but from rational Evidence of true Antiquity;

so we argue not from a sect or party as they do, but from the Universal Church: As far as the whole Church of Christ is of larger extent and greater credit then the Popish party, so far is our Tradition more Credible then theirs. And that is especially in three things.

1. The Papists are fewer by far than the rest of the Christians in the world. And the testimony of many, yea of all, is more than of a part. 2. The Papists above other parties have espoused an interest that leads them to pretend and corrupt Tradition, and bend all things to that interest of their own, that they may Lord it over all the world: But the whole Church can have no such Interest and Partiality. 3. And the Papists are but one side; and he that will judge rightly, must hear the other sides speak too. But the Tradition that we make use of, is from all sides concurring; yea Papists themselves in many points.

Yea our Tradition reacheth further then the Universal Church: for we take in all rational Evidence: even of Jews, Heathens, and Heretics, and Persecutors, that bear witness to the matters of fact, and what was the doctrine and practice of the Christians in their times, and what Books they made the ground of their faith: so that as true Universal impartial naturally-or-rationally-infallible History or Testimony, differeth from a private, pretended-prophetical assertion, or from the Testimony of one party only; so doth our Tradition excel both the sorts of Popish Tradition, both that of the Papal, and that of the Council party. And now judge who may better boast of or extol Tradition, they or we; and to what purpose, Cressy, White, and such men do bring their discourses of Tradition.

2. But yet we have not so done with them, till Tradition have given them their mortal stroke. You appeal to Tradition, to Tradition you shall go. But what Tradition mean you? The Tradition of the Catholic Church? And

where is this to be found and known? But in the profession and practice of the Church, and in the Records of the Church. Well then! Of both these let us inquire.

The first and great Question between you and us, is, Whether the Pope be the Head and Sovereign Ruler of the whole Catholic. Church: and then whether the Catholic Church and the Roman are of equal extent? What saith Tradition to this?

1. Let us inquire of the present Church: and there we have the profession and practice of all the Greek Church; the Syrians, the Muscovites, the Georgians, and all others of the Greek Religion dispersed throughout the Turks Dominions, with the Jacobites, Armenians, Egyptians, Abyssinians, with all other Churches in Europe, &c. that disclaim the Headship of the Roman Pope; all these do with one mouth proclaim that the Church of Rome is not, and ought not to be the Mistress of the world, or of all other Churches, but that the Pope for laying such a claim is an usurper, if not the Anti-Christ. This is the Tradition of the Greeks; this is the Tradition of the Abyssinians: the far greatest part of the Church on earth agree in this. Mark then what is become of the Roman Sovereignty, by the verdict of Tradition; even from the vote of the greatest part of the Church. Rome hath no right to its pretended Sovereignty. Babylon is fallen by the judgment of Tradition.

If you have the faces again to say that all these are Heretics or Schismatics, and therefore have no vote, we answer. If a minor party, and that so partial and corrupt, seeking Dominion over the rest, may step into the Tribunal, and pass sentence against the Catholic Church, or the greatest part of it, blame not others, if on far better grounds they do so by that part. And for shame do not anymore hereafter use any such self-condemning words, as to ask any Sect, [How dare you condemn the Catholic Church?

Do you think all the Church is forsaken but you, &c?] And let us ask you, as you teach your followers to ask us, [If we must turn from the Universal Church to any Sect, why rather to yours then another? Why not as well to the Anabaptists, or other party, as to the Papists?]

But your common saying is, that the Greeks, Protestants, and all the rest were once of your Church, and departing from it, they can have no Tradition but yours, for their spring is with you. To which we answer. 1. The vanity of this your fiction shall by and by be answered by itself. 2. You say so, and they say otherwise: why should we believe you that are a smaller, partial and corrupted part? 3. Well then let us go to former ages, seeing it is not the present Church whose voice you will regard (only by the way, I pray forget not, 1. That you do ill then to call us still to the Judgment of the present Church, and dare not stand to it. 2. And that you do ill to persuade men that the greater part of the Church cannot err, if you sentence the greater part as Schismatics or Revolters.) But how shall we know the way and mind of the ages past? If by the present age, then the greater part giveth us in their sense against you. If by the Records of those times, we are content to hear the Testimony of these. And first when we look into the Ancients themselves, we find them generally against you; and we find in that which is antiquity indeed, no footsteps of your usurped Sovereignty, but a contrary frame of Government, and a consent of antiquity against it. 2. When we look into later History we find, how by the advantage of Rome's temporal greatness and the Emperors residence there your greatness begun, and preparation was made to your usurpation, and how the translation of the Imperial Seat to Constantinople made them your Competitors, yea to begin in the claim of an universal Headship; and we find how it being once made a question, you got it by a murdering Emperor resolved on your side for his

own advantage. We find that it was long, even till Hildebrands days, before you could get any great possession, for all this sentence. It would but be tedious here to recite our Historical Evidence: we refer you to what is done already by Goldastus and Bishop Usher *de statu & success. Ecclesiar*. and in his *Answer to the Jesuits Challenge*, and in his *Discourse of the Antient Religion of Ireland*, &c. specially by Blondel in his French *Treatise of Primacy*, and Dr. Field, and many others that have already given you the testimony of Antiquity. More than you can give a reasonable answer to, I have produced in my Book called the safe Religion. In plain English, instead of Apostolical Tradition for your Sovereignty; we find that eight hundred years after the days of Christ, you had not near so much of the Catholic Church in your subjection, as you have now: that at four hundred, or five hundred, if not till six hundred years after Christ you had no known part of the world that acknowledged your universal Sovereignty; but only the Latin Western Church submitted to the Pope as their Patriarch, and the *Patriarch primae* sedis, the first in order among the Patriarchs: and that before the days of Constantine and the Nicene Council, he was but a Bishop of the richest and most numerous Church of Christians: and we see no proof that of an hundred years after Christ he was anymore then the chief Presbyter of a particular Church.

If all this will not serve, we have National Evidences beyond all exception, that the Ethiopian Churches of Habassia, the Indians, Persians, &c. were never your subjects to this day. That England, Scotland, and Ireland here in your Western Circuits, were not only long from under you, but resisted you, maintaining the Council of Calcedon against you, and joining with the Eastern Churches against you, about Easter day, &c. And that the Eastern Churches and many great Nations, (as Tendue, Nubia, &c.)

that now are revolted, were never your subjects, and some of them had little to do with you.

And yet if all this will not serve, we have your own Confessions. I have elsewhere mentioned some: *Cano Loc. Theol. lib. 6, c. 7, fol. 201*, saith [Not only the Greeks, but almost all the rest of the Bishops of the whole world, have vehemently fought to destroy the Privilege of the Church of Rome: and indeed they had on their side, both the Arms of Emperors, and the greater number of Churches: and yet they could never prevail to abrogate the Power of the one Pope of Rome] Mark here whether the Catholic Church was then your subjects, when the greater number of Churches, and most of the Bishops of the whole world, as well as the Greeks were against you, and vehemently fought against your pretended privileges.

Rainerius (supposed) *contra Waldenses Catal. in Bibliotheca Patrum, Tom. 4, p. 773*, saith [The Churches of the Armenians, and Ethiopians, and Indians, and the rest which the Apostles converted, are not under the Church of Rome.] Read and blush, and call Baronius a parasite. What would you have truer or plainer? And what Controversy can there be, where so many Nations themselves are witnesses against you? And you may conjecture at the numbers of those Churches by what a Legate of the Popes that lived among them, saith of one Corner of them, *Jacob. à Vitriaco Histor. Orient. c. 77*, that the Churches in the Easterly parts of Asia alone exceeded in multitude the Christians both of the Greek and Latin Churches] Alas, how little a thing then was the Roman Catholic Church!

If all this were not enough, the Tradition of your own Catholic Church is ready to destroy the Papacy utterly. For that a General Council is above the Pope, and may judge him and depose him, and that is de fide, and that its

Heresy to deny it, and that all this is so jure that *ne unquam aliquis peritorum dubitavit*, no wise man ever doubted of it, all this is the judgment of the General Council of Basil, with whom that of Constance doth agree; And whether these Councils were confirmed or not, they confess them lawfully called and owned, and extraordinary full: and so they were their Catholic Church Representative; and so the Popes Sovereignty over the Council is gone by Tradition: but thats not the worst. For, if a free General Council should be called, all the Churches in the world must be equally there represented: And if they were so, then down went the usurped Headship of the Pope: For we are sure already that most of the Churches in the world are against it: and therefore in Council they would have the Major vote. And thus by the concession of the Roman Representative Catholic Church the Pope is gone by Tradition. So that by that time they have well considered of the matter, me thinks they should be less zealous for Tradition.

CHAP. XXI. Their pretense that the Greeks and all other Churches were once under the Pope.

D*etect.* 12. Another of the Roman frauds is this: They persuade men that the Greeks, the Protestants, and all other Churches, were once under their Papal sovereignty, and have separated themselves without any just cause: and therefore we are all schismatics; and therefore have no vote in general Councils, &c.—

A few words may serve to show the vanity of this accusation. 1. Abundance of the Churches were so strange to you, that they had not any notable communion with you. 2. The Greek Churches withdrew from your Communion, but not from your subjection. If any of the Patriarchs or Emperors of Constantinople did for carnal ends at last submit to you, it was not till lately, nor was it the act of the Churches, nor owned, nor of long continuance. So that it was your Communion and not your subjection that they withdrew from.

2. And as for us of the Western parts, we answer you, 1. We that are now living, our Fathers, or our Grand-fathers, were not of your Church: and therefore we never did withdraw.

2. There were Churches in England before the Roman Power was here owned: And therefore if it was a sin to change, the first change was the sin, when they subjected themselves to you; and not the later, in which they returned to their ancient state.

3. And for the Germans or English or whoever did relinquish you, they have as good reason for it, as for the relinquishing of any other sin. If they did by the unhappiness of ill education or delusion, submit to the usurped Sovereignty of the Pope they had no reason to continue in such an error. Repentance is not a Vice, when the thing Repented of is a vice. Justify therefore your usurpation, or else it is in vain to be angry with us for not adhering to the usurper, and the many corruptions that he brought into the Church.

CHAP. XXII. Their plea that the Church of Rome is a True Church, and therefore we are Schismatics for separating from it.

D*etect.* 13. Another deceit that they manage with great confidence, is this; say they, If the Church of Rome be the true Church: then yours is not the true Church, and then you are Schismatics in separating from it: But the Church of Rome is the true Church; For you will confess it was once a true Church: when Paul wrote the Epistle to the Romans: and if it ceased to be a true Church, tell us when it ceased, if you can: If it ceased to be a true Church, it was either by heresy, or Schism or Apostasy: but by none of these: therefore, &c.

A man would think that children and women should see the palpable fallacy of this Argument; and yet I hear of few that the learned Papists make more use of. But to lay open the shame of it in brief I answer 1. The deceit lieth in the ambiguity of the word [Church.] As to our present purpose, observe that it hath these several significations. 1. It is taken oft in Scripture for one particular Church, associated for personal communion in God's Worship. And thus there were many Churches in a Country, as Judea, Galatia, &c. 2. It is taken by Ecclesiastical writers often for an Association

of many of these Churches for Communion by their Pastors; such as were Diocesan, Provincial, National Churches; whereof most were then ruled by Assemblies, where a Bishop, Archbishop, Metropolitan or Patriarch (as they called them) did preside. 3. It is taken oft in Scripture for the Body of Christ, the holy Catholic or Universal Church containing all true Believers as mystical, or all Professors of true faith as visible. 4. It is taken by the Papists oft for one particular Church which is the Mistress or Ruler of all other Churches.

And now I come to apply these in answer to the argument. 1. If the Question be of a true particular Church, we grant you that the Church of Rome was a true and noble Church, in the days of Paul and long after; and thus Paul owneth it in his Epistle as a true Church. And to the question when it ceased to be a true Church: I answer, 1. What matter is it to us whether it be ceased or not anymore then whether Corinth, Ephesus, Colossae, Thessalonica, or Jerusalem be true Churches or ceased? In charity we regard them all: but otherwise what is it to the faith or salvation of the world, whether Rome or any one of these be yet a true Church, or be ceased? I know not well whether there be any Church at Colossae or Philippi, or some other places that had then true Churches: And doth it therefore follow that I am not a true believer? What would you say to such a fellow that should argue thus concerning other Churches, as these men do of Rome? And say, e. g. [If Philippi, be a true Church, then England are no true Churches, If it be not, when did it cease to be a true Church?] Would you not answer him, [What is it to me whether Philippi be a true Church or not? May not we and they be both true Churches? How prove you that? And whether it be ceased or not ceased, doth no what concern my faith or salvation, further then as my charity is to be exercised towards them] So say

we of Rome: It was a true particular Church in the Apostles days. And if it be still a true Church what hinders but we may be so to? But whether it be so or not, is little to me. It concerneth not my faith or Salvation to know whether there be any such place as Rome on earth, or whether it were consumed long ago. If a man were so simple as to believe a report that Rome was destroyed by Charles of Bourbon, and never inhabited, or had a Pope since, he were but such a Heretic as Pope Zacharias and Bishop Boniface made of Virgilius, for holding there be Antipodes (though further from the South.)

2. And if you take the word [Church] in the second sense, for a Diocesan or Patriarchal Church, or Association of Churches; supposing such forms proved warrantable, the same answer serveth as to the first.

3. But (to come to the true state of our Controversy) If by [a true Church] you mean either of the two last, that is, 1. The whole Universal Church: or 2. A Mistress Church that must Rule all the rest, it was never such a true Church in Paul's days.

And therefore here we turn this argument of the Papists against themselves. If the Church of Rome were neither the whole Catholic Church, nor the Mistress of all other Churches when Paul wrote his Epistle to them, then it is not so now, nor ought to be so accounted. But the former is proved: 1. That the Church of Rome was not the whole Catholic Church then, no man thats well in his wits can doubt, that reads what a Church there was at Jerusalem, what a Church at Ephesus, and Philadelphia, Smyrna, Thyatira, Laodicea, Corinth, and abundance more. Prove that all or any of these were parts of the Church of Rome if you can. 2. Where doth Paul once name them either the Catholic Church, or the Mistress or Ruler of all Churches? Or give the least hint of any such thing? Or mention any Pope

among them whom the whole world was to take to be their Sovereign Head? Is it not an incredible thing that Paul (and all the Apostles) would forget to make any mention of this privilege, or teach them how to use it, or teach other Churches their duty in obeying the Church of Rome, if indeed they had been made the Mistress Church? Men that can believe what they list, may say what they list. But for my part I will never think so hardly of Paul and all the Apostles, as to accuse them of so great oblivion or negligence. And therefore I conclude, Rome was neither the Universal Church, nor the Mistress Church then (not many an age after) and therefore it is not so to be accounted now. So that you see how easily this silly Argument shows its shame.

But (though it concern not our main question) I shall tell them further, that the Matter of the Roman Church must be distinguished from its New Political Form. For the Matter, so many of its members as are true Christians, are part of the Catholic Church of Christ, though not the whole: And for the form, 1. There is the form of its several parts, and the form of the whole. The form of any parts of the Roman Church that are Congregations or particular Churches of true Christians, may make those parts true Churches: that is, there may be many a true Parish Church that yet live under the Papal Yoak. But as to the Political form of their Roman Catholic Church, as it is a Body Headed by one claiming a Universal Monarchy, so the form is false and Antichristian, and therefore the Church as Papal, must be denominated from this form; and can be no better.

And this is our true answer to the question, whether the Church of Rome be a true Church? There are I doubt not among them many a thousand true members of the Catholic Church, and there may be true particular Churches among them, having true Pastors and Christian people joined for God's

worship (though I doubt there is but few of them but do fearfully pollute it: and I am confident that salvation is much more rare and difficult with them, then it is with the Reformed Catholics; yet that many among them are true Christians and saved, I am fully persuaded, especially when I have read such writings as Gersons, Guil. Parisiensis, Ferus, Kempis, &c.) And I think the better of Bellarmine himself for saying of *Kempis de imitatione Christi* [*Ego certe ab adolescentia & usque in senectam hoc opusculum saepissime volvi, & revolvi, & semper mihi novum apparuit, & nunc etiam mirifice cordi meo sapit. Bellarm. de Scripter. Eccl. p. 298*.]

But the Pope as a pretended Universal Monarch is a false Head, and consequently their Papal Church, as such, is a false Antichristian Church, and no true Church of Jesus Christ.

And (by the way) I conceive you are thus to understand a clause in a late oath of Abjuration drawn up by the last Parliament to be offered to the Papists, viz. that [the Church of Rome is not the true Church] that is, 1. Not the whole Catholic Church, but part of it, as they are Christians. 2. Nor a true Church at all as Papal, and so formally as the Now Romish Church. But all this is little to our main Question.

CHAP. XXIII. Their pretending to fixed Unity and settledness, and that we are at uncertainty, incoherent, and changelings.

D*etect.* 14. Another great Endeavor of the Papists is, to fixedness, unity, consistency and settledness in Religion: but we are still at uncertainty and to seek, incoherent, not tied together by any certain bond, but still upon divisions, and upon change: And they instance thus [A while ago you were Episcopal, and then Presbyterian, and now you are nothing, but everyone goes his own way: A while ago you worshipped God in one manner, in Baptizing, Marrying, Burying, Common Prayer, the Lord's Supper; and now you have all new. Where is the Church of England now? Some of you are for one Government, and some for another: the Lutherans have superintendents, the Calvinists are Presbyterians: And what names of reproach do the Episcopal give the Presbyterians? And the Presbyterians take them to be Antichristian. Some of you are Arminians; some Calvinists; some say Christ died for all, and some say no; some are for Justification only by Christ's Passive Righteousness, and some also by his active; with other such differences even in these fundamental points.]

I repeat their words just as I have heard they make use of them with the people, and now I shall open the deceit of them in particular Answers to each part.

And 1. For the matter of unity, I have spoken of it before, and dare leave it to all the world that are judicions, whether the Papists or we are more unanimons, or more divided. Only to the Instances of division, I shall speak further now. 1. For the matter of Church Government, we are all agreed in the substance of it (except a very few stragglers;) As concerning the duty of Penitence, Confession, Restitution, Contrition, and of the excommunicating the obstinate, and Absolving the penitent, &c. All this we agree is the duty of the Presbyters; and we agree that these Presbyters may have a President, only some think that the President is *ejusdem ordinis*, of the same order, differing but in degree, and hath no power *jure divino*, but what the Presbyters have, but only the exercise is restrained as to the Presbyters, by men; but others think that the President is a Bishop eminently of another order, having not only the exercise, but the power above the Presbyters. And is this difference so great a business? And do not these cheaters know, that if for this they would reproach us, they must do so by themselves? Know they not that among their own Schoolmen there is the same difference, or in most points the same? And know they not that if differences in Ceremonies or Modes should unchurch us, or disgrace us, it would fall as foul on the whole Catholic Church, and that in the very primitive times? Did they never read of the difference between the Asian and the Roman Churches, about the celebration of Easter day, and how Polycrates and the rest did plead Tradition against the Church of Rome's Tradition; and how Irenaeus did reprehend the Bishop of Rome for his uncharitable censure of the Churches for so small a difference? And how Polycarp and Anicetus Bishop of Rome

could not agree, as building upon contrary Traditions: but yet maintained Christian peace; as Eusebius out of Irenaeus his Epistle to Victor tells us, *lib. 5. Hist. Eccl. c. 26*. And the English and Irish Churches long after that adhered to the Asian way; even after the Council of Nice had ended the controversy on the Roman side. And who knows not how many more controversies greater than these of ours have been among the Churches of Christ, without their unchurching or disparagement to Religion.

And for the Doctrinal Controversies mentioned, most of them lie more in words then in sense, and all of them are far from the foundation, though they be about Christ, who is the Foundation. If one of your picture-drawers mistake the complexion of Christ, or if one should say he was not buried in a sheet, these are errors about Christ that is the foundation, and yet far from the foundation. Those of us that say Christ died for all, and those that say he died not for all, do agree as your School-men do, that he died for all, as to the sufficiency of his death and price: but he died not for all as to the actual efficiency of pardon and salvation: Is not this your doctrine? And is not this ours? And are not you as much disagreed about it as we? What else meant the late decision against the Jansenists? And what meaneth the present persecution of them in France? And yet have you the faces to make this a reproach of us? And for the righteousness of Christ, we are commonly agreed that it is both his Obedience and Passion that we are justified and saved by: though we are not all of a mind about the reason of their several interests; which difference is so far from unchristening us, that it makes no considerable odds among ourselves, who are censorious enough in cases of difference.

And for different forms of worship, sure these men do willfully forget what a number of Offices and Mass books have been among themselves and

other Churches? And what a number of Litanies or Liturgies of several ages and Churches they have given us in the Bibliotheca Patrum? But more of this anon.

2. And as for the changes and unfixedness which they charge us with, we are contented that 1. Our principles. 2. And our practices be compared with the Papists, and then let even modest and judicious enemies be judges which of us are more fixed, or more mutable.

1. For our Principles: we take only Christ to be the chief Foundation of our Faith, and his inspired Prophets and Apostles to be the secondary foundation: whereas the Papists build upon many a most ungodly ignorant man, because he is the Pope of Rome. And which of these is the firmer foundation?

2. We take nothing for our Rule but the sure word of God contained in the holy Scriptures: but the Papists take the Decrees of all Popes and Councils for their Rule: Our Rule they confess to be Divine and infallible: Their Rule we affirm to be human and fallible. Which then is like to be more firm? Our Rule (the sacred Scriptures in the Original languages, as to the words, and the matter of them, as to the sense) the Papists themselves confess unchangeable; but whether they will say as much of their own, I will try by two or three Instances. 1. What an alteration Pope Sixtus, and Pope Clement made in the Vulgar Latin Bible, which is one part of their Rule, I told you before, and Dr. James his Bellum Papale will tell you the particulars. 2. The other part is their Decrees, of which Pope Leo the tenth in *Bulla contr. Luth. in Binius, p. 655*, saith [the holy Popes our predecessors never erred in their Canons and Constitutions] And yet hear what Pope Julius the second saith in his General Council at the Lateran with their approbation, *Cant. Prag Matth. sanct. monitor. Binius, vol. 4, p. 560*. [Though the Institutions of

sacred Canons, holy Fathers, and Popes of Rome —and their Decrees be judged immutable, as made by Divine Inspiration; yet the Pope of Rome, who, though of unequal merits, holdeth the place of the Eternal King, and the Maker of all things, and all Laws on earth, may abrogate these Decrees when they are abused.]

You see here from the mouth of Infallibility itself (if the Roman faith have any) of what continuance we may judge their Immutable Decrees to be of, which are made as by Divine inspiration: they are Immutable till the Pope abrogate them, who being in God's place, though of unequal merits (O humble confession!) is of power to do it.

3. We have a Rule that was perfected by Christ and his Apostles, to which nothing can be added, and therefore we are at a Certainty for our Religion: for we have a sure and perfect Rule from Heaven. Nothing may be added to it, or taken from it. But the Papists do profess that the Determinations of the Pope or Council may make a point (and so five thousand points, for there is no certain number) to be de fide articles of faith, and necessary to salvation, though not in se, yet *quoad nos*, as to us. (And what it is for a Law to be obligatory in se, and not *quoad nos*, is hard to understand.) So that the Papists never know when their faith is perfect and grown to its full stature. For ought they know a thousand more Articles yet may be added. And yet these men of uncertain growing faith, have the face to persuade men that we are mutable, and they are fixed. You see our several Principles: now to our Practices.

For our part, 1. We never changed our Head, our Lord, our Faith, or one Article of our Faith: if malice itself be able to charge us with changing the smallest Article of our Faith, let them say their worst: we change not our Rule, the holy Scriptures, nor one clause or sentence of it, but endeavor the

preservation of the same, which at the first we received. In our contests with the Papists, our great offense is at their mutation from the ancient Rule and way; we contend but for the faith once delivered to the Saints: the old way with us is the good way: we abhor a Religion that is new sprung up, or is less than one thousand five hundred and fifty years standing at least. If we change in anything, it is but by repenting of our former changeableness while our Nation was Popish; having then changed from the Apostolic simplicity, we change from that sinful change, and return to the ancient way again. And if we have made any further changes since our first change at the Reformation, it is but a perfecting the change to Antiquity, and Apostolic simplicity which we then begun. Rome was not built in a day, and is not pulled down in a day. The work of Reformation is but one change, though it be not done all at one time. If we find some spots of Romish dirt upon us, that escaped us at our first washing, it is no dangerous mutability yet to wash it off. If a man converted by saving grace be not perfectly rid of all his former sin the first day of his Conversion, should he be reproached as mutable for striving against it all his life after, and casting it off by degrees as he is able? If a man did but recover by degrees from the relics of his disease, they will not therefore reproach him as mutable? If he sweep the dust or dirt out of his house every day, they will not say, He is mutable and knows not where to rest. These men might as well reproach us as mutable, because we rise in the morning and do not still lie in bed; or because we go to bed at night, and do not stay up still.

But what is it that we are changeable in? We have changed none of the substance of worship: did we baptize before, and do we not so still? Did we pray or administer the Lord's Supper before, and do we not so still? What is the change? Why, 1. We before used the common Prayer book and now we

do not. 2. Before we used prayers at the burial of the dead, which now are omitted. 3. Before we used the Cross and Surplice, and kneeled at the Sacrament, which are now omitted. And what then? Therefore we have changed our Religion. Even as a man changeth his clothes by brushing them, or his house by sweeping it, or his face by washing it. Do these men think us so sottish as to place our Religion in these Circumstances? God hath bid us Pray continually: but he hath not told us whether we shall use a Prayer book or not, but left that to men's necessities or conveniences to determine of. And doth a man change his Religion or Worship of God, if he either begin or cease to use a Book? If any man had so little wit or Religion, as to place their Religion in a Prayer book, its no great loss to them if they have lost their Religion, when the Prayer book is taken from them. We doubt not but Prayer books are profitable to some, and hindrances to others: some should use them, and some should not: but whether we use them, or not use them, is no part of our Religion at all, but a mere Accident, or common help and appurtenance. God hath not told preachers whether they shall use any Notes for their memory in Preaching: to one it is a hindrance; to another a help. Doth a man change his Religion when he changeth a custom of using Notes? God hath not told us what Chapter we shall read, or what Psalm we shall sing, or what Text we shall Preach on this day or that day. What if one age think it best that some Pastors give Laws to all the rest, that they shall read no Chapter, preach on no Text, and sing no Psalm but by their direction: and the next age think it meeter to leave it to each Minister, as thinking it unfit to Ordain such Ministers that have not wit enough to choose their Text, or Chapter, or Psalm according to occasions. Will you say that here is a change of Religion? These outside Hypocrites tell the world what a thing they take Religion to be, and in what they place it. What if one

man use an hour-glass in preaching, and another use none? What if one read a Chapter with spectacles, and another without? Or if one preach in a Pulpit, and another below: or if one preach in a white garment, or another in a black: or if one stand at the Sacrament, and another sit, and another kneel: Are we therefore of several Religions? Or is this any part of the worship itself? Do we not all now either stand, sit, or kneel at the hearing of a Sermon, as we please? Do we not kneel or stand at Prayer as we please? Yea do not men commonly in singing Psalms of Prayer or Praise to God, sit or stand as they please? And what if we do so at the Sacrament? Is it not all one? Or doth standing, kneeling or sitting make another Religion, or any part of it? And for Marrying, Burying, Baptizing, and the rest, we have altered no part at all of the worship of God; but order them in that manner as seemeth most convenient. What ignorant souls are these, that think that the using a Prayer book, or praying without book, or the using this gesture, or that, these words, or those words that are to the same sense, doth make different Religions or Ordinances of worship? These are tricks that none but the sottishly ignorant will be deluded with, that know not what Religion or worship is. They may as well say, If I change my Lecture-day from Thursday to Friday, that I change my Religion or the worship of God. These are our great changes.

Well I will you now hear whether the Papists or we be the greatest Changelings? 1. Some just changes they have made themselves, that they know well enough are as great as ours. It was so common in the ancient Church to Pray only standing on every Lord's day, and not to kneel at all in any part of the worship of that day, that it was taken for an universal Tradition, and to kneel was taken for a great sin, and condemned by General Councils many hundred years after Christ; and yet the Church of

Rome, and other Churches as well as we, have cast off this pretended Tradition, violated this Decree of General Councils, and forsaken this universal Custom of the Church. And the Papists receive the Eucharist kneeling, for all this Law and Custom.

In the primitive Church, and in Tertullian's days, a Common Feast of the Church was used with the Lord's Supper, and the Sacrament taken then. But now this Custom is also changed. It was then the Custom to sing extempore in the Congregation to God's praise. But now Rome itself hath no such Custom. It was once the Custom to give Infants the Lord's Supper: but now Rome itself hath cast off that Custom. Once it was a Canon that Bishops must not read the books of Gentiles, (*Council. Carthag. 4*.) which yet Paul made use of, and the Papists now do too much value. Abundance such changes might be mentioned, greater than ours, in which we are justified by the Papists themselves.

2. But they have yet other kind of changes then these. They have changed the very Essence of the Catholic Church (in their esteem;) they have changed the Officers, the Doctrine, the Discipline, the Worship, and what not, as though they had been born for change, to turn all upside down.

In the Primitive times, the Church had no universal Monarch but Christ: but they have set up a new universal Monarch at Rome.

In the primitive times the Catholic Church was the Universality of Christians: and they have changed it to be only the subjects of the Pope.

In the Primitive times Rome was but a particular Church, as Jerusalem and other Churches were: but they have changed it, to be the Mistress of all Churches.

For many hundred years after Christ, the Scripture was taken to be a sufficient Rule of faith; but they have changed it to be but part of the Rule.

In the ancient Church all sorts were earnestly exhorted to read, or hear, and study the Scripture in a known tongue: but they have changed this into a desperate restraint, proclaiming it the cause of all Heresies.

In the ancient Church the Bread and Wine was the Body and Blood of Christ Representative and Relative: but they have changed it into the real Body and Blood.

Heretofore there was Bread and Wine remaining after the words of Consecration: but they have changed so, that there remaineth neither Bread nor Wine, but the qualities and quantity, without the substance, and this must be believed, because they say it, against Scripture and Antiquity, and in despite of sense itself.

In the ancient Church the Lord's Supper was administered in both kinds, bread and wine to all: but they have lately changed this into one kind only to the people, denying them one half of the Sacrament.

Of old the Lord's Supper was but the Commemoration of the sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross, and a Sacrament of our Communion with him and his members: but now they have changed it into a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the quick and dead: and in it they adore a piece of Bread as very God, with Divine worship.

Of old, men were taught to make daily confession of sin, and beg pardon, and when they had done all, to confess themselves unprofitable servants: but now they are so changed, that they pretend not only to be perfect without sin, and to Merit by the Condignity of their works with God, but to supererogate and be more perfect then innocence could make them, by doing more than their duty.

Of old those things were accounted sins deserving Hell, and needing the blood of Christ for pardon, which now are changed into venial sins, which

properly are no sins, and deserve no more than temporal punishment.

Of old the Saints had no proper merits to plead for themselves; and now men have some to spare for the buying of souls out of Purgatory.

Of old the Pastors of the Churches were subject to the Rulers of the Commonwealth; even every soul, not only for wrath, but for Conscience sake was obliged to be subject: but now all the Clergy are exempted from secular Judgment, and yet the secular power is subject to them: for the Pope hath power to depose Princes, and dispossess them of their Dominions, and put others in their rooms, and dissolve the bonds of Oaths and Covenants, in which the subjects were obliged to them, and to allow men to murder them by stabbing, poisoning, &c. If you do not believe me, stay but till I come to it, and I shall give you yet some further proof.

Would you have any more of the Popish Changes? Why I might fill a volume with them. Should I but recite all the changes they have made in Doctrines, and all that they have made in Church Orders, and Discipline, and Religious Orders and their Discipline, and in Worship, and Ceremonies, I should be over tedious: their very Liturgy or Mass-book hath been changed, and made by changes, such abundance of additions it hath had since the beginning of it. What changes Sixtus the fifth, and Clement the eighth made in their Bibles, I told you before: as also what changes they have had in the election of their Popes.

And now I am content that any impartial man be judge whether Papists or the Reformed Churches are the more mutable and unsettled in their Religion? And which of them is at the greater certainty, firmness, and immutability?

CHAP. XXIV. Their plea that our Church and Religion is new, and theirs old; and their calling for a Catalogue, and proof of the Succession of our Church before Luther.

D*etect.* 15. Another fraud of the Papists, which they place not the least of their confidence in, is this: They persuade the people that our Church and Religion is but new, of the other days invention: and that theirs is the only old Religion. And therefore they call upon us to give them a Catalogue of the professors of our Religion in all ages; which they pretend we cannot do: and ask us where our Church was before Luther?

To this we shall give them once more a brief, but satisfactory answer. I. We are so fully assured that the oldest Religion is the best, (since the date of the Gospel) that we are contented that our whole cause do stand or fall by this trial. Let him be esteemed of the true Religion, that is of the oldest Religion. This is the main difference between us and the Papists: We are for no Religion that is not as old as the days of the Apostles: but they are for the Novelties and Additions of Popes and Councils. Their own *Polidore Virgil de Inven. Rerum, p. 410, lib 8, c. 4*, calling us a Sect, doth give you a just description of us [*Ita licentia pacta loquendi*, &c. i.e. Having once got leave to speak, that sect did marvelously increase in a short time; which is called

Evangelical, because they affirm that no Law is to be received which belongeth to salvation, but what is given by Christ or the Apostles.] Mark what they confess themselves of our Religion: And yet these very men have the face to charge us with Novelty; as if Christ and his Apostles were not of sufficient Antiquity for them. Our main quarrel with them is, for adding new inventions in Religion, and their principal business against us is to defend it, and yet they call theirs the old Religion, and ours the new.

Our Argument lieth thus. That which is most conform to the Doctrine and Practice of Christ and his Apostles, is the truly Antient Religion and Church. But our Religion and Church is most conform to the doctrine and practice of the Apostles: therefore it is the truly ancient Religion and Church. The Major they will yield: For no older Religion is desirable, further then as the Law of Nature and Moral Determinations of God are still in force. I suppose they will not plead for Judaism. For the Minor, we lay our cause upon it, and are ready to produce our evidence for the Conformity of our Religion and Churches to the doctrine and practice of the Apostles.

That Religion which is most conform to the Holy Scripture is most conform to the doctrine and practice of Christ and his Apostles: But our Religion (and Churches) is most conform to the holy Scriptures: therefore, &c. They can say nothing against the Major, but that the Scripture is Insufficient without Tradition: But for that, 1. We have no Rule of faith but what is by themselves confessed to be true: They acknowledge Scripture to be the true word of God; So that the Truth of our Rule is Justified by themselves. 2. Let them show us as good Evidence that their Additional Articles of faith or Laws of life came from the Apostles, as we do that the Scriptures came from them, and then we shall confess that we come short of them: Let them take the Controversies between us point by point, and bring

their proof, and we will bring ours, and let that Religion carry it that is Apostolical: But we are sure that by this means they will be proved Novelists. For 1. Their Traditions in matter of faith superadded to the Scripture, are mere Heretical or Erroneous forgeries, and they can give us no proof that ever they were Apostolical. 2. The Scripture affirmeth its own sufficiency; and therefore excludeth their Traditions. 3. I shown you how in their own General Council at Basil, the Scripture sufficiency was defended. 4. I have shown you in my Book called the Safe Religion, that the ancient Fathers were for the sufficiency of Scripture. 5. Their Traditions are the opinions of a dividing sect, contrary to the Traditions or doctrine of the present Catholic Church: the far greater part of Christians being against them. 6. We are able to show that the time was for some hundred years after Christ, when most of their pretended Traditions were unknown or abhorred by the Christian Church, and no such things were in being among them. 7. And we can prove that the chief points of Controversy maintained against us, are not only without Scripture, but against it, and from thence we have full particular evidence to disprove them. If the Scriptures be true, as they confess them to be, then no Tradition can be Apostolical or true that is contrary to them: For example: the Papists Tradition is, that the Clergy is exempt from the Magistrates judgment: But the holy Scripture saith [Let every soul be subject to the higher power, Rom. 13:1-5. The Papists Tradition is for serving God publicly in an unknown tongue. But the holy Scripture is fully against it. Their Tradition is against Laymen's reading the Scripture in a known tongue, without special License from their ordinary: But Scripture and all antiquity is against them. The like we may say of many other Controversies.

So that these seven ways we know their Traditions to be deceitful; because they are 1. Unproved. 2. Against the sufficiency of Scripture. 3. Against their own former confessions. 4. Against the consent of the Fathers. 5. Contrary to the judgment of most of the Catholic Church. 6. We can prove that once the Church was without them. 7. And they are many of them contrary to express Scripture.

And if Scripture will but show which of us is nearest the doctrine and practice of the Apostles, then the controversy is ended, or in a fair way to it: For we provoke them to try the cause by Scripture, and they deny it: we profess it is the Rule and test of our Religion; but they appeal to another Rule and test. And thus you may see which is the old Religion: which will be somewhat fuller cleared in that which followeth.

II. And that our Church and Religion hath been continued from the days of Christ till now, we prove thus. 1. From the promise of Christ, which cannot be broken. Christ hath promised in his word, that that Church and Religion which is most conform to the Scripture, shall continue to the end: But our Church and Religion is most conform to the Scripture: therefore Christ hath promised that it shall continue to the end.

2. From the event. The Christian Religion and Catholic Church hath continued from the days of Christ till now. But ours is the Christian Religion, and Catholic Church: therefore ours hath continued from the days of Christ till now. The Major they will grant: the Minor is proved by parts; thus. 1. That Religion which hath all the Essentials of Christianity, and doth not deny or destroy any Essential part of it, is the Christian Religion: but such is ours: therefore, &c. 2. That Religion, which the Apostles were of, is the Christian Religion: But ours is the same that the Apostles were of: therefore, &c. 3. That Religion, which is nearer the Scripture then the

Romish Religion, is certainly the Christian Religion: But so is ours: therefore, &c. 4. They that believe not only all that in particular that is contained in the Ancient Creeds of the Church, but also in general all that is besides in the holy Scripture, are of the Christian Religion: But thus do the Reformed Churches believe, &c.

2. And for our Church; 1. They that are of that one holy Catholic Church, whereof Christ is the head, and all true Christians are members, are of the true Church: (For there is but one Catholic Church:) But so are we: therefore, &c.

2. They that are Sanctified, Justified, have the love of God in them, are members of the true Catholic Church: But such are all that are sincere Professors of our Religion: therefore, &c.

But all this will not serve them without a Catalogue, and telling them where our Church was before Luther: To this we further answer; we have no peculiar Catholic Church of our own; for there is but one, and that is our Church: Wherever the Christian Church was, there was our Church. And where ever any Christians were congregate for God's worship, there were Churches of the same sort, as our particular Churches. And wherever Christianity was, there our Religion was: For we know no Religion but Christianity. And would you have us give you a Catalogue of all the Christians in the world, since Christ? Or would you have us as vain as H.T. in his Manual, that names you some Popes, and about twenty professors of their faith in each age, as if twenty or thirty men were the Catholic Church: Or as if those men were proved to be Papists by his naming them? This is easy, but silly disputing.

In a word, Our Religion is Christianity. 1. Christianity hath certain Essentials, without which no man can be a Christian; and it hath moreover

many precious truths, and duties necessary *necessitate praecepti*, and also *necessitate medii*, to the better being of a Christian. Our being as Christians is in the former; and our strength and increase and better-being is much in the latter. From the former, Religion and the Church is denominated. Moreover, 2. Our implicit and actual explicit Belief (as the Papists call them) must be distinguished; or, our General and our particular Belief. 3. And also the Positives of our Belief must be distinguished from the implied Negatives; and the express Articles themselves, from their implied Consectaries.

And now premising these three distinctions, I shall tell you where our Church hath been in all Ages since the birth of Christ.

1. In the days of Christ and his Apostles our Church was where they and all Christians were: And our Religion was with them in all its parts, both Essential and perfective. That is, we now Believe 1. All to be true that was delivered by the Apostles as from God, with a General faith, 2. We believe all the Essentials and as much more as we can understand, with a Particular faith. 3. But we cannot say that with such a particular faith we believe all that the Apostles believed or delivered; for then we must say that we have the same degree of understanding as they; and that we understand every word of the Scriptures.

2. In the days of the Apostles themselves, the Consectaries, and implied Verities, and Rejections of all Heresies were not particularly and expressly delivered either in Scripture or Tradition (as the Papists will confess.)

3. In the next ages after the Apostles, our Church was the one Catholic Church, containing all true Christians, Headed by Jesus Christ: and every such Christian (too many to number) was a member of it. And for our Religion, the Essential parts of it were contained both in the Holy

Scriptures, and in the Public Professions, Ordinances, and Practices of the Church in those ages, (which you call Traditions:) and the rest of it, even all the doctrines of faith and universal Laws of God, which are its perfective parts, they were fully contained in the holy Scriptures. And some of our Rejections and Consectaries, were then gathered and owned by the Church, as Heresies occasioned the expressing of them: and the rest were all implied in the Apostolical Scripture doctrine which they preserved.

4. By degrees many errors crept into the Church: yet so, that 1. Neither the Catholic Church, nor one true Christian (*in sensu composito* at least) did reject any essential part of Christianity. 2. And all parts of the Church were not alike corrupted with error, but some more, and some less. 3. And still the whole Church held the holy Scripture itself, and so had a perfect General or Implicit belief; even while by evil consequences they oppugned many parts of their own profession.

5. When in process of time by claiming the universal Sovereignty, Rome had introduced a new pretended Catholic Church, (so far as their opinion took) by superadding a New Head and form, there was then a twofold Church in the West; the Christian as Christian headed by Christ; and the Papal as Papal Headed by the Pope; yet so as they called it but one Church; and by this usurped Monarchy as under Christ endeavored to make but one of them, by making both the Heads Essential, when before one only was tolerable. And if the Matter in any part may be the same, and the same Man be a Christian and a Papist, and so the same Assemblies: yet still the forms are various: and as Christians and part of the Catholic Church, they are one thing: and as Papists, and members of the separating sect, they are another thing. Till this time there is no doubt of our Churches Visibility.

6. In this time of the Romish Usurpation, our Church was visible in three degrees, in three several sorts of persons. 1. It was visible in the lowest degree among the Papists themselves, not as Papists, but as Christians. For they never did to this day deny the Scriptures, nor the Ancient Creeds, nor Baptism, the Lord's Supper, nor any of the substance of our Positive Articles of Religion. They added a New Religion and Church of their own, but still professed to hold all the old in consistency with it.

Wherever the truth of holy Scriptures and the ancient Creeds of the Church were professed, there was our Religion before Luther: But even among the Papists the holy Scriptures and the said Creeds were (visibly) professed: therefore among them was our Religion.

And note here that Popery itself was not ripe for a corruption of the Christian faith professed, till Luther's opposition heightened them. For the Scripture was frequently before, by Papists held to be a most sufficient Rule of faith, (as I shown before from the Council of Basil:) and consequently, Tradition was only pleaded as conservatory and expository of the Scripture; but now the Council of Trent hath in a sort equaled them. And this they were lately driven to, when they found that out of Scripture they were unable to confute or suppress the truth.

2. At the same time of the Churches oppression by the Papacy, our Religion was visible (and so our Church:) in a more illustrious sort, among the Christians of the most of the world, Greeks, Ethiopians, and the rest, that never were subject to the usurpation of Rome, but only (many of them) took him for the *Patriarch primae sedis*, but not *Episcopus Ecclesiae Catholicae*, or the Governor of the Universal Church. So that here was a visibility of our Church doubly more eminent then among the Romanists: 1. In that it was the far greatest part of the Catholic Church that thus held our

Religion, to whom the Papists were then but few. 2. In that they did not only hold the same Positive Articles of faith with us, but also among their Rejections, did Reject the chief of the Popish errors as we do. Besides many particular points named in my Safe Religion, they Rejected with us, the Popes Catholic Monarchy, the pretended Infallibility of the Pope or his Councils: the new form of the Papal Catholic Church, as Headed by him, with other such points; which are the very fundamental controversies between us and the Papists. So that (besides that the Papists themselves profess our Religion) the major part of the Catholic Church did profess it, with the Rejection of the Papacy and Papal Church; and so you may as easily see where our Religion was before Luther, as where the Catholic Church, or most of Christians were before Luther.

3. And beside both these, our Religion was professed with a yet greater Rejection of Romish corruptions, by thousands, and many thousands that lived in the Western Church itself, and under the Popes nose, and opposed him in many of his ill endeavors against the Church and truth, together with them that gave him the hearing, and were glad to be quiet, and gave way to his tyranny, but never consented to it.

Concerning these we have abundant evidence, though abundance more we might have had, if the power and subtlety of the Papal faction had not had the handling of them. 1. We have abundance of Histories that tell us of the bloody wars and contentions that the Emperors both of East and West have had with the Pope to hinder his tyranny; and that they were forced by his power to submit to him, contrary to their former free professions. 2. And we have abundance of Treatises then written against him, both for the Emperors and Princes, and against his doctrine and tyranny: some store of them Goldastus hath gathered: And intimations of more you have in their

own expurgatory Indices. 3. And we have the histories and professions of the Albigenses, Waldenses, Bohemians and others that were very numerous, and if Raynerius say true, they affirmed (about the year one thousand one hundred) that they had continued since the Apostles, and no other Original of them is proved. 4. Particular evidence unanswerable is given in by Bishop Usher *de Succes. & statu Eccl*. and Answer to the Jesuits, and the Ancient Religion of Ireland, and in Dr. Field, and Morneyes *Mystery of Iniquity, and of the Church*, and Illyricus, and many others. 5. Even General Popish Councils have contended and born witness against the Popes superiority over a Council. 6. And in that and other points whole Countries of their own are not yet brought over to the Pope. 7. They have still among themselves Dominicans, Jansenists, &c. that are reproached by the Jesuits as siding with Calvin in many Controversies, as Catharinus and many more in others. Most points of ours which we oppose to Popery, being maintained by some or other of them. 8. But the fullest evidence is the certain history or knowledge of the case of the common people and Clergy among them, who are partly ignorant of the main matters in Controversies between us (as we see by experience of multitudes for one, to this day) and are generally kept under the fear of fire, and sword, and torments; so that the truth of the Case is this: the Roman Bishops were aspiring by degrees to be Arch-bishops, and so to be Patriarchs, and so to have the first seat and vote, and to be called the Chief Bishops or Patriarchs, and at last they made another thing of their office, and claimed (about six hundred years or more after Christ) to be universal Monarchs or Governors of all the Church: But though this claim was soon laid, it was comparatively but few, even in the West, that made it any Article of their faith, but multitudes sided with the Princes that would have kept the Pope lower, and the most of the People meddled not

with the matter, but yielded to necessity, and gave place to violence, except such as the Albigenses, Bohemians, Wicklefists and the rest that more openly opposed. So that no man could judge of the multitude clearly, which side they were on, being forced by fire and sword, and having not the freedom to profess their minds.

So that in sum, our Religion was at first with the Apostles, and the Apostolic Church: and for diverse hundred years after, it was with the universal Christian Church: And since Rome's usurpation, it was even with the Romanists though abused, and with the greater part of the Catholic Church that renounced Popery then, and so do now; and also with the opposers of the Pope in the West under his own nose. You see now what Succession we plead, and where our Church and Religion still was.

If any deny that we are of the same Church and Religion with the Greeks, Abyssinians, and most of the Christian world, (yea all that is truly Christian) I easily prove it. 1. They that are Christians joined to Christ the Head, are all of the same Church and Religion (for none else are Christians or united to Christ, but the Church which is his Body) But the sincere Greeks, Abyssinians, &c. and we are Christians united to Christ the Head: therefore we are all of one and the same Church and Religion.

2. They that believe the same holy Scripture, and differ in no essential part of the Christian faith, are of the same Church and Religion: but so do both we and all true Christians: therefore we are all of one Church and Religion.

3. They that are truly regenerate, and Justified, hating all known sin, longing to be perfect, Loving God above all, and seeking first his Kingdom and Righteousness, and accounting all things but as dung in comparison of Christ, these are all of the true Catholic Church, and the true Christian Religion: but such are all that are sincere, both of the Greeks, Abyssinians,

&c. and the Reformed Churches; as we prove, 1. To others by our Profession and Practice, by which only they are capable of judging of us. 2. To ourselves infallibly against all the Enemies of our salvation in Hell or Earth, by the knowledge and acquaintance with our own hearts, and the experience of the work of God upon them. All the Jesuits in the world cannot persuade me that I love not God, and hate not sin, and prefer not the Love of Christ before all the world, when I feel and know that I do; till they can prove that they know my heart better than I do.

4. If Christ Consent to it, and we Consent to it, then we are all (that are sincere in their profession) of the true Catholic Church and Religion (for if he consent and we consent, who is there that is able to break the match?) But Christ consenteth, and we consent: as we prove by parts. 1. His consent is expressed in his Gospel, that whoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life; and whoever will, may drink of the water of life freely. 2. And our consent we openly professed at Baptism, and have frequently renewed, and our own souls are acquainted with the sincerity of it, whatever any that know not our hearts may say against it.

5. All that are truly Baptized, and own their Baptismal Covenant, are visible members of the true Catholic Church: (For it is the very nature and use of Baptism to enter us into that Church:) But Greeks, Abyssinians, Georgians, Armenians, &c. and Protestants, are all truly Baptized, and own their Baptismal Covenant: therefore we are all of the true Catholic Church.

What is ordinarily said against this succession of our Church, I have answered in my safe Religion. I now add an answer to what another, viz H. Turbervile in his *Manual* saith against us in the present point. The easiness of his Arguments, and the open vanity of his exceptions, will give me leave to be the shorter in confuting them.

His first Argument (p. 43.) is this. [The true Church of God hath had a continued Succession from Christ—But the Protestant Church, and so of all other Sectaries, hath not a continued Succession from Christ to this time: therefore, &c.] *Answ.* 1. I pray thee Reader be an impartial Judge what this man or any Papist ever said with sense and reason, to prove that the Eastern and Southern Churches have no true Succession. Let them talk what they please of their Schism, the world knows they have had as good a Succession as Rome. Are they not now of the same Church and Religion as ever they have been? All the change that many of them have made, hath been but in the entertaining of some fopperies, common to Rome and them. And if any of these (which you call Sectaries) can prove their Succession, it destroys your Argument and Cause. Me thinks you should not ask them, where their Church was before Luther?

2. But how doth this Disputer prove his Minor, that we have no Succession? Only by a stark falsehood: forsooth [by the Concession of the most Learned Adversaries, who freely and unanimously Confess, that before Luther made his separation from the Church of Rome for nine hundred or one thousand years together, the whole world was Catholic, and in obedience to the Pope of Rome.

Answ. O horrid boldness! That a man that pleads for the sanctity of his Church, dare thus speak so notorious an untruth in the face of the world! At this rate of Disputing, the man might have saved the labor of writing his Book, and have as honestly at once have persuaded his Disciples, that his Adversaries unanimously confess that the Papists cause is best. What if the fifteen cited by him had said so, when I can bring him one thousand five hundred of another mind, and cite him fifteen for one of another mind, is that the unanimous confession of his Adversaries? But unless his

Adversaries were quite beside themselves, there is not one of them could say as he feigneth them to say. For doth not the world know, that the Eastern and Southern Churches, far exceeding the Romanists in number, did deny obedience to the Pope of Rome? Would this persuade his poor Disciples that we all confess, that there are, or were no Christians in the world but Protestants and Papists? His first cited Confession is Calvin's [that all the Western Churches have defended Popery] A fair proof! Doth this Disputer believe in good sadness, that the Western Churches are all the world, or a sixth part of the world? But this is the Popish arguing. What Calvin speaks of the Western Churches, that is, the prevailing power in each Nation of them, he interprets of all the world. So he deals with Dr. White, who expressly in the words before those which he citeth, affirmeth the visibility of the Churches of Greece, Ethiopia, Armenia, and Rome; but only saith, that at all times there hath not been visible distinct companies free from all corruption: which one would think every penitent man should grant that knows the corruption of his own heart and life. It would be tedious to stand to show his odious abuse of the rest: when they that say most of the word [world] but as it is used, Luk. 2:1, so much of his first argument.

His second is this. Without a continued number of Bishops, Priests, Laics, succeeding one another in the profession of the same faith from Christ and his Apostles to this time, a continued succession cannot be had: But Protestants have no continued number, &c.

Answ. And how proves he the Minor? No how at all; but puts us to disprove it; and withal gives us certain Laws, which we will obey when they grow up to the honor of being reasonable. His first Law is, that [We must name none but only such as held explicitly the thirty-nine Articles, all

granting and denying the same points that the late Protestants of England granted or denied—for if they differ from them in any one material point, they cannot be esteemed Protestants] *Answ.* A learned Law! And what call you [a material point?] You may yet make what you list of it. If they differ in any point Essential to Christianity, we grant your imposition to be necessary. But there is not the least Chronological, or Geographical, or other truth in Scripture, but is a Material Point, though not Essential. Must you needs know which these Essentials are? In a word: Those which the Apostles and the ancient Church pre-required the knowledge and profession of, unto Baptism. And because all your fond exceptions are grounded on this one point, I shall crave your patience, while I briefly, but sufficiently prove that Men that err, and that in points material, may yet be of the same Church and Religion.

Argum. 1. If men that err in points material (that is, precious truths of God, which they ought to have believed.) may yet be true Christians and hold all the Essentials of Christianity: then may they be of the same true Church and Religion: But the former is true: therefore so is the later. The Antecedent is proved, in that all truths which may be called Material, are not of the essence of Christianity.

Argum. 2. The Apostle Thomas erred in a Material point (which is now an essential) when he would not believe Christ's Resurrection: and yet was a member of the true Church: therefore, &c.

Argum. 3. The Papists err in material points, and yet think themselves of the same true Church: therefore they must confess that differing in Material points may be the case of members of the same true Church. For proof of the Minor, I demand: Are none of the points Material that have been so hotly agitated between the Jesuits, and Dominicans and Jansenists? The

Papal party, and the Council party? The Thomists, Scotists, Ockamists, &c. At least review the Jesuit Casuists cited by the Jansenists *Mystery of Jesuitism*; and tell us whether it be no whit Material Whether a man may kill another for a Crown? Or may kill both Judge and witnesses to avoid an unjust sentence? Or whether a man should go with good meanings into a Whorehouse to persuade them to penitence, that hath found by experience that when he comes there he is naught with them himself? Or whether a man may lawfully lie and calumniate to put by a calumny? Or speak falsely with mental reservations? Or forbear loving God many years together, if not all his life? Are these points no whit Material? You know that one part of you (with a Pope and General Council) are for deposing Heretical Kings, and murdering and stabbing them, and others of you disavow it: Is this no whit material? And yet you are all of one Church and Religion. A hundred more of your differences I could name.

Argum. 4. From instances of the Fathers that have erred in Material points, and yet are taken to be of the same Church and Religion. How many Churches differed about Easter day? What abundance of errors are in your Clementines, and other such writers owned by you? Justin Martyr was a Millenary: Numbered diverse Infidels with Christians; thought that Angels lived by meat, and generated with Devils, &c. Athenagoras thought that second Marriages were comely Adultery and that the Angels fell by the love of women, and begot Giants of them, &c. Irenaeus hath the like: Theophilus Antioch. worse: Tertullian and Origen you will confess had yet worse, Clem. Alexand. was for the salvation of Infidels and Heathens: against swearing and many such, besides those before mentioned. Greg. Thaumaturgus hath divers, if the confession and other works be his that are ascribed to him. Cyprian, Firmilian, and the whole Council at Carthage

were for rebaptizing those baptized by heretics; Against all Wars and Oaths Lactantius (with many more) was a Millenary, and hath too many great errors. I have no delight to rake into their faults; but if it be necessary I shall quickly prove many and great errors by forty more of them at the least. And yet all these or most, are confessed by you to be of one Church and Religion.

Argum. 5. From your own Confessions. *Bellarmine, lib. 1, de Beat. SS c. 6*, faith that he seeth not how the sentence of Justin, Irenaeus, &c. can be defended from error. Of Tertullian he saith, There's no trust to be given to him: *lib. 4, de Rom. Pont. c. 8*. Eusebius he saith was addicted to the Heretics. Cyprian he saith did seem to sin mortally: *de Rom. Pont. lib. 4, cap, 7*. Augustine is accused by many Jesuits for going too far from Pelagius. Jerome is oft plucked by you. And so are many more of the Fathers. And yet you confess some of them at least were of the true Church and Religion.

Argum. 6. If there be no perfect concord to be expected till we come to the place of perfect knowledge and happiness, then it is not perfect concord, that is necessary to prove us of the same Church or Religion. But the Antecedent is alas too far past doubt. Therefore, &c.

Argum. 7. If the godly and learned Doctors of the Church (and all men) have some (alas how many) culpable errors in matters of Religion (yea of faith, if you call that de fide, which we are obliged to believe) then those that have such errors may be of the same Church and Religion: But the Antecedent is so true and evident that I think none but a blind proud Pharisee will deny himself to beg of God daily to pardon and heal his culpable errors. So much to prove that men of errors and differing minds (if not about the essence of the Church) may be of the same Church.

2. But why is it that they must all needs explicitly hold the thirty-nine Articles? 1. I pray you tell us, whether all your own Church do explicitly hold and believe all your Articles? That is, all that Popes and General Councils have defined or declared. Dare you say that one of five hundred, of five thousand, doth explicitly believe all this? And why then is it necessary in our case that all must explicitly believe all those Articles? 2. Yea with us it is far more unnecessary. For we take not those Articles for the Rule of our faith, but only the holy Scripture: And therefore you may as well tell us that no man is of our Religion, that did not write or speak all the same words that Jewell, Reynolds, Perkins, or such other have written in their whole works. 3. Its easy to prove for all that, that the sense and substance of those Articles have been owned by the Churches in all ages.

3. But what if we grant your conclusion, that [else they cannot be esteemed Protestants] what of that? As if none but Protestants were of the same Church and Religion with us. Sure you think we make a sect of ourselves like you, and exclude all others from the Church and Salvation as you do! The word [Protestant] is not the first denomination of our Religion from its essence; for so we call ourselves [Christians] only; But it is a title that accidentally accrued to our Religion, from our Protesting against your innovations and corruptions; and our Rejecting the errors contrary to our Religion which you had introduced. Now those that were not involved in your errors as our forefathers were, but lived at a further distance from you, might have no occasion to make such a Protestation; and yet be of the same Church and Religion as we are.

Now to your particular Laws. 1. Saith H.T. [Let him not name the Waldenses: for they held the Real presence, that the Apostles were Lay men, that all Magistrates fall from their dignity by any mortal sin, that it is

not lawful to swear, &c. and Waldo lived but in one thousand one hundred and sixty.

Answ. 1. We have better assurance of the faith of the Waldenses in their own published Confessions, then from the mouth of their Adversaries. 2. The Lutherans hold the real presence, and yet are of the same Religion and Church with us. 3. The Apostles were Lay-men in the Jews account and sense, as not being Priests or Levites, but not in Christians account that believed their mission: and thus thought the Waldenses. 4. They thought that Magistrates and Ministers do by Mortal sin forfeit all the right and title to their office, from which themselves may have comfort and justification in judgment: But they never thought that they were not to be obeyed by others, or that their actions were not valid for the Churches good. 5. Many of the ancientest Fathers thought it unlawful to swear at all, that yet are cited by you as of your Church. But the Waldenses are slandered in these points. 6. Though Waldo was but about one thousand one hundred and sixty, yet the same Religion and Church under other names, and before those names were fastened on them, was much elder, as Raynerius may satisfy you. So that for all this, the Waldenses and we are of one Church and Religion.

He adds [Let him not name the Hussites, for they held Mass, Transubstantiation and seven Sacraments, that the universal Church consisted only of the predestinate, &c.] *Answ.* O what a sort of men have we to deal with? The Council of Constance burnt John Huss to ashes for saying that there remained the substance of Bread and Wine after Consecration and that Transubstantiation was a new word to deceive men with] as Binius himself expresseth among their accusations of him: And among the articles for discovery of the Hussites, one was Whether they take it to be a mortal sin to reject the Sacraments of Confirmation, extreme unction and

marriage.] And yet now Huss is burnt for it, the poor lay-Papists are persuaded by their deceivers, that the Hussites were for Transubstantiation and seven Sacraments. Why then did a General Council accuse or receive accusation and witness against him for the contrary? 2. That the universal Church as invisible, and as taken in the first signification, containeth none but the truly sanctified (and so predestinate) we believe as well as Huss: though in the second Analogical signification, the Church as visible, containeth all the Professors of faith and Holiness, whether sincere or not. 3. And that they were condemned by the Council of Constance, and Huss and Jerome burnt after they had a safe conduct, doth show that the faith of Papists is perfidiousness, (for why should the people be more just then a General Council?) but it shows not that we and they are not of the same Church or Religion: you condemned and burnt those of our Religion too: therefore you thought at least that we are near kin.

But H.T. proceeds with his precepts [Let him not name the Albigenses: for they held all marriages to be unlawful, and all things begotten *ex coitu* to be unclean: They held two God's &c.] *Answ.* These are not only such falsehoods by which you uphold your cause, but the more inexcusable and shameless, by how much the more frequently and fully detected long ago, and yet continued in. Perrin, Viguerius and many others might have prevented your error: especially Bishop Usher *de Succes. Eccles. c. 6-9, and 10*, who hath given you enough out of your own writers to have satisfied you; and shown you, that it was from the Arians and Manichees, inhabiting those Countries among them, that the heavy charges of Bernard, Eckbertus Schonaugiensis and others were occasioned. And see by him there cited what the same Bernard saith against your Church of Rome, and then judge which he spoke hardlier of.

As for the Catharists next added, they were not the Puritan Waldenses as you speak, but part of the Manichees: and if such as they are described, we are content to lose their names, and are not ambitious to be reputed their Successors.

He adds [Let him not name the Wicklifians: for they held; that all things came to pass by fatal necessity; That Princes and Magistrates fell from their dignity and power by mortal sin.] *Answ.* We know by many of Wicklifs own books printed and manuscript what his judgment was, whatever your Council at Constance accuse him of. It was a Divine Necessity opposed to uncertainty, and to the determination of an unruled will, that he mentioneth. And do not your Jesuits lay as heavy a charge on the Dominicans sometimes? And with as great cause may many of your Schoolmen be disclaimed for this as Wicklife, if you will understand him, and them. Wicklife was known to obey and teach obedience to Magistrates. But is it not a fine world, when Wicklife must not be of our Church because he is supposed to deny the power of Magistrates in mortal sin? And yet the Pope and his Council determine that Princes or Lord's that will not root out such as the Pope calls Heretics must be cast out, and their Country given to others. It seems you take Wicklife to be some kin to yourselves. But we doubt not but he was of the Catholic Church and Religion, and therefore of the same with us.

H.T. adds [Let him not name the Grecians: for they rejected the Communion of Protestants. *Censur. Eccl. Orient*. They were at least seven hundred or eight hundred year in Communion with the Church of Rome. — they were united to the Church of Rome again in the Council of Florence: They held Transubstantiation, seven Sacraments, unbloody Sacrifice, Prayer to Saints, and for the dead.]

Answ. If one Patriarch, or twenty men reject our Communion, whats that to the Millions of Greek Christians that never rejected it? And whats that to all Patriarchs before and after that rejected it not? Did Cyril reject our Communion, that hath published a Protestant confession, and was so maligned, and treacherously dealt with to the death, and falsely accused to the Turks by the Jesuits, for his constancy? 2. Do you think the world knoweth not by what inducements you drew a few poor men at Florence to subscribe to a certain union with you? And what death the Patriarch died? And how the Greeks resented his fact? And what a return they made to your Church? I pray persuade yourselves that they and we and all are Papists. 3. If the Greeks did disclaim Communion with us, they are nevertheless of the same Church and Religion with us, for all that. Paul and Barnabas were both Christians when they parted in dissention. If one neighbor in anger call another Traitor unjustly, and say he will have no Society with him, they may be both the Kings subjects and members of one Common wealth for all that. 4. As to the Greeks opinions, and the Papists false accusations of them, I have spoken already against pretended Veridicus in my *Safe Religion*. It is not you nor all the Jesuits on earth that can prove the Greeks and us to be so distant, as not to be of the same Catholic Religion and Church.

You add [Let him not name the Egyptians: for they held Transubstantiation and unbloody Sacrifice, as is manifest by their Liturgies; but denied the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son, and held but one will in Christ. *Godignus de reb. Abas. lib. 1, c. 28*.] *Answ.* 1. Godignus talks not of the Egyptians but the Abyssinians. This learned man it seems, is so home-bred, and confined to the Roman Church, that he little regardeth the rest of the Christian world; or else he would have known a difference between the Egyptians and Abyssinians: He is likely to know well the true

Catholic Church that while. 2. You cannot prove that they hold Transubstantion. Nor shall your bare naming their Liturgy make us believe it. The Egyptian Liturgy you tell us not where to find, nor I suppose do you know yourselves. An Ethiopic Liturgy your compilers of the *Bibliotheca Patrum* have given us, *Tom. 6*. But 1. It hath no mention of Transubstantiation in it, that I can find, but only a *Hoc est Corpus*, &c. which we say in our Administration as well as they. 2. And I find that Liturgy so contrary to the reports of your own writers concerning the practice of the Ethiopians, (as about the Elevation, Confirmation, &c.) that I must needs conclude, that either the Liturgy or much of it is forged, or that the generality of your own Relators of their practice are grossly deceived, and do deceive, (which is not likely, because they are many, and write at several times, and it is against themselves.) 3. And as for the procession of the Holy Ghost, and the denial of two wills in Christ, some of your own writers profess, that the former in the Greeks, and the later in many others, is found to be but a verbal difference, the same words not signifying the same thing in their esteem as in ours. 4. However, if they would but become the subjects of the Pope, they might be of your Church for all this: and therefore seeing they are the subjects of Christ, we shall take both Ethiopians and Coptic's to be of the same Catholic Church with us, for all these and many other of their errors.

Lastly saith H.T. [Let him not cite the Armenians: for they hold but one nature in Christ, and that his flesh was changed into his Divinity, and were condemned by the Council of Calcedon.]

Answ. The Armenians are a considerable part of the Catholic Church. Binius in the life of Eugenius the third saith, their Catholic (so call they

their chief Bishop) hath infinite, that is, above a thousand Bishops under him. Oth. Frisingensis hath the like.

1. Though they held but one nature in Christ, it was not by permixtion or confusion of the natures, as Eutiches imagined, but Conjunction or Coalition: *Nicephor. Hist. Eccles. lib. 18, c. 53*. And diverse of your own writers say the difference is found to be but in words. And even all this they now deny, as you may see in their own Confession published not eighty years ago, *Artic. 26-29,30. &c. 2*. That they change the human nature of Christ into the Divinity, is your slander, and therefore no good argument. 3. That they were condemned by (the fifth Act, or in any Act of) the Council of Calcedon, is another untruth: sure you go much upon trust, that dare venture to stuff your book with such falsehoods. But the best is, your simple Papists know not but all is true: they must believe you, and cannot disprove you. The Armenians then and we are of one Catholic Church and Religion, notwithstanding all your forgeries and vain exceptions. I know that one or two petty Councils chide them for not mixing water with wine in the Eucharist; and more than that, the Canons of the General Council called *Quinisexti* do condemn the same error as theirs, and also their deputing the Sons of Priests successively to the Priesthood, and not shaving their hair: and their eating eggs and cheese on Saturdays and Sundays in Lent. But 1. We fear not to say that we are of the same Church with men that err more than not shaving, or then eating eggs and cheese comes to, or any of this. 2 And remember that this is one of your Reprobate Councils. 3. And one that the third time (when two General Councils before had done it) did *Canon. 36*, give *aequalia privilegia*, equal privileges to the Seat of Constantinople as Rome had. So that I think you will have no mind of this General Council. And if any other have judged them Eutichians, though I renounce that

opinion, yet I must tell you, that my Charity covereth far greater errors in the Papists, or else I could not take them for Christians. If the Question had ever been started in a Council, whether man's soul and body are two Natures or but one, its ten to one but it would have made another heresy, and yet perhaps the real difference have been no more than it is now there is no Controversy about it. But H.T. addeth [Protestants pretense to the Fathers of the first five hundred years, is very idle; because were it true, as it is most false, that those Fathers were Protestants, yet could not that suffice to prove them is continued Succession of one thousand six hundred years.]

Answ. 1. It sufficeth us if those Fathers were Christians, as we are, though having no usurper of a universal Monarchy to Protest against, they were not to be called Protestants. 2. It is an idle pretense indeed, to go about to prove a Succession of one thousand six hundred years, by the bare instance of five hundred years: but your idle head hath forged more idle pretenses then this, by way of calumniation. But yet we may prove the Antiquity of our Religion from those Fathers, and the Novelty of yours, and a Succession for those five hundred years: and for the rest, if the whole Christian world had been big enough for you to see, you might have discerned our Evidence of a further Succession.

He adds [2. Because those of the sixth age must needs know what was the Religion and Tenets of them that lived in the fifth age, by whom they were instructed, and with whom they daily conversed better than our Protestants can now do; who have Protested on their salvation, that it was the very same with theirs, received from them by word of mouth &c.]

Answ. 1. Any thing will serve for the simple that will believe you. But I pray you tell us whether it were all or some of the sixth age that made this

solemn Protestation that you mention. If all or most, or the ten thousandth man, tell us where we may find that Protestation. If a few, they were not the sixth age. 2. If Pope Boniface alone was not the sixth age, tell us where that age did Protest on their salvation, that the Bishop of Rome was taken by their Fore fathers for the universal Monarch and Head of the Church (beyond his bare Primacy of order) 3. What age hath protested on their salvation, that the Roman prohibition of reading Scriptures, or of receiving the Eucharist in both kinds, or other points anon to be mentioned, were the Religion of their Fore-fathers, and so from age to age? 4. I pray you tell us where to find this Protestation of the tenth age, which Genebrard, Bellarmine, and others of your own so complain of, as having not learned men, nor any Council, but Apostatical Popes and an ignorant wicked Clergy, that suspected a man of Heresy if he understood Greek or Hebrew, and of Magic or Conjuring, if he meddled with Mathematics? 5. It is legible in the writings of the sixth Age, that they did fetch the doctrine of the fifth age from their writings, and not only from word of mouth. What else mean the preservation of those writings and those numerous citations out of them? Nay more; they would not trust their memories in a General Council for the Canons of the Church: no nor for the Canons of the next preceding Council, no nor for the Common Creed; but had all read and repeated out of the writing before the Council when there was occasion. And let Conscience be free to speak truth for a few sentences, and tell us in good sadness, whether you believe that the Oral Tradition of all the Church did preserve the Knowledge of Augustine's, Epiphanius, Chrysostom's, &c. doctrine, so much as their writings do? Is the doctrine of Aquinas, Scotus, Gabriel, &c. yea the Council of Trent preserved now more certainly in men's memories, then in writing? If so, they have better memories then

mine that keep them, and they have better hap then I that light of such keepers. For I can scarce tell how to deliver my mind so, in any difficult point, but one or other is misunderstanding and misreporting it; and by leaving out or changing a word, perhaps make it another matter: so that I am forced to refer them to my writings: and yet there by neglect they misinterpret me, till I open the book itself to them.

6. Either the Fathers of the fifth age are intelligible in their writings, or not. If they be, then we may understand them I hope with industry. If they be not, then 1. Much less were their transient speeches intelligible. 2. And then the writings of the sixth age be not intelligible, nor of any other: and so we cannot understand the Council of Trent (as the Papists do not that controvert its sense voluminously,) nor can we know the Churches judgment.

7. By your leave, the Roman Corrupters take on them so much Power to make new Laws and new Articles of Faith *quoad nos*, by definitions, and to dispense with former Laws, that unless they are all Knights of the Post, they can never swear that they had all that they have from their Fore-fathers.

8. Well! But all this is the least part of my answer. But I grant you that the sixth age understood and retained the doctrine of the fifth age, and have delivered it to us. But that there were no Heretics or corrupters, you will not say yourselves. Well then! The far greatest part of the Catholic Church did not only receive from the fifth age the same Christian Religion, but also kept themselves from the grossest corruptions of the Pope and his flatterers, that were then but a small part: And thus we stick to the Catholic Church succeeding to this day, and you to a usurper that then was newly set on the Throne of universal Sovereignty. So that your chief Argument treadeth Popery in the dirt: because the greater part of the Catholic Church not only

in the fifth and sixth age, but in the seventh, eighth, ninth, tenth, thirteenth, fourteenth, fifteenth and sixteenth ages, have been aliens or enemies to the Roman universal Monarchy: therefore if one age of the Church knew the mind of the former age, better than the Pope did, we may be sure that the Pope is an usurper.

The third Argument of H.T. is, that the Fathers of the first five hundred years taught their tenets: therefore its impossible they should be for the Protestants. *Answ.* 1. Protestants are Christians, taking the Holy Scriptures for the Rule of their faith. If the Fathers were Christians, they were for the Protestants, but its certain they were Christians. If you could prove that they were for some of your mistakes, that would not prove them against the Protestants in the doctrine of Christianity, and the holy Scriptures; and so that we are not their Successors in Christianity, and of the same Church, which was it that you should have proved, but forgot the question. And of this we shall speak to you more anon.

Well! By this time I have sufficiently shown the succession of our Church: and continuation of our Religion from the Apostles, and where it was before Luther, and given you the Catholic Church instead of a dozen or twenty names in each age, which it seems will satisfy a Papist; but yet we have not done with them, but require this following Justice at their hands.

Seeing the Papists do so importunately call to us for Catalogues and proof of our succession, Reason and Justice requireth that they first give us a Catalogue of Papists in all ages, and prove the succession of their Roman Catholic Church: which they can never do while they are men.

And here I must take notice of the delusory ridiculous Catalogue wherewith H.T. begins his Manual. His Argument runs thus [That is the only true Church of God, which hath had a continued succession from

Christ and his Apostles, to this day, (very true:) But the Church now in Communion with the See of Rome and no other, hath had a continued succession from Christ and his Apostles to this time: therefore, &c.—] For the proof of the Minor he giveth us a Catalogue. And here note the misery of poor souls that depend on these men, that are deluded with such stuff, that one would think they should be ashamed the world should see from them.

1. What if his Catalogue were true and proved, would it prove the Exclusion, that [no other Church:] had a succession? Doth it prove that Constantinople, or Alexandria had no such succession, because the Romanists had it? Where is there ever a word here under this Argument to prove that exclusive part of his Minor?

2. And note how he puts that for the Question that is not the Question between us. A fair beginning! The Question is not about Churches in Communion with you, but about Churches in subjection to you: But this is but a pious fraud, to save men by deceiving them. The Ancient Church of Rome had the Church of Jerusalem, Corinth, Philippi, Ephesus, and many a hundred Churches in Communion with her, that never were in subjection to her.

3. And if the Papists can but prove themselves true Christians, I will quickly prove that the Protestants are in Communion with them still, as Christians, by the same Head (Christ) the same spirit, baptism, faith, love, hope, &c. though not as Papists, by subjection to the same usurper.

4. Our question is of the Universal Church: And this man nameth us twenty or thirty men in an age that he saith were professors of their Religion: And doth he believe in good sadness that twenty or thirty men are either the universal Church, or a sufficient proof that it was of their mind?

5. But principally, did this man think that all, or any besides their subjects had their wits so far to seek, as to believe that the persons named in his Catalogue were Papists, without any proof in the world, but merely because they are listed here by H. T? Or might he not to as good purpose have saved his labor, and said nothing of them?

6. But what need we go any further? We will begin with him at his first Century, and so to the second, and if he can prove that Jesus Christ, or the Virgin Mary, or John the Baptist, or the Apostles, or any one of the rest that he hath named, were Papists, (much more all of them) I am resolved presently to turn Papist. But unless the man intended to provoke his reader to an irreverent laughter about this abuse of holy things, one would think he should not have named John the Baptist, that was dead not only before Rome had a Church, but also before the time that Bellarmine and his Brethren pretend that Peter received his Commission, to be the universal Head. And did not this writer know that Protestants can give him the same names as for them? And if printing them be proof, their proof is as good: If it be not, what proof shall we have? Our proof is the Holy Scriptures, written by the Inspiration of the Holy Ghost in those times. Thence we prove that the first Church held the same belief as we have: yea, though it be not incumbent on us, we will thence prove that the Catholic Church was not then Papists. Why else do we still appeal to Scriptures, and they refuse to stand to the trial of it any otherwise then as expounded by the Pope, but that we are confident, and they diffident of them. We know the Apostles faith from the Apostles; but the Papists will not know it but from the present Church of Rome. They tell you the Apostles were for them: but how know we that? Why by the testimony of the next age: and where is that testimony? Why the third age received it; and how is that proved? Why

because the fourth age was of their mind; And how prove you that? Why in the upshot, because the present age is of their mind: Why but most Christians of the present age, are against them: yea, but they are none of the Church: It is only the present Church of Rome. Well! But the present Church of Rome represented in a General Council may err. I, but the Pope cannot in Cathedra and in approving a Council. So that the sum is this: If the Pope himself may be judge, the Apostles were Papists: But if the Apostles may be heard themselves, they were none.

I make no doubt (though Bellarmine deny it,) but other Churches can prove as good a succession as the Roman, as to Bishops; And poor Bellarmine after all is fain to give up this Mark as insufficient to prove a true Church. *Lib. 3. de Eccles. c. 8. Dico secundo, Argumentum à succession legittna adferri à nobis praecipue ad probandum non esse Ecclesiam ibi non est haec successio, quod quidem evidens est: ex quo tamen non colligitur necessario, ibi esse Ecclesiam ubi est successio*. By his own confession then, succession will not prove the Romanists a true Church.

But as to a succession of Religion, and a continuation of the Catholic Church, for my part, I am so far from declining it, in argumentation, that I here solemnly profess to all the Papists that shall read these words, that, As Soon As I Shall See Any Certain Proof, By Catalogue Or Any Other Way, That The Catholic Church, Hath Successively From Age To Age Been Papists, I Will Turn Papist Without Delay: And I Challenge Them To Give Us Such Proof If They Can.

Nay if they will prove that in the first age alone, or the second, or third alone, the Catholic Church were Papists, I am resolved to turn Papist: Nay I

am most confident they cannot prove that in any one age to this day, the Catholic Church were Papists.

And as to H.T.s Catalogue, I return him further answer, that no one named by him in the first age had any one of their errors: And no one named by him to the year four hundred, (I may add, to the year six hundred, if his false catalogue be truly corrected) was a Papist; so well hath he proved the Popish Succession.

But for the plainer opening of this, I shall add the discussion of another of their deceits.

CHAP. XXV. Their jumbling all our differences together, and then making lesser or common differences to be the Protestant Religion.

D*etect.* 16. Another notable fraud of the Papists, is, to confound all their own errors and corruptions together, and then to instance in some of those errors that are common to them with some others, and to omit the Essential parts of Popery: And so they would make the world believe, that if they prove the Antiquity of any points in difference between them and us, they do thereby prove the antiquity of Popery (and so of the succession) And so they would make our Religion also Essentially to consist in every inferior difference between us.

Suffer them not therefore thus to juggle in the dark, but distinguish between the Essentials of Popery, or the main difference between them and us, and the other errors, which are not proper to them alone.

Thus Bellarmine opens his juggling *lib. 4, de Eccles. c. 9*, where he pleadeth Antiquity of Doctrine as a Note of the true Church: And (saith he) *Jam duobus modis*, &c. Two ways we may by this Mark prove our Church. 1. By showing the sentences of the Ancients, by which we confirm all our tenets, and refute our adversaries. But this way (saith he) is most prolix, and

obnoxious to many calumnies and objections. (Mark Papists, and take heed of appealing to Antiquity.) The other way (saith he) is shorter and surer, by showing first from the confession of the adversaries, that our tenets are the doctrine of all the ancients, &c.] And indeed if the weakness or rashness of any Protestants be the Papists strength, its time for us to be more prudent: but if it be the Papists unhappiness that cannot understand the ancients in the ancients, but only from the Pope or the Protestants, the Fathers are fallen into the hands of Babies as well as the Scriptures; and the Protestants have too little wit if they will join with the Pope in an abusive interpreting the Fathers for the Papists. And thus Bellarmine proceeds to cite Calvin, and the Centurists, as giving them the Fathers. But wherein? Forsooth in the point of Free-will, Limbus, Concupiscence, Lent, Lay baptism in necessity, &c. And therefore by our Confessions Antiquity is for the Papists. And this is their shortest and surest way. (The more fools we then.) Is not here great diffidence in the Fathers, when they have more confidence in our sayings then their writings?

But this juggling will not serve the turn. Take up the Essentials of Popery, and prove a Catholic succession of them, and you shall win the day. In Explication of my former professions, I here again solemnly promise and protest, that [When Ever I See A Valid Proof Of A Catholic Succession Of These Following Points, I Will Presently Turn Papist: Or Of Any One Of Them, I Will Take Up That One.] And I provoke the Papists that boast of Tradition, Succession and Antiquity, to do this if they are able.

1. Let them prove a Catholic Succession, or continuation of this point, that The Pope of Rome is appointed by Christ to be the universal Monarch, Sovereign, Governor, Head of the Catholic Church, and the Vicar of Christ on earth, and holding the place of God himself, whom all must obey.

2. And that the true and only Catholic Church is a Society thus headed and Governed by the Pope, and that no man is a true member of the Catholic Church, that is not the subject of the Pope as universal Monarch: Nor can any other be saved, as being without the Church.

3. And that the Church of Rome is by God's appointment the Mistress of all other Churches.

4. And that the Pope of Rome is Infallible.

5. That we cannot believe the Scriptures to be the word of God, or the Christian doctrine to be true, but upon the Authoritative Tradition of the Roman Church, and upon the knowledge or belief of their Infallibility: that is, we must believe in the Pope as Infallible, before we can believe in Christ (who is pretended to give him that infallibility.)

6. That no Scripture is by any man to be interpreted but according to the sense of the Pope or Roman Church, and the unanimous consent of the Fathers.

7. That a General Council approved by the Pope cannot err; but a General Council not approved by the Pope may err.

8. That nothing is to us an Article of faith till it be declared by the Pope or a General Council; (though it was long before declared by Christ or his Apostles as plain as they can speak.)

9. That a General Council hath no more validity than the Pope giveth it.

10. That no Pastor hath a valid Ordination, unless it be derived from the Pope.

11. That there are Articles of faith of Necessity to our Salvation, which are not contained in the Holy Scriptures, nor can be proved by them.

12. That such Traditions are to be received with equal pious affection and reverence as the holy Scriptures.

13. That Images have equal honor with the Holy Gospel.

14. That the Clergy of the Catholic Church ought to swear obedience to the Pope as Christ's Vicar.

15. That the Pope should be a temporal Prince.

16. That the Pope and his Clergy ought to be exempted from the Government of Princes, and Princes ought not to judge and punish the Clergy, till the Pope deliver them to their power, having degraded them.

17. That the Pope may dispossess Princes of their Dominions, and give them to others, if those Princes be such as he judgeth heretics, or will not exterminate Heretics.

18. That in such cases the Pope may discharge all the subjects from their allegiance and fidelity.

19. That the Pope in his own Territories, and Princes in theirs, must burn or otherwise put to death, all that deny Transubstantiation, the Popes Sovereignty, or such doctrines as are afore expressed, when the Pope hath sentenced them.

20. That the people should ordinarily be forbidden to read the Scripture in a known tongue; except some few that have a license from the ordinary.

21. That public Prayers, Praises and other public worship of God, should be performed constantly in a language not understood by the People; or only in Latin, Greek or Hebrew.

22. That the Bread and Wine in the Eucharist, is Transubstantiate into the very body and blood of Christ; so that it is no more true Bread or Wine, though our eyes, taste, and feeling tell us that it is.

23. That the consecrated host is to be worshipped with Divine worship, and called our Lord God.

24. That the Pope may oblige the people to receive the Eucharist only in one kind, and forbid them the Cup.

25. That the sins called venial by the Papists, are properly no sins, and deserve no more but temporal punishment.

26. That we may be perfect in this life by this double perfection. 1. To have no sin, but to keep all God's Law perfectly. 2. To supererogate, by doing more than is our Duty.

27. That our works properly merit salvation of God, by way of Commutative Justice, or by the Condignity of the works as proportioned to the Reward.

28. That Priests should generally be forbidden Marriage.

29. That there is a fire called Purgatory, where souls are tormented, and where sin is pardoned, in another world.

30. That in Baptism there is an implicit vow of obedience to the Pope of Rome.

31. That God is ordinarily to be worshipped by the Oblation of a true proper propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead, where the Priest only shall eat and drink the body and blood of Christ, while the Congregation look on and partake not.

32. That the Canon of Scripture is the same that is declared by the Council of Trent.

I will pass by abundance more to avoid tediousness; And I will not stay to inquire which of these are proper to the Papists. But I am resolved so to receive many of them as they can prove a Catholic succession of; that is, that they were in all ages the Doctrine of the Universal Church: And I crave the charity of such a proof from some Papist or other, if they have any

charity in them; and that they will no longer keep universal Tradition in their purses.

And I would desire H.T. to revise his Catalogue, and instead of twenty or thirty dead and silent names, that signify no more than Blanks or Cyphers, he would prove that both those persons and the Catholic Church did in every age hold these thirty-two forementioned doctrines. And when hath done, then let him boast of his Catalogue. Till they will perform this task, let them never more for shame call to us for Catalogues or proof of succession. But if they are so unkind that they will not give us any proof of such a Catholic succession of Popery, we shall be ready to supererogate, and give them full proof of the Negative, [That there hath been no such succession of these thirty-two points,] as soon as we can perceive that they will ingeniously entertain it: though indeed it hath been often done already.

But certainly it belongeth to them that superinduce more Articles of Faith, to prove the continuation of their own Articles through all ages; of which anon.

Well! But one of these Articles at least (the Popes Sovereignty) H.T. will prove successively, if you will be credulous enough. In the first age he proves it from Peters words, Act. 15:7-10. God chose Peter to convert Cornelius and his company: therefore the Pope is the Universal Monarch. Are you not all convinced by this admirable argument? But he forgot that Bellarmine, Ragusius (in Council. Basil.) and others of them say, that no Article can be proved from Scripture, but from the proper literal sense. To say somewhat more, he unseasonably talks of the Council of Sardis and Calcedon, an. 400, and 451, lest the first age have but a blank page.

In the second age he hath nothing but the names of a few that never dreamt of Popery, and a Canon (which you must believe was the Apostles)

that Priests must communicate. Of which we are well content.

In the third Age he nameth fifteen Bishops of Rome, of whom the last was deposed for offering incense to Saturn, Jupiter, &c. But not a syllable to prove that one of these Bishops was the universal Monarch: Much less that the Catholic Church was for such Monarchy. But to excuse the matter, he tells you, that the second and third Age produced no Councils (the greater deceivers then are the Papists that have found us Councils then) and so you have no Catholic succession proved. Yea, but he saith, they have successions of Popes, Martyrs and Confessors, which is sufficient for their purposes. See the strength of Popery! Any thing is sufficient for your purposes, it seems. Rome had Bishops, therefore they were the Universal Rulers of the Church: A strong consequence! Rome had Martyrs and Confessors: therefore it was the Mistress of all Churches. Who can resist these arguments? But why did you not prove that your Confessors and Martyrs suffered for attesting the Popes Sovereignty! If they suffered but for Christianity, that will prove them but Christians, and not Papists. Thus you see to the confusion of the Papists, that they have nothing to show for the succession or antiquity of Popery for the three first Ages. Yea worse than nothing: For here he comes in with some of the Decretals forsooth of some of their Bishops. Decretals unknown, till a while ago in the world, brought out by Isidore Mercator: but with so little cunning as left them naked to the shame of the world; the falsehood of them being out of themselves fully proved, by Blondell, Reynolds, and many more, and confessed by some of themselves. Here you see the first foundation of Papal succession; even a bundle of fictions, lately fetched from whence they please to cheat the ignorant part of the world.

But in the fourth and fifth ages H.T. doth make us amends for his want of proof from the three first. But suppose he do, whats that to a succession, while the three first ages are strangers to Popery? Well! But lets hear what he hath at last. His first proof (after a few silent names) is from the Council of Nice; And what saith that? Why 1. It defined that the Son of God is consubstantial to his Father, and true God And whats that to Popery? 2. But it defined the Popes Sovereignty: But how prove you that? Why it is in the thirty ninth Arab. Canon. O what Consciences have those men that dare thus abuse and cheat the ignorant! As if the Canons of the first General Council had never been known to the world, till the other day that Alphonsus Pisanus a Jesuit publisheth them out of Pope Julius and I know not what Arabic book. These men that can make both Councils and Canons at their pleasure above a thousand years after the supposed time of their existence, do never need to want authority. And indeed this is a cheaper way of Canon-making in a corner, then to trouble all the Bishops in the world with a great deal of cost and travail to make them. But if this be the foundation, the building is answerable. Their Bishop Zosimus had not been acquainted with these new Articles of an old Council, when he put his trick upon the sixth Council of Carthage, where for the advancement of his power (though not to an universal Monarchy, yet to a preparative degree) he layeth his claim from the Council of Nice, as saying [*Placuit ut si Episcopus accusatus fuerit, &c*.] which was that If an ejected Bishop appeal to Rome, the Bishop of Rome appoint some of the next province to judge; or if yet he desire his cause to be heard, the Bishop of Rome shall appoint a Presbyter his Legate, &c.] In this Council were 217. Bishops, Aurelius being president, and Augustine being one. They told the Pope that they would yield to him till the true copies of the Council of Nice were searched;

for those that they had seen had none of them those words in, that Zosimus alleged. Hereupon they send abroad to the Churches of the East, to Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, &c. for the ancient Canons. From hence they received several copies, which all agreed; but none of them had either Zosimus forgery in; nor the forged clause which Bellarmine must have in; much less the eighty Canons of Pisanus the Jesuit, or this one which H.T. doth found his succession on, but only the twenty Canons there mentioned, which have not a word for the Popes Sovereignty.

And here note 1. That Zosimus knew not then of Pisanus Canons, or else he would have alleged them; nor yet of Bellarmine's new part of a Canon for the Primacy of the Bishop of Rome. 2. That Zosimus himself had not the faith, the wit or the memory, to plead either Scripture, Apostolical Institution, or Tradition, for his privilege, but only a false Canon of the Council of Nice: as looking no higher it seems for his authority. 3. How early the Roman Bishops begun both to aspire, and make use of forgeries to accomplish it. 4. That there was no such Apostolic or Church Tradition for this Roman power, as our Masters of Tradition now plead for; which all the Catholic Church must know. For the whole Council, with all the Churches of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, &c. that is, in a manner all save Rome were ignorant of that which Zosimus would have had them believe, and Bellarmine and H.T. would have us to believe. 5. Note also how little the Church then believed the Popes infallibility. 6. Yea Note, how upon the reception of the several Copies of the Nicene Canons, they modestly convicted Zosimus of falsehood: And how the Council resolved against his usurpation. See in the African Councils, the Epistle of Cyril and Alexandria, and Atticus of Constantinople: and the Epistles of the Council to Boniface and Celestine. In their Epistle to Boniface before they had received their

answers from other Churches about the Nicene Canons, they tell him that they believed they should not suffer that Arrogancy [*non sumus istum typhum passuri*] But to Celestine they conclude more plainly, though modestly [*Presbyterorum quoque & sequentium*, &c. i.e. [Let your holiness, as beseemeth you, repel the wicked refuges of Presbyters and the Clergy that follow them; because this is not derogate, or taken from the African Church by any Definition of the Fathers; and the Nicene Decrees most plainly committed both the inferior Clergy, and Bishops themselves to the Metropolitans. For they did most prudently, and most justly provide, that all businesses (N. B. all) should be ended in the very places where they begun; and the Grace of the holy Ghost will not (or should not) be wanting to each province: which equity should by the Priests of Christ be prudently observed, and most constantly maintained: Especially, because it is granted to everyone to appeal to the Councils of their own Province, or to a Universal Council, if he be offended with the judgment of the Cognitors. Unless there should be any one that can think that our God can inspire a justice of trial into any one man (N. B.) and deny it to innumerable Priests that are congregated in Council. Or how can that judgment thats past beyond sea be valid, to which the necessary persons of the witness could not be brought, either because of the infirmities of sex, or of age, many other impediments intervening. For that any (i.e. Legates) should be sent as from the side of your holiness, we find not constituted by any Synod of the Fathers. Because that which you sent us by our fellow Bishop Faustinus as done by the Nicene Council in the truer Councils, received as the Nicene, (sent from holy Cyril our fellow Bishop of the Church of Alexandria, and from venerable Atticus the Bishop of Constantinople, out of the Authentic (Records,) which also heretofore were sent by us to Boniface your

predecessor, Bishop of venerable memory, by Innocent a Presbyter, and Marcellus Subdeacon, by whom they were from them to us directed,) in which we could find no such matter. And do not ye send your Clergy executors to potent men; do not ye yield to it; lest we seem to bring the smoky Arrogancy of the world (or secular arrogancy) into the Church of Christ, which preferreth the light of simplicity and day of humility for them that desire to see God. For of our brother Faustinus, we are secure, that the safe brotherly charity in your holinesses honesty and moderation, can suffer him to stay no longer in Africa.]

Well said Aurelius! Well said Augustine! Well said all you African Fathers! Had others stuck as close to it as you, the Papacy had been kept from the Universal Monarchy.

Note here 1. That this Council looked no higher for the power of the Pope and other Metropolitans, then to the Council of Nice, and thought it a good argument, that the Pope had no such power, because no Council had so subjected the African Church: And therefore they never dreamt that Christ or the Apostles had given it him. 2. Note that they evince the Nullity of his pretended power out of the Nicene Council. 3. Note that they took him not to be above a Council, having power to dispense with its Canons. 4. Note that by the Nicene Council, not some, but all business must be ended where they begin, and this Council so interpreted them: and therefore there's no appeals to the Pope. 5. And that he that saith otherwise unjustly chargeth the Holy Ghost to be wanting to the Church. 6. That this order is to be held fast. 7. That they took it for a sufficient reason against appeals to Rome, because all might appeal to a provincial or general Council. 8. Note that they thought it a thing not to be imagined by a man, that God should give his Spirit to any one man, even to the Pope, to enable him to try and judge, and

deny it to a Council, General or Provincial. This seemed to them a thing that none should imagine, so that they little dreamt of the Roman infallibility or power of Judging all the world. 9. Note also that they thought the Pope to be uncapable of this universal judgment, were it but by distance, and the natural impediments of age, sex, and many the like that must needs hinder the necessary witnesses from such a voyage or journey. So that they give an Argument from Natural necessity against the Popes pretended Sovereignty and judgment. 10. Note also that they plainly make such judgments to be invalid for want of necessary witness and means of prosecution. 11. And whereas the Pope might object that he could prevent all this by his Legates, they flatly reject that too, and say they find no such thing Constituted by any Synod: so that they both rejected the Popes trying and judging by Legates in other Metropolitans jurisdiction; and they took it for a sufficient ground to do so, that there was no Council had so constituted; little dreaming of a Scripture constitution, or Apostolical Tradition. And if the Pope may neither judge them by himself nor his Legates, he may sit still. 12. Next they convince the Roman Bishop of sending them a false Canon of the Nicene Council. 13. And they show us here what way the Pope then took to get and keep his Power: even by sending to the secular commanders of the Provinces, (in whom they had special interest by their residence at Rome,) to execute their wills by force. 14. And note how the Council plainly accuseth them for this, of introducing secular Arrogancy into Christ's Church, that better loveth simplicity and humility and light. 15. And note how plainly they require the Bishop of Rome to do so no more. 16. And how plainly they tell him that Faustinus his stay any longer in Africa will not stand with that honesty and moderation of the Bishop of Rome which is necessary to the safety of brotherly charity.

I give you but the plain passages of the Council as they lie before you, and screw no forced consequences from them. And now let Binius and his brethren go make women and children believe that it was not Appeals to Rome, but a troublesome manner of trial that the Council was against. And let H.T. tell men that take him for infallible, of a Nicene Canon for the Popes Supremacy and Monarchy. And let him persuade idiots and dotards that the Catholic Church in the fourth and fifth ages was for the universal Government of the Pope. And so I proceed to his next proof.

Saith H.T. [The first Constantinople Council decreed the Bishop of Constantinople to be chief next the Bishop of Rome.]

Answ. 1. You see then that Primacy was but the Institution of Councils, for order sake. 2. You see then that it was grounded on a secular reason; for so saith the Canon [because it is new Rome.] 3. You see then that the Popes Primacy was but honorary, and gave him no universal Government. For the primacy here granted to Constantinople, gave them no Government over Alexandria, Antioch, &c. 4. Yea expressly the second Canon limits all Bishops without exception to their own Diocese. And so doth the third Canon, expressly affirming [that according to the Nicene Council in every province, the provincial Council ought to administer and govern all things.] See now what a proof here is of Catholic succession of the Roman Monarchy! Nay how clearly still it is disproved to that time.

The next proof of H.T. is from the third Act of the first Council of Ephesus, that Peter yet lives and exercises judgment in his Successors] *Answ.* He turns us to look a needle in a bottle of hay. That Council is a large volume, containing six Tomes in Binius, and not divided into Acts. But I suppose at last I have found the place, *Tom. 2, c. 15*, where the words [that Peter was the Head of the Apostles] though nothing to their purpose, are

neither spoken nor approved by the Council, but only by Philip a Presbyter, Celestines Legate. And the Council, though specially moved by his concurrence to extol Celestine to the highest, yet 1. Never spake a word of his Governing power or Sovereignty, but only his consent: And when they mention the Roman Church, it is only their consent which they predicate. 2. And they extol Cyril equally with Celestine [*Novo Paulo Celestine* (they forgot Peter) *Novo Paulo Cyrillo*: —*Unus Celestinus, Unus Cyrillus*,] &c.

The next witness brought is the Council of Calcedon, as calling Leo Universal Archbishop and Patriarch of old Rome, and sentence is pronounced against Dioscorus in the names of Leo and Saint Peter.] *Answ.* 1. This is but one of your common frauds. It was not the Council that called him universal Archbishop, but two Deacons in the superscription of their Libels, viz. Thedodorus and Ischirion. And were they the Catholic Church? 2. By [Universal Archbishop] its plain that they meant no more than the chief in dignity and order of all Archbishops; and not the Governor of all. 3. I have shown you before that this very Council in its Canons not only give the Bishop of Constantinople equal privileges with the Bishop of Rome, but expressly say that Rome received this primacy of order *à patribus*, from a Council, because it was *Sedes Imperii*, the seat of the Emperor. I thought I had given you enough of this Council before. Sure I am when Bellarmine comes to this Canon, he hath nothing to say for his cause, but plainly to charge this famous fourth General Council with lying or falsehood, and to say, that the Pope approved not this Canon. But approved or not approved, if this was the Catholic Church representative, sure I am that their testimony is valid to prove that there was then no Catholic reception of the Roman Monarchy as of God, but contrarily a mere primacy of Dignity and Honor given it newly by men.

In the sixth age he had not one Council to pretend it seems for the Roman Sovereignty, for he cites none, but about other matters (of which anon.)

In the seventh age (which he calls the sixth) though then the Sovereignty was claimed by Boniface, he citeth no Council for it neither.

In the eighth age (from the year seven hundred) he cites the second Council of Nice, as approving an Epistle of Pope Adrian, wherein he saith that the Roman Church is the Head of all Churches.] *Answ.* 1. But whether Adrian himself by the Head meant the chief in Dignity, or the Governor of all, is a great doubt. 2. But whatever he meant, the Synods approving his Epistle for Images, is no proof that they approved every word in it. 3. Yea Tharasius seems to imply the contrary, calling him only, *Veteris Romae primas & testatorum principum successor*; as if his See had the Privilege only of being the Primate of Rome, and not the Ruler of the world. 4. But if this Council did (as it did not) openly own the Papal Sovereignty, it had been no great honor to him: For as in their decrees for Images they contradicted two Councils at Constantinople; and that at Frankford contradicteth them; so might they as well contradict the Church in this: Even as they defined Angels to be corporeal, which the Council of Lateran afterward contradicted. But the plain truth is, it was the scope of Adrian's Epistle as for Images, which they expressed themselves to approve. And that their Image-worship itself hath no Catholic succession, me thinks they should easily grant, considering not only, 1. That there is nothing in the first ages for them. 2. And that Epiphanius and many before him speak expressly against it. 3. But specially that there have been more General Councils of those ages against them then for them, and that before this of Nice decreed for them, the representative Catholic Church (except still the Pope be the Catholic Church) did condemn them.

I suppose by this time you will think it needless for me to follow H.T. any further in his Catalogue. I am content that any impartial sober person judge, whether here be a satisfactory proof of a Catholic succession of the Papal Sovereignty, when through so many ages, they bring not a word for any succession at all; much less that it was owned by the Catholic Church: and least of all that all the rest of Popery was so owned.

*Obj. But a*t least some other points of Popery are proved by H.T. to have such a succession. *Answ.* Peruse his proofs and freely judge. Two of the thirty-two Articles which I mentioned before he speaks to: The one is that Bishops, Priests and Deacons should abstain from their Wives, or be degraded.] But 1. The Council which he cites for this, is but a Provincial Council in Spain in the fifth Age: and whats this to Catholic succession? 2. The Evidences for the Antiquity of Priests marriages are so clear and numerous, that I will not thank any of them to confess their doctrine a Novelty. 1 Cor. 9:5. Have we not power to lead about a Sister, a Wife as well as other Apostles, and as the brethren of the Lord and Cephas? I hope they will not deny that Peter had a Wife? 1 Tim. 3:2,4. A Bishop must be blameless, the husband of one Wife—One that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity. ver. 12. Let the Deacons be the husbands of one wife, ruling their children, and their own houses well, Tit. 1:7. If any be blameless, the husband of one Wife, having faithful children,— The Antient Canons called the Apostles, say, Can. 6. Let not a Bishop or Presbyter put away his own Wife on pretense of Religion. And if he reject her, let him be excommunicated: but if he persevere, let him be deposed.] Let Bellarmine persuade those that will believe him, that this Canon speaks but of denying them maintenance: Canons as well as Scripture are unintelligible to these men. The Canons at Trull. of the fifth

and sixth Council, do expressly expound this Apostolic Canon as I do here: and they profess it was the Apostles concession then to the Bishops to marry: and they themselves forbid any to separate Priests from their Wives, and professedly oppose the Roman Church in it, *Can. 12,13*. For this Bellarmine, *lib. 2, c. 27, de Pontif. Rom*. reproacheth them, and thats his answer. Forsooth, the Pope approved not these Canons: 1. Let Adrian's words be read, and then judge. 2. What if he did not? Our enquiry is of Catholic Tradition and succession, and not of the Popes opinion. But its easy to bring much more for this.

Another point that H.T. proves, is, The same Canon of Scripture which they own: And for this he brings one Provincial Council, *Carth. 3*, as in the sixth Age. An excellent proof of Catholic succession through all Ages. But have we not better proof of the contrary? Let him that would be satisfied peruse these records and judge. *Euseb. Eccles. Hist. l. 3, c. 9, vel. 10*, and there Joseph. *li. 1, cont. Apion. Constitut. Apostol*. (whosoever was the author) *lib. 2, c. 57. Canon. Apostult. Dionys. Eccl. Hier. c. 3. Melet. in Euseb. Eccl. Histor. lib. 5, c. 24. Origen in Niceph. hist. Eccles. lib. 5, c. 16. Orig. Philocal. c. 3. Euseb. Hist. l. 6, c. 25. Tertul. cont. Marcion. Carm. lib. 4, c. 7. Athanas. Tom. 2. Epist. 39. Et in Synops. Sacr. scrip. Hilar. Pictav. Explanat. in Psalmos. Cyril. (vel. Johan.) Hierosol. Catech. 4. Council. Laodic. Can 59. Epiphan. haeres. 8, and 76, and de Mensur. and ponderib. Greg. Nazianz. Carmin. de veris and genuinis libris SS. Amphiloch. in Balsam. p. 1082. Hieronym. in Prolog. in lib. Reg. and Prol. in lib. Solom. Et Epist. ad Laetam. and passim. Ruffinus in Symbolum*. But what need I cite anymore, when Dr. Cosin hath done it in a volume purposely? Where this allegation also of the third *Conc. Carthag*. is answered.

And now having shown you that Papists cannot prove any Catholic Succession, or Continuation, or Tradition of their Religion, let us consider of their silly shift, by instancing in some by-points common to them with others. Of which I shall say the less because I have spoke to it already in my Safe Religion.

And before I mention any particulars, remember that I have proved before that ignorance or difference about many points not essential to Christianity, may consist with our being of one Religion and Catholic Church, and therefore such differences are nothing to the point of succession of the Catholic Church or Religion. This is plain to any reasonable man. And that the Papists may see that for their parts they have nothing to say against it, I shall add to what is said, that they tolerate or plead for the toleration of greater differences among themselves, which yet they affirm to consist with the unity of faith. I will now give you but an instance or two.

The Jesuits maintain, that if a man do but believe in their Pope and Church as infallible, he may (not only as some say, be ignorant of some Article of the Creed itself, and yet be a true Catholic, yea and be saved, but also) believe a false Article as from God and the Church: The former is commonly taught not only by such as Suarez, that say the Article of Christ's Descent into Hell is not to all of Necessity to Salvation, but by many others in the Doctrine of Implicit faith. The later clause you may see among others in Franc. Albertinus the Jesuit, *Corollar. p. 250*, where his objectors put this case [Suppose twenty Bishops preach to a country man a false Article, as if it were spoken by God and the Church: that proposal of the twenty Bishops is so sufficient, that the Country man prudently formeth an evident practical judgment, and morally certain, to believe with a speculative assent the Article proposed by the twenty Bishops, for the Authority of God as the

formal reason. Three absurdities seem hence to follow. 1. That the Country man should be obliged under mortal sin, to believe the twenty Bishops, and so the precept of faith should bind to believe a falsehood. 2. The Country man should be in God's Grace without faith. In Grace, because he commits no mortal sin, yea he obeys the command of believing: Yet without faith, because he believes a falsehood opposite to faith, and so loseth faith. 3. God should concur to deceive—To the first Albertinus answereth that its no Absurdity that the command of faith do oblige to believe a falsehood, it being not per se, but *per accidens*. To the second he saith, that the Country man doth not lose his grace or faith, because the falsehood believed is not formally opposite to the true faith (but materially)— Here you see that a man may hold an Article opposite to the faith materially, and yet not only be a true Christian in grace and faith, but also in so doing obey by accident the command of believing, so be it he believe in their Church. And if that be so, with what face can these men say, that our Church or Religion is new, or not the same with the Greeks, &c. when we have the same formal Object of faith, and differ in no Essential Material point? See here their lubricity and partiality.

One Instance more: The second Council of Nice that decreed for Image-Worship, doth yet expressly decree that Latria, Divine worship is to be given only to God; Thomas Aquinas *sum. 3, q. 25, art. 3, and 4*, purposely maintaineth that *Latria*, Divine Worship is to be given to the Image of Christ, and to the Cross that he died on; and to the sign of that Cross. Here is an Article of their faith expressly contradicted: And yet Aquinas is a member of their Church; And if any say, he is no member, its proved past doubt, for the Pope hath Canonized him for a Saint: So that now it is a part of their Religion to take him for a true believer: And Albertinus hath (as he

thinks) proved, that though in many other matters of fact the Pope be fallible, yet in the Canonizing of Saints he is infallible, because of some promise of God's special assistance (if one knew where to find it.) Abundance of such Instances might be brought that prove, that the Papists own men as true believers, that deny or contradict Articles of their faith. But what need we more, then that France and thousands elsewhere are yet members of their Church, that deny the Lateran and Florentine definition for the Popes Supremacy above a General Council? And when most Papists hold that Angels are incorporeal, contrary to the definition of the said second Council of Nice. And therefore by their own law, nay much more, we may well say that those were of our Religion that differed from us in nothing that is indeed or our esteem Essential to the faith. Now to a few particulars.

1. The Papists tell us that [Fulk confesseth that Jerome, Austin, Ambrose, &c. held the invocation of Saints] *H.T. p. 49*. *Answ.* 1. If any hold that they should desire the departed Saints to pray for them, as they do the living, we have reason enough to take it for their error, but its no proof that they are not of the same Church and Religion with us: As long as they give no part of that adoration or honor to Saints which is proper to God the Father, Son, or Holy Ghost, it is not inconsistent with true Faith and Christianity.

2. But yet we must tell you that the Primitive Church was unacquainted with the Romish prayer to Saints. Till the end of the fourth Century they are not able to prove that ever three men (if any one) were for any prayer to the Dead at all, except such a conditional speech in an Oration as Greg. Nazianzen hath [If holy souls have any care or feeling of such things as these, receive this Oration] *Orat. 11*. I entreat the Reader that needeth information of the way of Antiquity in this point, to read Bishop Ushers

Answer to the Jesuit on this point, p. 418, &c. Where he saith that [for nine parts of the first four hundred years, he dare be bold to say that the Jesuit is not able to produce so much as one true testimony out of any Father whereby it may appear that any account at all was made of it] Where he citeth the full express words of the Fathers of those first ages against praying to Saints, as Origen in *Jos. Hom. 16*. And in *Rom. lib. 2, c. 2*. And *Contr. Celsum lib. 8, p. 432,433,406,411,412, and lib. 5, p. 239*. Tertullian *Apol. c. 30*. Tertullian and Cyprian of Prayer: Athanasius *Orat. 4. Cont. Arrium p. 259,260. Eccles*. *Smyrn. apud Euseb. Hist. lib. 4. &c*. I am loath to recite what is there already given you. 3. And when Prayer to the dead did come in, how exceedingly it differed from the Romish Prayers to the dead, I pray you read there in the same Author. 4. And also of those Adorations and Devotions offered by the Papists to the Virgin Mary, I desire you to read in the same Author, and Place, enough to make a Christian tremble, and which for my part I am not able to excuse from horrid Blasphemy or Idolatry, though I am willing to put the best interpretation on their words that reason will allow.

5. The Reason why in the Old Testament men were not wont to pray to Saints, Bellarmine saith was, because then they did not enter into heaven nor see God. *Bellar. de sanct. Beat. li. 2, c. 19*. So Suarez in the third part, *Tom. 2, disp. 42. Sect. 1*. But abundance of the chief Doctors of the Church for diverse Ages were of opinion that the Saints are not admitted into Heaven to the clear sight of God before the day of Judgment (as most of the Eastern Churches do to this day) therefore they could not be for the Popish Prayer to Saints.

And here again observe, that men may be of the same faith and Church with us, that differ and err in as great a matter as this. The Council of

Florence hath now defined it, that departed souls are admitted into Heaven to the clear sight of God: And yet Stapleton and Francis. Pegna. à Castro, Medina, Sotus, affirm that Irenaeus, Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Clemens Romanus, Origen, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Austin, Lactantius, Victorinus, Prudentius, Theodoret, Aretas, Oecumenius, Theophilact, Euthymius, yea and Bernard, have delivered the contrary sentence. See *Staplet. Defens. Eccles. author. cont. Whitak. lib. 1, c. 2*, with *Fran. Pegna in part. 2. Director. Inquisitor. come. 21*.

Now as all these must needs be against the Popish Invocation of Saints, so they were against that which is now determined to be de fide; Whence I gather (on the by) 1. That the Romish faith increaseth, and is not the same as heretofore. 2. That they had not this Article by Tradition from any of these Fathers, or from the Apostles by them (unless from the Scriptures.) 3. That men that err in such points as are now defined by Councils to be de fide, are yet accounted by Papists to be of their Church and faith: And therefore they may be of ours, notwithstanding such errors as this in hand. 4. And note also by this taste, whether the Papists be not a perjured generation, that swear not to expound Scripture but according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.

6. The Council of Laodicea condemned them as Idolaters that prayed to Angels, Can. 35. (which Caranza, Crab, and other Papists have turned into Angulos; whose falsification you may see fully detected by the said Bishop Usher, *ibid. p. 470,471,472*. Read there also the full Testimonies of Greg. Nissen, Athanasius, Epiphanius, &c. against praying to Saints and Angels, and the detection of Bellarmine's fraud, that pretendeth the Fathers to speak of the Gentiles Idolatry when they mention the Virgin Mary and the Saints, and say expressly they were not to be adored.

But for all this, *H.T. Manual. P. 291*, &c. hath Fathers for this Adoration of Angels and Saints. And who are they? The first is Dionysius: to which I answer, 1. There is never a such a word in the place cited in Dionysius, in the Book that I have at hand, printed *Lugdun. 1572*. 2. We are for praying the Saints to pray for us too, that is, those on earth: And the words cited by him, mention not the Saints in heaven. 3. That Dionysius is not Dionysius but a spurious Apocryphal Book: Not once known and mentioned in the world till Gregory the greats days, (six hundred years after Christ) as Bellarmine himself saith *Lib. de Scriptor. Eccles. de Dionys. And lib. 2, de Monach. c. 5*.

The second is *Clem. Apostol. Constit. 5*. *Answ.* 1. The words speak only of honoring the Martyrs, which is our unquestioned duty; but not of Praying to them. 2. Its an Apocryphal forgery, and neither the Apostles nor Clements Work which he citeth (but anything will serve these men:) Let him believe Bellarmine *de scriptor. Eccles. p. 38,39*, where he proveth it, and saith that [in the Latin Church, these Constitutions are of almost no account, and the Greeks themselves *Canon. 2. Trul*. reject them as depraved by Heretics, and that the receiving of them is it that misleadeth the Ethiopians.] See more against them in Cooks *Censurâ, p. 17,18,19*, and Rivets *Crit. Sac. & Dalaeus in Pseudepigrap.*

The third Testimony of H.T. is from Justins second Apol. *Answ.* It is not Praying to Angels that Justin seemeth to intend, but giving them due honor, which we allow of. His intent is to stop the mouths of Heathens that called the Christians impious for renouncing their God's: To whom he replieth, that we yet honor the true God, and his Angels, &c.—

His Testimony for the third age is only Origen (and yet none of Origen) First in his Lament. *Answ.* 1. Origen there mentioneth the Saints, but not the

dead Saints. It may be all the Saints in the Church on earth whose prayers he desireth. 2. If this satisfy you not, at least be satisfied with this, that you cite a forgery that is none of Origen's works. Not only Erasmus saith that [This Lamentation was neither written by Origen, nor translated by Jerome, but is the fiction of some unlearned man, that by this trick devised to defame Origen:) But Baronius *Annal. Tit. 2, ad an. 253, p. 477*, witnesseth that Pope Gelasius numbers it with the Apocryphals.

But H.T. hath a second testimony from Origen. in *Cantic. Hom. 3*. *Answ.* 1. That speaks of the Saints prayer for us, but not of our prayers to them one word, which is the thing in question. 2. But Erasmus and others have shown that neither is this any of Origen's works. Sixtus Senensis saith, that some old Books put Jerome's name to it: And Lombard and Aquinas cite passages out of it as Ambroses.

You see now what Testimonies H.T. hath produced for the first three Ages, even till above four hundred years after Christ. And yet no doubt but this is currant proof with the poor deluded Papists that read his Book.

2. The next exception to be considered is, Praying for the Dead: which they say the ancient Church was for.

Answ. 1. We are for the Commemoration of the holy lives and sufferings of the Saints: and the first sort of the ancients prayers for them began here, as the occasion. 2. We are for thankful acknowledgement of God's Mercies to the departed Saints, and to the Church by them. And the first prayers for them were such as these. 3. Bishop Usher hath copiously proved that they were Saints, supposed to be in Heaven or Paradise, and not in Purgatory, that were then prayed for: and therefore that it was not the Popish praying for tormented souls that was then practiced: And therefore their prayers then were besides Commemorations and Thanksgivings, the petitioning of all

those following Mercies for them which are not to be received till the resurrection: Bellarmine himself proving that though we were certain that the blessed souls shall have a raised glorified body, and be justified in the last Judgment, yet may it be prayed for, because it is yet future. Now we are far from being of another Church or Religion then those that hold such an opinion as this. Saith Usher p. 224, when he had cited many testimonies [In these and other prayers of the like kind, we may descry evident footsteps of the primary intention of the Church in her supplications for the dead: which was that the whole man (not the soul separated only) might receive public remission of sins, and a solemn acquittal in the judgment of that great day; and so obtain both a full escape from all the Consequences of sin (the last enemy being now destroyed, and death swallowed up in victory) and a perfect consummation of bliss and happiness: all which are comprised in that short prayer of S. Paul for Onesiphorus (though made for him while he was alive) [The Lord grant unto him that he may find mercy of the Lord in that day] Yea, diverse prayers for the dead of that kind are still retained in the Roman offices; of which the great Spanish Doctor John Medina thus writeth; Although I have read many prayers for the faithful deceased, which are contained in the Roman Missal, yet have I read in none of them that the Church doth petition, that they may more quickly be freed from pains: but I have read that in some of them petition is made, that they may be freed from everlasting pains.] Again there be other prayers (saith Medina) wherein petition is made, that God would raise the souls of the dead in their bodies unto bliss at the day of judgment.]

You see then, that our Question is not whether the dead may be prayed for: but what prayers may be made for them. And therefore to find that about three hundred years after Christ (more or less) men begun to pray for

the dead, is no proof that they were not of our Church or Religion; or that therefore we want succession. It was not a praying to be sooner out of Purgatory that then was used, as Papists do, but a Praying for the mercies promised at the Resurrection: And thus we think it lawful to pray for the dead; were it not for the accidental evil that might follow with them that will misunderstand and abuse it.

And its further to be noted, that as Pegna, Stapleton and others confess, the Fathers, Greek and Latin, before mentioned, did believe that men had not their perfect Joys till the Resurrection; and therefore they had the far stronger motive to pray for the dead. And if Protestants had not been partly of this mind (save only that we put not the soul into hidden receptacles, nor anywhere but with Christ) Bellarmine had not found so much occasion of that unworthy calumny against Calvin for the words cited by him in his *Instit*. as if he denied the beatifical vision, if not the immortality of the soul: Even because he took not our bliss to be perfect till the Resurrection, but somewhat short of what we shall then be. Now seeing the Fathers were so commonly of that mind, and the Greeks and Ethiopians are still of that mind, and Bellarmine saith Luther and Calvin are of that mind, you may see that neither in that nor the point of praying for the dead as used by the ancients, is our distance so great as to weaken the proof of our succession, or make us to be of two Churches or Religions.

And here you may see the differences between the Prayers for the dead which are used by the Papists, and by the Eastern Churches to this day. And yet if upon private unsound opinions any should go somewhat further in this point, it followeth not that such error changeth the faith. I desire the Reader that would have a fuller sight of the face of Antiquity in this point, to read Bishop Usher of it in the forementioned Answer to the Jesuit.

3. Another point that they much challenge us about, is, The Veneration or Adoration of Images, Relics, and the Cross, to which I may join, peregrinations to places esteemed by them to be of eminent holiness. Concerning Peregrinations, you may see by a plain Epistle of Gregory Nyssen (in the end of his printed works, but in the midst of a M. S. in Paris Library) written purposely against going on Pilgrimage to Jerusalem, what is to be thought of this. He adviseth even the retired Monastics even in those Countries that were near Judea, to forbear such Pilgrimages as dangerous and unnecessary, and not at all commanded in the Scripture. The Papists did as long as they could persuade the world that this Epistle was none of Gregory's, and when they were made ashamed of that, they would expound it as prohibiting Pilgrimages to none but the Monastics: And sure if it should be forbidden them, then much more should others be forbidden, that have not the leisure, and pretend not to the devotions which these pretend to. Read but the Epistle itself without either Molinaeus his notes on our side, or Gretsers frivolous answers, and judge as thou seest cause.

As for Images, we allow the Historical use of them, and the setting them up in Churches the Lutherans allow, and we dislike it only as dangerous and a needless snare, but take not ourselves to be of another Church or Religion from those that are otherwise minded: No nor from those that Reverence them as they respect the persons whom they signify. But its one thing to use Images, and another thing to use them Popishly, which is to make them mediate objects of Divine worship, yea to worship the very Image itself, and the Cross and the sign of the Cross with the same worship as we do him that is signified by them: So that we confidently affirm, 1. That the Primitive Church did make no use of Images at all in the worship of God; no nor endure them in the place of Worship. 2. That when they were first

brought in, the Popish use of them was still renounced and detested. Clemens Alexandrinus Protreptic. ad Gent. saith that [We are plainly forbidden to use that deceitful Art] (of painting or image-making)—And [We have no sensible Image made of any sensible matter, but such an Image as is to be conceived with the understanding] Origen against Celsus *lib. 7, p. 373,384,386,387,* is large and plain against this use of Images, as the Protestants are. And the *Eliber. Council. C. 36*, saith [*Placuit picturas in Ecclesia esse non debere, ne quod colitur, aut adoratur in parietibus depingatur*. It seemeth good to us, that Pictures ought not to be in the Church, lest that which is worshipped or adored should be painted on Walls] Some Papists would fain find a sense for this (anon contrary to the words: But Melch Cano plainly saith, that the Council did not only imprudently but impiously make this law to take away Images, *Loc. Theol. lib. 5, c. 4, conc. 4*. I shall cite no more, but entreat the Reader that is willing to be informed how much Antiquity was against the Papists in the points of Images, to peruse only Dallaeus de Imaginibus, and Usher in his Answer to the Jesuit and Sermon to the Parliament: And I provoke the Papists to confute what is in them alleged if they can.

H.T. hath no better shift to salve their credit (*Manual p. 319,320*.) then to set their own Schoolmen and General Council together by the ears. The second Council of Nice (that did most for Images) did openly renounce the adoring them with Divine honor, and Tharasius solemnly professed, *Duntaxat in unum verum Deum latriam & fidem se refer & reponere* [They did refer and repose faith and divine worship in the true God alone] But Aquinas *sum. 3, q. 25, a. 3, & 4*, maintaineth (as I before observed) that the Image of Christ, and the Cross and the sign of the Cross are to be worshipped with Divine worship.] And what saith H. Turbervile to this?

Why [This is a mere school opinion and not of faith with us: Urge not therefore what some particular Divines say, but hearken to the Doctrine of God's Church.—] Very good! Is not this so gross a kind of juggling, that would never down if devout ignorance and implicit faith had not prepared the stomachs of the people? 1. You see here that to contradict the Determination of a General Council, is not of faith with them. But it is not against your faith? Do you give leave to mere school opinions to contradict General Councils? See here what's become of the Popish faith? If the Determinations of Councils be not Articles of faith with you, then you have no faith, but give up your cause: And if they be, then Aquinas and his followers are Heretics. 2. And then see whats become of the Popes Infallibility in Canonizing Saints, that have sainted Thomas Aquinas that proves a Heretic by your Law: so that your cause is gone which way ever you turn you. 3. And then see what it is to pray to Saints, when some of them are made Heretics by your own Laws. 4. And then also see, at what Unity the Church of Rome is among themselves, when it is the very common doctrine of their learned Schoolmen, which contradicteth a General Council: Are you not well agreed that while? 5. And lastly note what a Holy Church you have, when the common sort of your most learned Divines are thus made Heretics: See Bishop Ushers allegations of *Th. Arundels Provincial Council at Oxford, 1408, ex Guil. Linewood lib 5. And Jac. Naclantus in Rom. c. 1, fol. 42*, saith [We must not only confess, that the faithful in the Church do worship before the Image, as some cautiously speak, but that they adore the Image, without any scruple: yea and that they worship it with the same worship as the Prototype: so that if it be worshipped with Divine worship, the Image must have Divine worship—] And Cabrera in *3 part. Thom. qu. 25, art. 3, disp. 2, num. 15*, there cited by

Usher, saith that it is of faith that Images are to be worshipped in Churches and without: and we must give them signs of servitude and submission, by embracing, lights, offering incense, uncovering the head, &c. 2. That Images are truly and properly to be adored, with an intention to adore themselves, and not only the samplars represented in them. This Conclusion is against Durand and his followers, whose opinion by the Moderns is judged dangerous, rash, and savoring of Heresy: and M. Medina reporteth that M. Victoria reputed it heretical: but our conclusion is the common one of Divines. If Images be improperly only adored, then they are not to be adored simply and absolutely; which is manifest Heresy. And if Images were to be worshipped only by way of Remembrance, because they make us remember the samplars, which we thus adore as if they were present, it would follow that all creatures are to be adored with the same adoration as God—which is absurd. 3. The Opinion of Saint Thomas, that the Image must be worshipped with the same act of adoration, as the samplar which it representeth, is most true, most pious, and very consonant to the decrees of faith] Thus Cabrera, who adds that this is the doctrine of Thomas and all his Disciples and almost all the old Schoolmen, and particularly of Cajetan, Capreolus, Paludanus, Ferrariensis, Antoninus, Soto, Alexand. Ales. Albertus Magnus, Bonaventura, Richardus de media villa, Dionysius Carthusianus, Major, Marsilius, Thom. Waldensis, Turrecremata, Clichtovaeus, Turrian, Vasquez, &c. And Azorius saith [It is the constant opinion of Divines,] *Institut. Moral tom. 1, lib. 9, c. 6*. Yea in the Roman Pontifical published by the Authority of Clement the eighth, it is expressed, that [The Legates Cross shall have the right hand, because Divine worship is due to it See here whether the Pope himself be not an Heretic, and the Pontifical contain not heresy, and the whole rabble of the Schoolmen

heretics, by contradicting the determination of the General Council at Nice 2, which H.T. citeth, and the doctrine which he saith is the doctrine of God's Church, such is the faith and unity of the Papists.

But they will say still that though all these worship the very Cross and Images themselves, and that with Divine worship, yet there be some of a better mind, that do but worship God by the Image, such as H.T. &c. *Answ.* And do you think that rational Pagans did not know as well as you that their Images were not God's themselves, and so worshipped them not as God's, but as the representers and instruments of some Diety? *Lactantius Instit. lib. 2, c. 2*, brings them in saying thus [*Non ipsa*, &c. We fear not them, but those whom they represent, and to whose names they are consecrated [And Arnobius thus [*Deos per simulachra veneramur*: It is the God's that we worship by Images] And Augustine thus reporteth the Pagans sayings [in Psal. 96. *Non ego lapidem, &c*. I do not worship that stone, nor that Image, which is without sense] And in Psal. 113, *cono. 2*. [*Nec simulachrum, nec daemonium colo, &c*. 1. Worship neither the Image, nor a Spirit in it; but by the bodily likeness I behold the sign of that which I ought to worship.] Yea that many of them renounced the worshipping of Devils, appeareth by Augustine's report of their words, in Psal. 96. [*Non colimus mala daemonia, &c*. We worship not evil spirits: It is those that you call Angels, that we worship, who are the powers of the great God, and the Ministers of the great God] To whom Austin answers [Would you would worship them (that is, honor them aright,) then you would easily learn of them not to worship them] And doubtless few could be so silly as to think there were as many Jupiter's or Apollos as there were Images of them in the world. So that you see here that some of the Pagans as to Image-worship disclaimed that which the Papists ascribe to them, viz. Divine worship.

Oh but saith H.T. tell us not of particular Doctors, but of the Doctrine of God's Church. *Answ.* What not of Saint Thomas? What! Not of the Army of School Divines before mentioned? What! Not of the [*Communis sententia Theologorum*:] the common judgment of Divines? For so they call it; What? Not of that which is de fide, or consonant to it, and whose contrary is heresy, or savors of Heresies? (as they say of Durand opinion) what! Not of Pope Clement the eighth and the Roman Pontifical? (p. 672.) wonderful! Are all these nobody in your Church? O admirable harmony that is in your united Church!

But you can agree to leave out the second commandment lest the very words should deter the people from Image worship; and to make an irrational division of the tenth to blind their eyes. And yet you cry up the Testimony of the Fathers, when you are fain to hide one of the ten commandments, so that thousands of your poor seduced followers, know not that there is such a thing. No wonder if you cast away Gregory Nyssen's Epistle against Pilgrimages; and Epiphanius his words (in the end of his *Epistle to Johan. Herosol*.) against Images; and if Vasquez (in *3 Thom. disp. 105, c. 3*.) contrary to the plain words do fain that it was the Image of a profane or common man that Epiphanius pulled down; and Al. Cope (*Dial. 5, c. 21*.) say, that the epistle is counterfeit and not Epiphanius': and if Bellarmine (*de Imag. c. 9*.) and Baronius (ad an. 392.) say that this part of the Epistle is forged: and if Alphons. a Castro. (*cont. Haeres. de Imag*.) reproach Epiphanius for it as an Iconoclast: so well are you agreed also in the confutation of the Fathers Testimonies, that any way will serve your turn, though each man have his several way. Fair fall Vasquez that plainly confesseth, that indeed the Scripture doth forbid not only the worship of an Image for God, but also the worshiping of the true God in an Image: but

saith that this commandment is now repealed, and therefore under the Gospel we may do otherwise. (*Vasq. li. 2, de Adorat. Disp. 4, c. 3. Sect. 74,75. &c. 4. Sect. 84*.)

But of this point I shall say no more now but this. 1. Many Christian Churches do reject Images from their Churches and worship as well as Protestants. 2. More reject statues that reject not pictures. 3. Many that keep them, worship not them, nor God in them, or by them, as by a mediate *Obj. 4. Ge*neral Councils have been against Images, that want nothing but the pleasure of the Pope to make them of as good authority as the Council that was for them. 5. That Council that was for them (Nice 2.) condemneth the Schoolmen and Pope Clement himself as Heretics, for worshiping them, or the Cross with Divine worship. 6. I again urge any Papist to answer Dallaeus book rationally that can. 7. To spare me the labor of saying more of the judgment of the ancient Catholic Church against the Popish use of Images, I desire the Reader to peruse what Cassander an honest Papist hath written to that end, Consultat. de Imag. et simulac. who begins thus [*Ad Imagines vero sanctorum quod attinet, certum est, initio praedicati Evangelii aliquanto tempore inter Christianos, praesertim in ecclesiis, imaginum usum non fuisse, ut ex Clemente & Arnobio patet: Tandem picturas in ecclesiam admissas ut rerum gestarum historiam exprimentes &c.*—] And he produceth abundance from antiquity against the present Popish use of them.

4. Another point in which the Papists pretend to better Countenance from Antiquity then we, is the point of the Corporal presence with Transubstantiation: But of this there is so much said by multitudes of our Divines, that I shall now say no more, but desire the studious to Read at least Bishop Ushers *Answ.* to the Jesuit of it, and Edmundus Abertinus *de*

Eucharistia: a Treatise so full of evidence from Scripture, Reason, and the judgment of the Fathers, that I boldly challenge all the Papists in the world to give a tolerable answer to it, that is a better than that is given.

When we have thus shown them the stream of Antiquity to have been against them, they pass us by, and thrust into the ignorant people's hands, a few musty scraps of abused words, which are answered and cleared over and over: Thus do H.T. D. Bailey, and others.

5. In the point of Satisfaction and Purgatory, besides what Sadeel, Chamier and others have said, Usher and the foresaid Dallaeus in a full Treatise have shown the Papists nakedness from Antiquity, so that modesty should forbid them to pretend the Fathers for them anymore, if any modesty be left.

6. About their Fasts (though that be no essential of Religion) both the time, manner &c. is so fully spoke to by the said Dallaeus in another just volume *de Jejuniis*, that Popery in this also is openly condemned by the Fathers in the view of the impartial considerate world.

The point of Free will, and most of the rest in which they imagine that we dissent from Antiquity or the Eastern Churches, I have spoke to already in my first Book against Popery. I had thought to have gone through the rest particularly, at least the rest mentioned by H.T. and D. Bailey; but finding them so frequently and fully handled already, I will forbear such labor in vain.

CHAP. XXVI. Their false interpretation of the sayings of Ancients, from whence they would extort a proof of their Sovereignty.

D*etect.* 17. Another of the Papists Deceits, and one of the Principal that they support their cause with, is, A false interpretation and application of all the sayings of the Fathers, which they can but force to a show of countenancing their supremacy. That you may find out their juggling in this, I shall show you some of their Footsteps more particularly.

1. Any claim that their own ambitious Bishops have made to a further power then was due to them, they use as an Argument for their universal sovereignty: when as we deny not but that there was too much pride and Ambition in their Prelates (which is all that this will prove;) even in some that otherwise might be good men. We deny not but that Zosimus would fain have extorted a confession of his usurped power, and a submission to it from Aurelius, Augustine, and the rest of the African Council. But yet he could not do it. We confess that Leo the first, and Gregory the first, and others, were very busy for the extending of their power: And that the Roman Bishops were long endeavoring to have put the halter on the Africans heads, yea and long about the French before they got them under.

And shall these partial ambitious men be the witnesses? And because they would have had more power, doth it follow that it was their due?

2. Again, if they find that any distressed Churches or Bishops have but sent to Rome for help, they presently gather thence that they took the Pope to be Christ's Vicar General. As when Chrysostom sent to Innocent, and Basil and the rest in the East did send so oft for help into the West, when as the reasons were but such as these; 1. Because Rome during the Emperors residence there, was the place where life or death was last pronounced on every man's cause by the secular power: and therefore the Bishop of Rome had the greater opportunity to befriend other Churches. 2. And afterward Rome had a great secular influence on the Empire. 3. And because in the divisions of the East about Arianism, they thought the countenance of the Orthodox in the West might have done somewhat to turn the scales. 4. Because the Bishop of Rome being taken for the Patriarch of the first place, his voice might do much against an adversary.

I will delay you now with no more instances, then those of Basils time from the East. Eusebius, Meletius, Basil, and the rest of the Orthodox, being both pestered with the Arians, and all to pieces also among themselves, do send for help to the West. (*Basil. Epist. 69*.) But to whom? And for what? Not to the Bishop of Rome only, nor by name, but equally to the Bishops of Italy and France, without any mention of the Roman power. And it was not that the Pope might decide all by his sovereign power, which certainly was so near a way to their relief, that no wise man can imagine them so mad as to forget it, if it had been a thing then known and approved of. But only they desire that some may be sent to help them to be the stronger party in a Synod, or at least someone to comfort them, and put some countenance on their cause. And *Epist. 70*. Basil writeth himself (in the name of the rest:)

but to whom [To the Bishops of France and Italy.] and France before Italy, without taking notice of a universal Head of the Church at Rome. And what doth he so importune them for? Not that the Pope would decide the controversy: but that they would acquaint the Emperor with their state (because the West had an Orthodox Emperor, and the East an Arian) or send some to them to see how it stood with them: so that it was but either help from the Emperor, or countenance from the number of Bishops (because they were over voted quite at home) that they desired. So *Epist. 74*. Basil again writes, [to the Bishops of the West;] (and so no more to the Roman Bishop then the rest,) and he giveth these as his Reasons [For, (saith he) what we here speak is suspected, as if we spoke through private contention. —But for you, the further you are remote from them by habitation, so much credit you have with the people, whereto is added that the grace of God helpeth you to relieve the oppressed: And if Many of you unanimously decree the same things, it is manifest that the multitude, will produce a certain reception of your opinion.] Wonderful! If there were then a Vicar General of Christ at Rome, that it never came into their mind to crave his decision or help, as such?

O but say the Papists, that was because they had to do only with the Arians, that cared for no authority that was against them. *Answ.* 1. But would these Arians have so much regarded the votes of the French and Italian Bishops, yea or a few men sent from them, and yet not regard the Head of the Church? The Arians sure had heard of this Headship, if any had. And would not the Orthodox desire so much as a word from Rome for this advantage? 2. But it is false that they were only the Arians that they called for help against. They expressly say, that it was also because they were divided among themselves, (by personal quarrels.) How importunately

doth Gregory Nyssen afterward call for help from others, and telleth Flavianus in his Epist. to him, of their misery as if all were lost? And the only sad instance was, that Helladius (counted a good Bishop) had proudly neglected him, and made him stand at his door (when he went to visit him) a great while before he was let in; and then did not bid him sit down; and then did not speak to him first but two or three strange angry words. This was the great business. But to proceed with Basil. *Epist. 77*, he falls to chiding the Western Bishops, for not sending to them, nor regarding them and their communion: and to touch their pride, he addeth, [We have one Lord, one faith, one hope: Whether you think yourselves the Head of the universal Church: the head cannot say to the feet, I have no need of you; or if you place yourselves in the order of other Church-members, you cannot say to us, we need you not.] And would you here believe that the Papists have the faces to cite this passage of Basil, for their Headship, because here is the word Head! When as its plain, 1. That Basil by the Head means but the chiefest part, and not the sovereign power. 2. That he speaks to all the Bishops of the West, and not only to the Roman Bishop. 3. That he doth it as a smart reproof of their arrogancy, and not in any approbation at all. But anything will serve them. More from Basil I shall have occasion to mention anon.

3. Nore also, that when the Papists find but any Heresy condemned by the Bishop of Rome, they cite this as a testimony of their Sovereignty: As if other Patriarch and Bishops condemned them not as well as they; Or as if we knew no that the Church desired the most general vote against Heretics, and therefore would be loath to leave so great a Bishop out.

4. And when they find the Pope excommunicating foreign Bishops, they cry up this as a Testimony of his Headship: As if we did not know, 1. That

to refuse Communion with another Church or Bishop is no act of Jurisdiction over them. 2. That other Bishops have made bold also to excommunicate the Pope: I will now but recite those words of Nicephorus *lib. 17, c. 26*, which you use to glory in (as many do in their own shame) [Vigilius (saith he) proceeded to that insolency, that he excommunicated Mennas for four months. And Mennas did the same by him: But Justinian being moved to anger with such things, sent some to lay hold on him. But Vigilius being afraid of himself, fled to the Altar of Sergius the Martyr, and laid hold on the Sacred Pipes, would not be drawn away till he had pulled them down—] But by the Mediation of the Empress Theodora, the Pope was pardoned, and Menna and he absolved one another. A fair proof of the Vicarship! 3. And so it was, that Pope Honorius was condemned for a Heretic by two or three General Councils.

5. Also when they meet with any big words of their own Popes (as I command this or that) they take it for a proof of the Vicarship: As if big words did prove Authority. Or as if we knew not how lowlily and poorly they spoke to those that were above them. As Gregory the first for instance, was high enough towards those that he thought he could master. but what low submissive language doth he use to secular Governors that were capable of overtopping him? And what flattering language did his successors use to the most base murderers and usurpers of the Empire?

6. Another Roman deceit is this; When they find any mention of the exercise of the (now thriving) Roman Power, over their own Diocese or Patriarchal circuit, they would hence prove his universal Power over all. And by that Rule the Patriarch of Alexandria or Constantinople may prove as much.

7. Also when they meet with the passages that speak of the elevation of their Pope to be their first Patriarch, in the Roman Empire, or any Power that by the Emperors was given him, they cunningly confound the Empire with the world, and especially if they find it called by the name of the world; and they would persuade you that all other Christians and Churches on earth, did ascribe as much to the Bishop of Rome, as the Roman Empire did. Its true that he was in the Empire acknowledged to be first in order of dignity, because of Rome the seat of his Episcopacy; especially when General Councils began to trouble themselves and the world about such matters of precedency. And its well known from the language of their writers, as well as from the words of Luke 2:1, that they usually called the Empire all the world: And from such passages would the Papists prove the Primacy at least of the Pope over all the world. But put these Jugglers to it, to prove if they can, that beyond the Rivers Meroes and Euphrates, and beyond the bounds of the Roman Empire, the Pope did either exercise Dominion, or was once so much as regarded by them, any more than any other Bishop, except there were any adjacent Island or Country that had their dependence upon the Empire. I hope they will not deny that the Church extended much beyond the Empire. (Though our History of that part of it be much defective.) And let them prove if they can, that ever any of those Churches had any regard to the Roman Bishop, anymore then to another man. Let them tell you where either the Empire of the Abyssinians or any other out of the line of the Imperial power, was any whit like-subject to the Pope.

8. But their chief fraud is about names and words. When they meet with any high complemental title given to the Bishop of Rome, they presently

conclude that it signifieth his Sovereignty. Let us instance in some particulars, and show the vanity of their conclusions from them.

1. Sometimes the Roman Bishops are called [*Summi Pontifices*,] the chief Popes: and hence some gather their Supremacy. But I suppose you will believe Baronius (their chief flatterer) in such a case as this. And he tells you in *Martyrolog. Roman. April. 9*, that [*Fuit olim vetus ill usus in Ecclesia, ut Episcopy omnes, non tantum Pontifices, sed & summi Pontifices dicerentur*— i.e. It was the ancient custom of the Church to call all Bishops not only Pontifices Popes, but chief Popes] And then citing such a passage of Jerome Epist. 99, he addeth [Those that understand not this ancient custom of speech, refer these words to the Popedom of the Church of Rome.)

2. As for the names Papa, Pope, Dominus, *Pater Sauctissimus, beatissimus, dei amantissimus*, &c. its needless to tell you that these were commonly given to other Bishops.

3. And what if they could find that Rome were called the mother of all Churches? I have formerly shown you, where Basil saith of the Church of Caesarea, that it is as the mother of all Churches in a manner. And Jerusalem hath oft that Title.

4. Sometime they find where Rome is called *Caput Ecclesiarum*, and then they think they have won the cause. When if you will consult the words, you shall find that it is no more than that Priority of Dignity which (not Christ, but) the Emperors and Councils gave them, that is intended in the word. Its called the Head, that is, the chief Seat in Dignity, without any meaning that the Pope is the universal Monarch of the world.

5. But what if they find the Pope called the Archbishop of the Catholic Church, or the Universal Bishop? Then they think they have the day. I

answer, indeed three flattering Monks at the Council of Calcedon, do so superscribe their libels; but they plainly mean no more than the Bishop that in order of dignity is above the rest; And many particular Churches are oft called Catholic Churches. There's difference between [A Catholic Church] and [The Catholic Church.] And the Bishop of Constantinople had that Title, even by a Council at Constant. an. 518, before the Bishop of Rome had it publicly, or durst own it: It was settled on the Patriarch of Constantinople to be called the Oecumenical or Universal Patriarch. Who knoweth not that Emperors gave such Titles at their pleasure? Justinian would sometime give the Primacy to Rome, and at another time to Constantinople, saying [*Constantinopolitana Ecclesia omnium aliarum est caput*: The Church of Constantinople is the Head of all other Churches.] *An. Dom. 530. C. de Episcopis. l. 1, lege 24*. And its known that this Justinian that sometime calls Rome the Head, did yet when the fifth General Council had condemned Vigilius Pope of Rome, permit Theodora his Empress to cause him to be fetched to Constantinople, and dragged about the street in a halter, and then banished, till they had forced him to subscribe and submit to the Council: even as they had deposed Pope Silverius his predecessor. And Baronius himself mentioneth a Vatican Monument which as it calls Agapetus Episcoporum princeps on one side, so doth it call Menna [the Apostolic Universal Bishop:] Which Baronius saith, doth mean no more than that he was Universal over his own Provinces: and if that be so, any Bishop may be called Universal. And do not these men know what Council of Carthage decreed that the Bishop *primae sedis* should be called neither *Summus Sacerdos, nor Princeps Sacerdotum, vel aliquid hujusmodi, tantum Episcopus primae sedis*: i.e. Not the chief Priest, or the chief of Priests but the Bishop of the first seat] And how long will they shut their eyes against

the testimony of two of their own Popes, Pelagius and Gregory the first that condemned the name of Universal Bishop?

Sometime they find the Church of Rome called Apostolic; and so were others as well as that, as is commonly known.

And sometime the Pope is called the Pillar of the Church; And what of that? So are many others as well as he; as all the Apostles were as well as Peter? The Church is built on the Foundation of the Apostles and Prophets. That the Pastors of the Church were ordinarily called the Pillars and props of it, as by Nicephorus Gildas, Theodoret, Basil, Tertullian, Dionysius, Jerome, Augustine, &c. you may see proved in Gatakers, *Cinnus p. 395,396*.

And lastly, when the Papists read their Popes called the Successors of Peter, they take this as a proof of their Sovereignty. Whereas 1. Peter himself had no such Sovereignty. 2. They succeed him not in his Apostleship. 3. They are called Paul's Successors as well as Peters. 4. Others are called Peters Successors too as well as they, by the Fathers. 5. And other Bishops ordinarily are called the Apostles Successors, and other Churches called Apostolic Churches.

I shall only set before them the words of one man at this time, (*Hesychii Hierosol. apud Photium Cod. 269*.) and desire them to tell me whether ever more were said of the Pope, yea or of Peter, then he saith of Andrew, calling him [*Chori Apostolici primogenitus, primitus defixa Ecclesiae columna, Petri Petrus, fundamenti fundamentum; principii principium vel primitiae, qui vocavit antequam vocaretur, adduxit priusquam adduceretur*] i.e. [The first begotten of the Apostolic Chore, the first fixed Pillar of the Church; the Peter of Peter, or the Rock of Peter, the Foundation of the Foundation; the

Principal of the Principal, who called before he was called, and brought (others) to (Christ) before he was brought to him (by any others.)

And the same Hesychius saith of James *apud Photium Cod. 275*. [Πῶς ἐγκωμιάσω, &c. i.e. With what Praises may I set forth the servant and Brother of Christ, the chief Emperor (or Commander or Captain) of the New Jerusalem; the Prince or chief of Priests, the President or Principal of the Apostles, the Crown or Leader among the Heads, the principal Lamp among the Lights; the principal planet among the Stars; Peter speaketh to the people; but James giveth the Law (or sets down the Law)] Can they show us now where more than this is said of Peter himself? Much less of the Pope?

CHAP. XXVII. Their corrupting Councils and Fathers, and citing such.

D*etect.* 18. Another of the Principal Deceits of the Papists, is, the forging and corrupting of Councils and Fathers, and the citation of such forgeries. Be careful therefore how you receive their Allegations, till you have searched and know the Books to be genuine, and the particular words to be there, and uncorrupted.

They have by their greatness obtained the opportunity of possessing so many Libraries, that they might the easilier play this abominable game. But God in mercy hath kept so many monuments of Antiquity out of their hands, partly in the Eastern, and partly in the Reformed Churches, as suffice to discover abundance of their wicked forgeries and falsifications.

Of their forging Canons, yea feigning Councils that never were, (as *Council. Sinuessan. Council. Rom. sub Silvestr*.) See Bishop Ushers *Answer to the Jes. p. 12,13*. As also of their forging Constantine's Donation, and Isidore Mercators forging of a fardel of Decretals; and of their falsifying and corrupting in the Doctrine of the Sacrament, the works of Ambrose, of Chrysost. (or the Author *operis Imperfecti*,) of Fulbertus Bishop of

Chartres; of Rabanus of Mainz, of Bertram, or Ratrannus, &c. Read I pray you the words detecting their horrible impious cheats.

But their *Indices expurgatorii* will acquaint you with much more. And yet their secreter expurgations are worst of all.

What words of Peters Primacy, and others for their advantage, they have added to Cyprian *de unitate Ecclesiae*, see in Jer. Stephens his Edition of it, where much more additions to Cyprians works are detected out of many Oxford Manuscripts.

Andreas Schottus the Jesuit publishing Basils works at *Antwerp Lat. A.D. 1616*, with Jesuitical fidelity, left out the Epistle, in which is this passage following, which should not be lost: speaking of the Western Bishops he saith [verily the manners of Proud men do use to grow more insolent, if they be honored. And if God be merciful to us, what other addition have we need of? But if God's anger on us remain, what help can the pride of the West bring us? When they neither know the Truth, nor can endure to speak it; but being prepossessed with false suspicions, they do the same things now, which they did in the case of Marcellus, contentiously disputing against those that taught the truth, but for Heresy, confirming it by their authority. Indeed I was willing (not as representing the public person of the East) to write to their Leader (Damasus) but nothing about Church matters, but that I might intimate that they neither knew the truth of the things that are done with us, nor did admit the way by which they might learn them. And in general, that they should not insult over the calamitous and afflicted, nor think that Pride did make for their dignity, when that one sin alone is enough to make us hateful to God] so far Basil in that Epistle left out by the Jesuit; in which you may see the Roman power in those days, in the consciences of Basil and such other Fathers in the East.

And (by the way) how Tertullian reverenced them, you may see *lib. de pudicit. p. 742*, where he calls Zepherinus, as we say, all to naught: And the Asian Bishops condemning of Victor, with Irenaeus his reproof of him; Cyprians and Firmilians condemning Stephen: Marcellinus his condemnation by all: Liberius his being so oft Anathematized by Hilary Pictav. the resistance of Zosimus and Boniface by the Africans, &c. show plainly in what esteem the now-infallible universal Head was then among the Fathers, and in all the Churches. But when the Papists come to the mention of such passages, what juggling's do they use? Sometime they silence them: sometime they pass them over in a few words that are buried in a heap of other matters: sometime they bring in some forgeries to obscure them. But commonly they make a nose of wax of Councils and Fathers, as well as of Scripture, and put any ridiculous sense upon them that shall serve their turns, though perhaps six men among them may have five or six Expositions.

An Epistle of Ciril of Jerusalem to Austin is forged by one, that their Molanus calleth A barbarous impostor (*Histor. Imag. l. 3, c. 36*.) about the miracles of Jerome; where Purgatory and other errors are befriended. When as Ciril himself died thirty years before Jerome. And yet Binsfield, Suarez and other of the most learned Papists stick not to make use of this forgery for all that.

But it would be tedious to recite their particular forgeries. The studious Reader may find many of them discovered up and down by Bishop Usher and other of our Writers. And for his fuller help, I advise him to read Dr. Reynolds *de Libris Apocryph*. and Dr. Th. James his corruptions of the Fathers, and Scultetus his medulla patrum : yea of the Papists themselves, read Sixtus Senensis his *Bibliothec*. and *Bellaerm. de Scriptorib. Eccles*.

and Possevines *Apparatus*, and Erasmus censures on the Fathers which he dealt with: But especially let him not be without Cooks *censura Patrum*, and Blondell on the Decretals; to which also add Rivets *Critica Sacra*, and *Dallaeus de Pseudepigraphis*.

Of their abominable Legends I shall say nothing, but that the wiser sort of themselves are ashamed of them. And if any Ancients have abused the Church by shameless forgeries, the Papists make use of such as confidently as if they were the word of God. For instance, Let any man but read over the Books of Basil Bishop of Seleucia (if it be his indeed) of the life and Miracles of Thecla, and try his faith upon it, whether he be able to believe that Thecla stood so long at the window to hear Paul while all those daily applications and orations were made to her? That Demas and Hermogenes were there to stir up the people against Paul as a deceiver, under the cloak of being his companions; that any of those Orations recited are true, when the Author like a professed fabler useth to say [I suppose thus or thus they said:] that her Mother Theoclaea, and her lover Thamiris were on the sudden so cruel as to burn her, while they are said so much to burn in Love to her; that when Thecla had formed her body like a Cross, and cast herself into the flaming pile, the flames in reverence of the Cross, became as a Chamber to her, covering her like a vault from the people's sight, and not approaching her; and that the earth making a grievous noise, the showers and hail destroyed the people, and Thecla went her way without observance, finding Paul and Onesiphorus hid in a Sepulcher at prayer for her: that Paul permitted her to cut her hair, and change her habit, and become his fellow travailer; that Alexander the Governor was so inflamed with her beauty at Antioch, even before she came in full sight of the people in the City Gate, that he could not forbear, but presently must leap upon her

like a mad dog; that she tore his Cloak, and threw off his Crown, and so saved her Virginity; that for this she was cast and tied to wild beasts, and the Lions couched to her, and one Lyoness fought for her, and killed the rest that assaulted her; that yet they turned more upon her: that she leaped into the Fish pond among the devouring Sea Calvs; and that fire from Heaven came down into the Water, and there made her a chamber, and saved her from those Sea-beasts; that Falconilla's soul appeared to her Mother Tryphaena to beg Thecla's prayers that she might be admitted into heaven, telling her how much Thecla was admired in Heaven. (She knew who was admired in Heaven before she could be let in:) that at Thecla's prayers she was admitted into heaven; (but tells us not where she was before:) that when Thecla was again tied to wild bulls, and fire set to their posteriors to enrage them, the fire killed them, and burnt the bonds, and she was unhurt. That Thecla again puts on man's clothes, and seeks Paul; (whether she wore breeches I find not;) that Paul hereupon pronounceth her an Apostle (a predecessor of Pope Joan) and ordaineth her to go and preach the Gospel: and appointeth her to one Pagan City (as if either women were Apostles, or ordained to be preachers of the Gospel, that by Paul were forbidden to speak in the Church: or Apostles were confined to a City:) that she fixed at Seleucia, and there converted and baptized many, and at last (after many miracles) did not die, but entered alive into the earth, which opened itself for her in the place where the holy Table stood; that after her death she wrought those one and thirty miracles that fill a second Book, and many more; appearing to this Basil, and encouraging him when he was weary, to go on in the writing of her praises, and plucking him by the ear, and so curing his headache, which else would have prevented his Oration in her praise the next day, with abundance more that are more strange then this.

I have instanced but in this one case of Thecla, because it would be endless to tell you of all the rest of their fictions (were I acquainted with them all) Nor do I mention this as one of their Legends, no nor as a piece of Metaphrastes, but as the works of St. Basil (not Basil the great) an ancient Father. Now either this is Basils work, or it is not. If it be not, then you see what trust is to be given to the Papists Antiquities, and supposed Fathers: For this is one of them, and this story vindicated by Petrus Pantinus, yea by no less a man then the Great Baronius, the Master of Antiquities, who *Annal. Tom. 1, ad. An. D. 47*, bringeth a whole Army of Fathers to attest the Acts of Thecla, and approveth of this of Basils, and the like of Metaphrastes. Two Testimonies trouble him shrewdly. One is no later than Tertullian, who (*de Baptis. c. 18*.) saith thus [But if any women read the pretended writings of Paul, and defend the example of Thecla, for women's Liberty to teach and baptize, let them know that a Presbyter in Asia, that framed that writing, putting Paul's name instead of his own, was cast out of his place, being convicted of it, and confessing that he did it in love to Paul.]

The other is Jerome's testimony *de Script. Eccless*. who citing the fore-cited words, saith [The travails therefore of Paul and Thecla, and the whole fable of the baptized Lyon, we reckon among Apocryphal writings: For how can it be that the inseparable companion of the Apostle (Luke) was ignorant of this only among all his matters?]

But yet Baronius thinks that these are not the same Books that Tertullian and Jerome speak against: and why so? Because 1. Here is no mention of Theclaes Preaching and Baptizing, nor of the Lyon baptized. 2. Because so many Fathers attest the story. But the first is a visible falsehood, contrary to the express words of the story, which feign Paul to have sent her to preach

as a true Apostle, and mention her baptizing the people of Seleucia. And for the baptized Lyon, perhaps Jerome spoke *de baptismate sanguinis*: and meant the Lyon that died in the defense of Thecla: And in that place Thecla is brought as calling Death a Baptism: However that word which might easily be mistaken, is no great disproof that this is the same story. And for the Fathers Testimony, as we believe that a famous Martyr called Thecla there was, from whence the occasion of the story rose, so it doth but show how unfit the Fathers are to be the Authors of our Faith, or to be esteemed infallible, that so easily believe and recite the forged stories of an Asiatic Presbyter, even when Tertullian had before revealed the deceit.

But if really this Book was written by Basil of Seleucia, and was not spurious, then we yet further see, that they that rest upon the Holy Scriptures alone for the matters of their faith, do take a surer wiser way, then they that build all on the credit of such credulous imprudent fabulous Fathers as this author was.

By this little taste you may see how their Records and Testimonies from Antiquity are to be trusted: Even as Zosimus report of the Nicene Canon to the African Council was, who proved it a forgery, and so rejected it, when the writings are only in their keeping, and their interest calleth them to deprave them, they are little to be trusted; who dare venture to corrupt those that are in the hands of the Christian world.

CHAP. XXVIII. Their persuading the people that we are all Liars, that nothing we say and write may be regarded.

D*etect.* 19. Another of the Popish devices is, when they have laid their own cause upon so many forgeries, and uphold it by so many false reports, to make the people believe that it is we that are the liars, and that we are not to be believed in anything that we say of them: and that we misreport the Fathers, bely the Roman Catholics, and therefore no man should read our Books, or discourse with us, so as to afford us any credence. So that indeed they get as much by mere persuading the people that we are Liars, as by any way that I know. We cannot tell them what is in their own Writers, but the ignorant people are commonly taught to say, we slander them. Though we cite the book, and page, and line, and tell them that they were printed at Rome, or Colen, or Antwerp, or Paris, by men of their own Profession, yet they believe us not, for they are instructed to hold us for liars, that we may be uncapable of doing them good. If we cite any of the Fathers, they tell us that we misalledge them, or have corrupted them, or they say no such thing. If we show them the books published by their own Doctors, and licensed by their Superiors, and printed by Papists, yet they

will not believe us. And so they are taught the easiest way in the world to repel the truth, and confute those that would do them good. It is no more but say, you lie, and all's done.

In such a case as this, what is there to be done? Ignorance and Incredulity thus purposely conjoined, are the wall of brass that is opposed to our endeavors. To what purpose should we speak to them that will not hear? In such a case I know but one of these two ways. 1. To endeavor to revive the stupefied humanity and Reason of these men: and ask them, Is Religion the work of a man or of a beast? Of a wise man, or of a mad man? Is it a Reasonable or an Unreasonable course? If it be Reasonable, why then will you go without Reason upon other men's bare words? But if you are so little men as to venture your souls without Reason, me thinks you should not venture against it? Would you rest on the bare word of one of these men, if it went against Reason? If so, then you renounce your manhood. But suppose you will be so unreasonable, yet I hope you have your five senses still? What if a Priest shall tell you that the Crow is white, and the snow is black, or that you see not when you know you see, will you believe him? If you will believe them before your eyes, and taste, and feeling, then I have done with you; who can dispute with stocks and stones, or men so far forsaken of God, as to renounce all their senses? But if you will not believe a Priest against your eyes, and other senses, then why do you believe him that Bread is not Bread, and Wine is not Wine, when the eyes, and smell, and taste of all men say it is? And if your senses tell you that your Priests deceive you in one thing, me thinks you should not be so confident of them in other things, as to believe and hearken to none but them.

2. If this will not serve, try whether you can procure their Priests to discuss those points before the incredulous people, that so they may hear

both sides speak together. Get a conference between them, and some experienced judicious Divine. But this will hardly be obtained. For if it be to dispute with one that is able, they'll presently pretend a danger of persecution: and no promise of security will satisfy them. But if it be a weak inexperienced man that challengeth them, then they will venture, and take the advantage.

If nothing else can be done, it is the best way to offer them some small Book against Popery to read. If they are so captivated that they will neither Hear nor Read, and their Leaders will not be drawn to a Dispute, I know not what to do but leave them, and let them take what they get by their unreasonable obstinacy: They are unworthy of truth that set no more by it.

CHAP. XXIX. Their feigned Miracles.

D*etect.* 20. Another of their deceits is by pretended Miracles. If they do but hear of a Wench that hath the *strangulatus uteri*, or *furor uterinus*, or such hysterical Passions in any violent degree, they presently go to cast the Devil out of her, that so they may make deluded people think that they have wrought a Miracle. And usually the Country people, and perhaps the diseased woman herself, may be so much unacquainted with the disease, as verily to believe the Priests, that they have a Devil indeed: and so turn Papists when the cure is wrought, as thinking it was done by the finger of God. The nature of this disease is to cause such strange symptoms, that most ignorant people that see them, do think that the persons are either bewitched, or have a Devil. At this very time while I am writing this, I am put to dissuade a man from accusing one of his neighbors of witchcraft, because his daughter hath this disease, and crieth out of her. Lest the Papists get further advantage by this ignorance of the people, I shall acquaint them briefly with some of the symptoms of this disease. It usually seizeth upon young women between the Age of seventeen and thirty-two years: And

most commonly on those that are of a sound complexion, somewhat sanguine, or at least, fleshly and strong, and but seldom on the weaker sort (in this manner.) When it is but a mere strangulation, women commonly know it, by the rising to their throat, and swelling, and the like: But when it comes to the disease we mention, it causeth them to fall by fits into sudden trances, and swoons: in which at first usually they seem stupid as dead, if it be in a colder body, but after they grow to violent motions, and strivings, and ragings, so that its as much as two can do to hold them. And when the fit is over, they are well again. Sometime there will be motions like convulsive in the head, the hands, and the fingers distinctly: so that you shall see one hand violently moved to some part of the body, so that it will be hard to remove it. Sometime one finger set double, and then another, and after that another, so that it will be hard till the fit is over to set them strait. Usually the body tossed up and down with raging madness. And some of them will continue a year, or two, or seven in this case, daily falling in such fits as one would think should destroy or weaken them presently, and yet after the fits, be almost as well as ever, and their strength doth not much decay. If they hear any mention of a Witch, they will likely take a conceit that they are bewitched; and then in their fits they will cry out upon the Witch, and if they see her, they will fall into a fit. If they get but a conceit that they are Possessed with a Devil, (by hearing the mention of others that were possessed) they will by the power of corrupted fancy, play the parts of the possessed, and rage, and roar, and swear, and speak as in the person of the Devil, and take on them to prophesy, or tell of secrets. All this I have known: and I have eased some of them by medicine in a few moments, and cured them (at that time) in a few days: So that I could easily have made the common people believe that I had cast out a Devil, if I had but had the

design and conscience of a Papist. A while ago a neighbor Minister told me of a neighbor that was handled thus. I told him what disease it was, and advised him to persuade her to a judicious Physician. But the next I hear of her was that neglecting the Physician, she was cured by some Papist Priest, and thereupon was turned Papist. And no doubt but among themselves it is reported for a Miracle.

The same course they take also in some distractions and other diseases. And sometime persons are trained up by them to dissemble and counterfeit a lunatic or possessed state.

And here because H.T. in his *Manual, p. 85,86*, doth plead their Miracles, I shall revive the memory of one of the great Miracles that was done among their Proselytes in the Parish of Wolverhampton: though I have mentioned it heretofore. I have the Book by me (*Printed at London by F. K. for Will. Barret, 1622*.) and have spoke with many persons that knew the Actor himself, being yet alive: so that I suppose that no Papist about Wolverhampton will deny it, whatever they do elsewhere.

At Bilson in the Parish of Wolverhampton in Stafford-shire there was a Boy named William Perry, Son of Tho. Perry, who seemed to be bewitched or possessed with a Devil: (about thirteen years old, but of special wit above his age.) In his fits he seemed to be deaf, and blind, writhing his mouth aside, continually groaning and panting, and when he was pricked, pinched, whipped, he seemed not to feel. He seemed to take no food that would digest, but with it cast up rags, thread, straw, pins, &c. his belly almost as flat as his back, his throat swelled and hard, his tongue stiff and rolled up towards the roof of his mouth, so that he seemed always dumb, save that once in a fortnight or three weeks he would speak a few words. It was thought he was bewitched by one Joan Cocks, because 1. He would

discern when that woman was brought into the room, though it were secretly done, as was tried before the Grand Jury at Stafford. 2. He would not endure the repeating of the first verse of John, [In the beginning was the word, &c.] but other texts he would endure. When the Parents had been a while wearied with him, and the Country flocked in to see him, a Priest of the Romish Religion was invited to cure him. The Priest exorcised, him praying in Latin over him, hanging a stone about his neck, washing him with Holy water, Witch water, and anointing him with Holy Oil, &c. which seemed to ease him, and make him speak, and sometime cure him for the time. They Hallowed all his meat and drink: He would not so much as eat Raisins, or smell to flowers, unless they were blest by the Priest: He told them that while the Puritans stood by him he saw the Devil assault him in the shape of a black bird. The Priest requireth the chief fiend to show himself: then the boy puts out his tongue swelled: The Priest commandeth him to show the People by the sheet before him, how he would use those that died out of the Roman Catholic Church. Whereupon he pulls, and bites, and tosseth the sheet, till the people cry out and weep. Then he commandeth the Devil to tell him, how he did use Luther, Calvin and John Fox: and he playeth the same part more fiercely than before. Then the Priest commands him to show what power he had of a good Catholic that died out of mortal sin: and then he thrust down his arms, and hanged down his head, and trembled. The Boy promiseth when his fit is over, that the will live and die a Catholic, persuading his parents and friends, &c. On this manner three Priests one after another followed the cure, still succeeding, but yet not curing him, that they might draw the Country to a longer observance of them, (and preached to them in the house) and that the Miracle might be the more famous. For forsooth there were many Devils in him, they said, to be

cast out. And it stopped the cure, because the Mother would not promise them to turn Papist if they cured him. But in the meantime the supposed Witch is brought to trial at Stafford Assizes, 1620, before Judge Warburton and Judge Davies: But in the end the Judges desired Bishop Morton then present to take care of the Boy: who took him home to his Castle at Eccleshill, and after certain weeks time (the Bishop being abroad) the said Bishop comes to the Boy, and tells him that he understood that he could not endure the first verse of John, and saith he, the Devil understandeth Greek as well as English, being a Scholar of almost six thousand years standing, and therefore he knows when I recite that verse in Greek: And so calling for a Greek Testament, he read the 12th verse; and the Boy thinking it had been the first, fell into his fit: And when that fit was over, the Bishop read the first verse, and then the Boy had no fit, thinking it had been some other verse. And thus they proved him a deceiver, and the Boy was much confounded, but pretended more distraction; and then that he might get away, he complained of extreme sickness, and made water in the Urinal, as black as ink, groaning when he made it: But the third day after, they espied him mixing ink with his Urine, and nimbly conveying away the Inkhorn. And when they came in upon him, and found him in the conveyance, he broke out into tears, and was suddenly cured, and confessed all, how he had been taught his art, and how he did all, and confessed that his intent was to be cured by a Priest, and to turn Papist (and whether they have catched him again or no, I know not; for I hear he is a Quaker in Bristol, or at least a reviler of the Ministry) The Bishop took his examination at large, Oct. 8th, and 13th, 1620. If any doubt of the story, they may be satisfied yet by the Boy himself, or by the Reverend Bishop yet alive, or by any of the neighbors in Bilson that were at age there but thirty-seven years ago.

But before the Bishop had discovered the knavery, one of the Conjuring Priests writes the Narrative of the business (which is printed with the rest) and is Entitled [A Faithful Relation of the proceedings of the Catholic Gentlemen with the Boy of Bilson, showing, &c.] And they begin with [Not to us O Lord, but to thy Name give the Glory!] And so they proceed to make their report of it, for deluding the people, as a Miracle. And the writing was by a Papist Gentleman examined, attested upon Oath to be received from one Mr. Wheeler, &c. But when they heard of the Discovery, they were ashamed of their faithful Relation. At last, the Bishop brought the Boy at the next summers Assizes, July 26, 1621, to ask pardon openly of God, and the woman accused by him, and of the Country cheated by him, and there was an end of that Popish Miracle. Abundance more such I could give you out of certain records; but I recited this for the sake of H.T. and the Papists of Wolverhampton.

And for your Miracles; I beseech you, if you regard not us, yet open your ears to a Jesuit that speaks the Truth. Joseph Acosta (*de temporib. noviss. lib. 3, c. 3*.) [To all the Miracles of Antichrist, though he do great ones, the Church shall boldly oppose the Belief of the Scriptures: and by the inexpugnable Testimony of this Truth, shall by most clear light dispel all his juggling's as Clouds.—Signs are given to Infidels, Scriptures to Believers; and therefore the Primitive Church abounded with Miracles, when Infidels were to be called: But the last, when the Faithful are already Called, shall rest more on the Scripture, then on Miracles. Yea I will boldly say, that all Miracles are vain and empty, unless they be approved by the Scripture; that is, have a doctrine conform to the Scripture. But the Scripture itself is of itself a most firm Argument of Truth.]

And the same Acosta confesseth in his Indian History, that they do no Miracles in the Indies (where the boast is.) And if they did, it would confirm Christianity, but not Popery.

Yea if Miracles be so much to be looked at, why will you not give us leave to observe them? The same Miracles that you boast of, do testify against you, if they be true. To instance now but in one. Prosper makes mention of a Miracle (which *Thyraeus de Daemoniac. p. 76*, and many more of yours recite,) that was done by the Sacramental Wine: A person possessed by the Devil was cured, (after many other means used in vain) by the Drinking of the Wine in the Eucharist. And doth not this Miracle justify us that give the people the Wine, and condemn you, that refuse to give it them? Many other Miracles I could recite, that the Fathers say were done by the Sacrament in both kinds received, which condemn you that forbid it.

CHAP. XXX. Their Impudent slanders. The horrid Lyes against Luther and Calvin, insisted on by the Marquess of Worcester, and their common Writers.

D*etect.* 21. Another of the Papists ways of deceiving is, by impudent Lyes and Slanders against their Adversaries; which they vent with such confidence, that the seduced people easily believe them. They that are taught to believe their Priests against their own seeing, hearing, feeling, tasting and smelling, must needs believe the vilest Lyes that they are pleased to utter, in cases where the miserable people are unable to disprove them. I will give you but a few of that multitude of Instances that might be given.

1. In a Manuscript of the Papists which I lately received from a Neighbor of Sturbridge, as sent from Wolverhampton, there are these words, with which they conclude [Luther having richly supped, and made his friends merry with his facete conceits, died the same night. This is testified by Cochleus in *vita Lutheri*. And John Calvin, a branded sodomite, consumed with lice and worms, died blaspheming and calling upon the Devil. This is registered by Schlusselburge and Bolseck; these were the Ends of the Parents of the Protestant and Presbyterian pretended Reformed Religions.

And as if their own tongue must sentence them to Hell, in the very words before they say [All Liars, their part shall be in the pool burning with fire and brimstone, which is the second death] And so make Application of it to the Protestants, as being Liars; and when they have done, conclude with the two forecited impudent Lies of Luther and Calvin. The like words of Calvin hath the late Marquess of Worcester (or Dr. Bailey for him) in his Papers to King Charles; the whole writing being stuffed with such impudent Lies, that one would wonder that human nature should be capable of such wickedness, and that the silly people should swallow down such heaps of falsehood. And it is not these two alone, but multitudes of Papists that have written these Lies of Luther and Calvin. Thyraeus the Jesuit in his Book *de Daemoniacis, part. 1, c. 8, p. 21*, tells us this story: that the same day that Luther died, there was at Gheola a Town in Brabant many persons possessed of Devils, that waited on their Saint Dymna for Deliverance, and were all that day delivered: but the next day they were all possessed again; whereupon the Exorcist or somebody asked the Devils where they had been the day before; and they answered, that they were commanded by their Prince to be at the Funeral of their fellow Laborer Luther. And for proof of this, Luther's own servant that was with him at his death, looking out at the window, did more than once, to his great terror, see a company of ugly spirits leaping and dancing about without: and also that the Crows followed the Corps all the way with a great noise.]

O wonderful patience and mercy of God, that suffereth such abominable Liars to live, and doth not cause some sudden vengeance to befall them! Reader, I will tell thee now the case of these two servants of Christ that are thus reviled (even as their Master was before them, that was said to do Miracles by the power of the Devil.)

As for Luther, he was oft taken with a great pain in his breast, about the mouth of the stomach, and thought his Death when it came would be sudden; which made him say, *Feri Domine, feri clementer, quia ipse paratus sum*: strike Lord, strike mercifully, for I am ready] Having preached his last Sermon at Wittenburg, Jan. 17th, he took his journey the 23rd, to Count Mansfields Country, whither he was called. When he came thither, he was grown so weak, that they almost despaired of his life; yet by the use of somentations he had so much ease, as that he preached sometime, and did other work from Jan. 29th, to Feb. 17th. The last day of his life, though he was weak, yet he sat at the table with them, and at Supper his discourse was upon the Question, Whether we shall know one another in Heaven? Which he affirmed and proved, in that Adam knew Eve as soon as he saw her, that she was flesh of his flesh: and therefore much more shall we know one another in Heaven, &c. After Supper, he withdrew himself as he used, for private prayer; but the pain of his breast increased on him. When he had taken a medicine, he lay down on a Couch and slept sweetly two hours, and then went to his Chamber, saying to those about him [Pray God to preserve the Doctrine of the Gospel to us; for the Pope and Council of Trent have strange Contrivances.] When he was laid down and had slept a while he awakened, and found by the increase of his pain, that he was near his End, and spoke to God as followeth in their hearing [O my heavenly Father, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the God of all Consolation, I thank thee that thou hast revealed to me thy Son Jesus Christ, in whom I have believed, whom I have professed, whom I have loved, whom I have Celebrated (or Honored) whom the Pope of Rome and the rest of the rabble of the ungodly do persecute and reproach: I beseech thee O my Lord Jesus Christ receive my soul. O my heavenly Father, though I am taken from this

life, and though my body must now be laid down, yet I know certainly that I shall abide with thee forever, and that none can take me out of thy hands.] Then he said [So God loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whoever believeth in him, should not perish, but have everlasting life] Then he repeated part of the 68th Psalm: and when he had drunk a medicine that was given him, he said [I go hence: I now return my spirit unto God] presently adding [Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit, thou hast Redeemed me O God of Truth] And so he died as if he were setting himself to sleep, without any sign of further pain: but when they saw him dying, Dr. Jonas and Caelius cried to him [Reverend Father; do you die constant through Christ in his doctrine which you have hitherto preached?] And he answered [Yea] and never spoke more. When he was dead (at Islebe) Count Mansfield would have kept his body, but the Duke of Saxony would not suffer him, but caused it to be brought back to Wittenburg, and there with great solemnity interred.]

This is the true report in brief of Luther's Death, delivered to the world by those that stood by him, and were eye witnesses. And yet these impudent Lying Papists have persuaded their followers that the Devils were seen dancing about him, that when he should be buried there was a horrible thunder, and the body was taken away out of the Coffin by the Devil, and a stink of Brimstone left behind, with more such stuff as this, which they have printed, and which one would think the Father of Lies should be ashamed of.

And for Calvin, not only those before mentioned, but also Bolsecus, Surius, Prateolus, Democharis, Lindanus, Sanctesius, Cahierus, and others publish to the world, not only that he was an Epicure, but a Sodomite, and was burnt on the shoulder for Sodomy with a hot iron at Noviodunum

where he was born. Yea Lessius the Jesuit impudently calls Christ to witness, that shall judge all men according to their works, that he doth not devise these things of his own brain, but from good authors, and forty years currant fame. And his Authors are these Papists, Bolsecus, Brigerus, Stapleton, Campian, Duraeus, Surius, and Reginaldus. Hath Hell any greater calumnies then these to fill the mouths or writings of men withal?

Reader, I shall show thee what credit these men are of by this instance. As for the time when they say he was stigmatized for Sodomy, it was when he was a Papist, and therefore if it had been true, it had been a greater dishonor to them then to us. But its a mere forgery of the Devil and a Friar. Jerome Bolseck a Friar, seemed to turn Protestant, and coming to Geneva, he began to preach the Pelagian doctrine there, and openly contend against the Pastors in the Congregation; and being confounded by Calvin, the Magistrates imprisoned him, and banished him for sedition. Then he betakes himself to the neighbor Towns, to play the same game there: but the Magistrates of Bern also banish them out of their Country. Whereupon he turned Papist again, and when Calvin was dead, he wrote all these abominable lies of him, and all the rest (with Schlusselburgius the Lutheran, an enemy of Calvin's) do take up the report from this one Lying heretical Papist: and so it becomes a currant fame with them, as if it were as true as the Gospel: Whereupon our writers call to them, provoke them, challenge them to search the Records at Noviodunum, where they say the thing was done, and prove that ever there was such a thing, or else bear the open shame of Liars. But they can bring no proof, but call on us to disprove it: When the City are Papists, and haters of Calvin. But after all this, as God would have it, the Papist Dean of that City, called Jacobus le Vasseur, publisheth at Paris, 1633, the Annals of their Cathedral Church, and therein

pouring out his hatred against Calvin, and saying what he can against him, doth yet out of their records clear him of all these accusations, and lets the world know that there was never any such thing, and that they had no crime at all against him, but that he turned from the Papists; and that the Major or chief Governor of the City went away with Calvin, when he was forced to fly from his native Country. He recites all the passages of Calvin's life there, but professeth that they had no more against him. Thus God confounded the Lying Papists by one of themselves, and the Records of that City, where they said the thing was done. And yet they believe one another, and carry on the Lye to this day.

Mr. Rob. Amstrowther, Chaplain to the King of England's Ambassadors with the Emperor, being at Vienna, heard the Jesuits and other repeating confidently this slander of Calvin; Whereupon he opened to them this Evidence against it; and satisfied them of the falsehood, so that they told him, they never knew so much before, and promised him they would never mention it more.

If any would see the very words of their own Records, and Doctor Vasseur, he may read them in Rivets Sum. Contr. against Bailey, and again in his *Jesuita Vapulans, c. 2.*

And as for the life of Calvin after he forsook the Papists, if you will but believe that the City of Geneva, and all the Ministers and others that were about him, in his life and at his death, did know better than Bolseck, a fugitive Apostate Papist that was his enemy, and then far off, you may see at large in Melchior Adamus, and Beza, the description of such a shining burning light as Rome hath not to boast of. He was a man of admirable wit, judgment, industry, and piety. When he had forsaken his own Country for the Gospel sake, and taken up in Geneva, and planted the Gospel there, with

Farellus and Viretus, at last the ungodly part getting the Head, the Ministers were banished. And so he settled in in another City. The four Bailiffs of Geneva that banished the Ministers, within two years were ruined by the judgments of God. One of them accused of sedition, seeking to scape through a window fell, and was broken to death. Another was put to death for murder. The other two being accused of Mal-administration, fled and were condemned. Calvin is sent for and entreated to return to Geneva: which by importunity, and Bucer's persuasion, he yieldeth to. There was he continually molested by the ungodly, and loved by the good. The Malignants whom he would restrain by Discipline from Whoredom, drunkenness, and other wickedness, were still plotting or raging against him, and called their Dogs by his name. But shame was still the end of their attempts. His revenge was to tell them [I see I should have but sorry wages if I served man: but its well for me that I serve him that always performeth his promises to his servants] As for his work, he preached every day in the week each second week, and besides that, he read three days a week a Divinity Lecture. And every Thursday he guided the Presbytery; and every Friday at a meeting he held an Expository conference and Lecture: so that the whole came to almost twelve Sermons a week. Besides this, he wrote Epistles to most Countries of Christendom (in Europe) to Princes, Divines and others; And he wrote all those great volumes of most Learned judicious Controversies, Commentaries, and other Treatises, which one would have thought might have been work enough for a man that had lived a hundred years, if he had done no other. And many Heretics he confuted, and some convinced and reduced. He set up among the Ministers a course of teaching every Family from house to house, of which he found incredible fruit; For all this his labor he endured the affronts, contradictions, and reproaches of

the rabble, yea and sometime hath been beaten by them: because he would not administer the Sacrament to ungodly men, that were rulers in the place, he was at first banished, and after threatened, and continually molested by them, and railing fellows set to preach and write against him. And whether he were an Epicure, you may soon judge: He always used a very spare diet: and for ten years before his death did never taste one bit, but at supper, as his constant course so that every day was with him a better fast then the Papists use to make on their fasting days. By this extreme labor, speaking, and fasting, and watching (for he dictated his writings as he lay in bed much,) he overthrew his body, and falling first into a Tertian, and then into a Quartan, after that he fell into a Consumption, with the gout and stone, and spitting of blood, and the disease in the Hemorrhoid veins, which at last ulcerated by over much fasting, speaking, and use of Aloes; besides the headache which was the companion of his life. In these sickness he would never forbear his labor, but when he was persuaded to it, he told them, that he could not bear an idle life. And when he was near to death was still at work, asking those that entreated him to forbear, Whether they would have God find him idle? Under all these pains of Gout, Stone, Collick, Head-ach, Hemorrhoids, Consumption, &c. those that were about him testified to the world that they never heard him speak a word unbeseeming a patient Christian. The worst was that oft repeated word [How long, Lord! How long!] as being weary of a miserable world. Witnesses he had enough; for he could scarce have rest, for people crowding to him to visit him. On Mar. 23nd, he went among the Ministers to their Meeting, and took his farewell of them there. The next day he was wearied by it: but the twenty seventh day he was carried to the Court to the Senate of the City, where he made a speech to them, and took his farewell of them, with many tears on both

sides. April. 2nd, he was carried to Church, and staid the Sermon, and received the Sacrament. Afterward the Senate of the City came to him, and he made a heavenly Exhortation to them. On April 25th, he dictated his Will, which I would his slanderers would read. His Library itself, and all his goods being prized, came scarce to three hundred Crowns. May 11th, he wrote his farewell to Farellus. May 19th, all the Ministers came to him, with whom he sat, and did eat, and cheerfully take his leave of them. On the twenty seventh of May his voice seemed to be stronger, and so continued till his last breath that day, which was with such quietness as men compose themselves to sleep. The next night and day the City Magistrates, Ministers, Scholars, people and strangers, were taken up in weeping and lamentation. Everyone crowded to see the Corps, among whom the Queen of England's Ambassador to France was one. He was buried according to this desire in the common Church-yard, without any Monument or Pomp: and hath left behind him such a Name, as in despite of all the Devils in Hell, and all the Papists on earth, shall be precious till the coming of Christ; and such writings hath he left as are the comfort of the Disciples of Truth, and the shame of the reproaching Adversaries.

Reader, this is that Calvin that is so hated by the bad, and loved and honored by the good: whom these Papists have called an Epicure and Sodomite, and said that he died blaspheming, and calling upon the Devil, and was eaten with lice and worms. Is not God exceeding patient, that will suffer such wretches to live on the Earth? What man could they have named since Augustine, yea since the Apostles days, that was more unfit for such a slander then Calvin? Yet because one man Bolseck that was banished and turned Papist, and lived then I know not in what Country, hath written these things against him, the rest of them, even as much as the late Marquess of

Worcester, take them up as confidently, as if the infallible Chair had uttered them.

But yet if thou think this Enemy Bolseck is more to be believed then those that lived with Calvin, and the City of Geneva, that had continual access to him, I will give thee such a Testimony as shall shame the Papists, that have a spark of modesty. Hear then what other Papists themselves say that knew better what they said, or made more Conscience of their words.

Florimundus Raimundus a Papist of Burdeaux (or the Jesuit Richeome that wrote in his name) writing for the Pope and against Calvin, hath these words of him. [Under a dry and lean body he had a sharp and lively wit, ready in answering; bold in attempting; a great faster; even from his youth, whether for his health to overcome the headache, or for his studies—There is scarce a man found that ever matched Calvin in Labors: for the space of twenty three years, in which he remained in the Episcopacy of Geneva, he preached every day once, and twice on the Lord's day of times. And every week he read public Lectures of Divinity (besides) and every Friday he was at the conference of the Pastors: The rest of his time he spent either in writing Books, or answering letters.]

Reader, is this Testimony from a Papist like the rest? But yet thou shalt have more. Papirius Massonius a Learned Papist, and Scholar to Baldiom one of Calvin's Enemies, wrote Calvin's life; and he saith of him, [No day almost passed in which he did not preach to the Citizens. Thrice every eight days as long as he lived, he professed (or publicly taught) Divinity (in the Schools;) being Laborious, and always writing or doing something.—Of a weak body, but worn by watchings, reading, writing, meditations, diseases, businesses, preachings. He took very little sleep; and therefore much of his works he dictated in bed to his servant that wrote them from his mouth. He

did eat but once a day: and confessed that he found not a more present or surer Remedy for his weakness of stomach and headache. His clothing was of small price, to cover him rather than adorn him.—At Worms and Ratisbone he exercised the strength of an excellent wit with so great applause of the Germane Divines, that by the judgment of Melanchthon and his Associates; by a peculiar privilege he was called The Divine. He wrote as much and as well as any man of the contrary parties, whether you respect number, acuteness, language, sharpness, emphasis, or subtlety: not a man of all his Adversaries, whether Catholics, Anabaptists, Lutherans, Arians, or the forsakers of his Party, that wrote against him, did seem to match him in gravity of writing, and weight of words and sharpness, in answering his principles. He almost terrified Pighius himself discoursing of free will, and Sadaletus.] These are the words of a Learned Papist.

But this is not all. Abundance of Papists tell us of a story how Calvin hired one in Geneva to take on him dead, that he might have the honor of raising him from the dead. This the Jesuit Thyraeus de Daemoniacis writes, and many others, and it goes among them for a currant truth; and all from the report of Bolseck. But, as God would have it, Pap. Massonius confuteth this also, and saith, that his Master Baldwinus knew nothing of it, who lived at Geneva, and after turned Papist, and Calvin's enemy: and other reasons he giveth to disprove this and the other slanders that were raised of Calvin, saying, that they were but *scriptores plebii, maledicendi studio*, &c. vulgar Writers, that study or love to reproach or speak evil, that vend these things. And so much shall serve against the Papists Lies against Luther and Calvin.

If you would see more of that heap of Lies confuted, which the Marquess of Worcester gave in to King Charles, read Mr. Chr. Cartwrights Reply to them, where part of them (and but part) are detected.

And as they have done by these, so by others also. When Beza was eighty years of age, a false report came to the Papists that he was dead. Whereupon Claudins Puteanus with his Jesuitical Companions wrote a Book, that at his death he turned Papist and renounced his Religion: so that the old man (that lived seven years longer) was fain himself to write against them, to prove that he was not dead, nor turned Papist: These be the means by which men are reconciled to the Church of Rome.

They have printed also a story that Calvin's own Son being bitten by a mad dog, was sent by his Father to one of their Saints Images for Cure, when no other means would serve; and being cured, he turned Papist: when as the world knew that Calvin never had a Son. Also they tell us of a saying of Luther's, that [This Cause was not begun in the Name of God, nor will it be ended in the Name of God] This Luther spoke of Eckius and the other Papists, as himself professeth in his *Answer to Eurferus, Tom. 1, fol. 404*. And these shameless Liars confidently publish that he spoke this of himself, as the Marquess of Worcester to King Charles did.

Another saying of his they as impudently abuse, viz. [If the wife will not, let the Maid come,] persuading the world, that Luther would have a man lie with his Maid, if his Wife refuse: whereas he only labors to prove, that Desertion is a sufficient cause of divorce: and that if the Wife refuse, she should be warned again and again before others and the Judges, and in Case of utter refusal and desertion, Vasthe may be rejected, and Hester the Maid taken to Wife: which many a Papist is ready to justify.

Yea they annex that Luther would have men Contain but five days; when as he vehemently detesteth it, and urgeth the contrary, telling them that God no doubt will enable them to be Continent, if they will use his Means, *Tom. 5, serm. de Matrimon*. They forgot that the *5th supposititious Epist*. of their

Clement pleading for the Community of all things, adds [*In omnibus autem sunt sine dubio & Conjuges*] [Among these All no doubt but Wives and Husbands are contained.]

Of the horrid Lyes of Genebrard, Possevine, and other Papists against Peter Martyr, Beza, Calvin and others, see Dr. Reynolds *ad Anglica. Seminar. ante lib. de Idololatria Rom. Eccl. 5, p. 20,21,22,23.*

When the fall of their house at Black-friars had killed their Priests, and such abundance of the people that were hearing him in the midst of the Sermon, they printed a Book to persuade the people beyond sea, that it was a company of the Heretics or Puritans that were killed at the hearing of one of their preachers: Dr. Gouge tells you when and where it was printed, and many read it.

When the Gunpowder Plot was in hand, they had contrived presently to give it all abroad that the Puritans did it: Read Mr. Samuel Clark of it in his Mirror of God's Judgments, Fol. and you shall find this fully detected.

When Fisher the Jesuit had held his conference with Dr. Featley, and Dr. White, there being present two Earls, one of them (the Earl of Warwick) having business shortly after beyond sea, fell unknown into Dr. Westons company at Saint Omers, who presently tells it him for news, how Fisher had confounded the Protestant Doctors, and that two Earls and so many people were turned by it to the Church of Rome; not knowing that he that heard him was one of the two Earls, and that there were not so many people there, and how they were confirmed against Popery by that Dispute. And when the Earl of Warwick brought home this jest, Dr. Weston hearing what sport was made with it in England, writ a simple excuse for his Lying, which I have at hand, but find it had been better for him to have said nothing.

Should I recite but half the forgeries of this nature, by which the Priests and Jesuits cheat the poor people, I must be voluminous.

But alas, their very worship of God is much of it composed of Lyes, and is not that like to be acceptable worship? How their Offices and Legends are stuff with fictions, Cano and many of their own confess. And Cassander saith that so few of the relics in all Germany would be found true ones if examined, that its better quite take off the people from the veneration of them. Instancing in one of old that was worshipped as a Saint, and upon enquiry was found to be the bones of a Thief.

Agobardus Bishop of Lions (saith Usher) complained about eight hundred years ago, that the Antiphonary used in his Church had many ridiculous and phantastical things in it: and that therefore he corrected much of it, cutting off what seemed superfluous, or light, or lying, or blasphemous. *Agobard. ad Cant. Lugd. de Correct. Antiphon. p. 396*. And not long since Lindanus made the like complaint, that [Not only Apocryphal matters out of the Gospel of Nicodemus and other toys are thrust in, but even the secret prayers, (yea, alas for shame and grief, the very Canon varying, and redundant) are defiled with most filthy faults.]

Reader, I will trouble thee no more with stirring in this puddle; but only warn thee, as thou lovest thy soul, trust it not on the bare reports of such Liars, but try before thou trust, and give not up thy sense and Reason to men that make so little, or so ill a use of their own. If thou refuse this Council; say not but thou wast warned.

CHAP. XXXI. Their quarrels at our Translations of Scripture.

D*etect.* 22. Another of their Deceits is by quarrelling with our Translations of the Bible, and making the people believe that we have so corrupted it, that it is none of the word of God, and so they openly scorn it, and deride it.

As to this point, though Learned men can soon confute them by vindicating the Text as in the Original Languages, and then vindicating our Translation; yet the common disputant need not put them and himself to so much trouble. If really they will but let the Law of God contained in the Holy Scripture be the Rule by which our difference shall be tried and decided, we will cut short the rest of the controversy, and take it wholly together, and we will stand to the Vulgar Latin, which is it that themselves applaud. We are content that this be the Rule between us. Yea rather than they shall shift off the unlearned by these tricks, we will admit of their own Translation, which the Rhemists have (with little friendship to our cause) composed. Only we must entreat them that their Commentaries and conceits be not taken into the Text as part of the Word of God. So that this quarrel is

quickly at an end. The Scripture is so full against them, that no Translation that makes it not another thing, can make it to be on their side.

CHAP. XXXII. Their design to make the Ministers odious to the people. Their riches and ours compared.

D*etect.* 23. Another of the Designs of the Papists is, to bring all the faithful Pastors of the Churches into contempt, or suspicion at least with the People, that so they may draw them to refuse our helps, and the Papists may deal with them alone, whom they know they are easily able to over-reach. Though our people have not that absolute Dependance upon their Teachers as theirs have, yet an ordinate Dependance is Necessary to them, or else God would never have appointed Teachers and Pastors for his Church. The Papists dare not trust their followers so much as to read a Bible in their vulgar tongue. Much less to Read our writings against their errors and impieties: No nor their Priests and Friars ordinarily to read them: No nor commonly to read the writings of their own Party: No not those, nor the strongest of those that are written against us: for fear lest the objection should prove too hard for the answer; or lest they should understand the truth of our doctrine in some measure. Sr. Edw: Sands in his *Europae Specul*. professeth how hard he found it, to meet with the Works of Bellarmine himself in any Book-sellers shop in Venice or other parts of

Italy. But our people have all leave to keep and read the Papists writings: We dare venture them upon the light upon equal terms: But yet we know them to be insufficient, for the most part, to defend even plain and necessary truths against the Cavils of adversaries that overmatch them in learning and other abilities. Now lest we should but afford them our assistance, the Papists principal design is to bring them into false conceits of the Ministers, and make us odious to them; that they may neglect our help, and the easilier hearken to other Teachers. And if they can but prevail in this design, the day is their own, and the souls of our unhappy people are like to be undone.

And the more is it to be feared, lest at last they should this way prevail, both because of the sin that lieth on ourselves in too reserved and negligent a doing of our work; and because of the great obstinacy and unprofitableness of the people, that hate the light, and unthankfully despise it, or will not obey it, and work by it while they may.

The designs of the Papists against the Ministry are these 1. They principally endeavor to delude the Rulers of the Land and set them against them, of which more anon.

2. They are very busy to procure an overthrow of their established maintenance: To which end they animate all sects to rail against Tithes.

3. They labor by scoffs and nicknames to make them odious. As they were the Authors or chief fomenters of the old scorn under the name of Puritans, so are they of many more of late. If in Court, or Parliament, City or Country; you hear men set themselves of purpose to scorn or vilify the Ministry, its very probable that they are either secret Papists, or their deluded servitors. If they speak of men that regard the Ministry, and be not hardened as they to a despising of Christ in his servants, they call such

[Priest ridden] and the Pastors they scornfully call [Jack-Presbyters, Drivines,] and many other scoffs are at hand, to serve the ends of the Devil and the Pope, by alienating the Affections of the people from their Teachers, that so they may devour them at pleasure.

4. Another of their ways of reproach is, by telling the people what odious divisions are among us, and how many minds we are of, and how oft we change, and such like reproaches, by their mouthing it they can make something of; while they never tell them how much more changeable they have been, and what divisions are among themselves, incomparably beyond all ours. Nor do they ever tell them how far we are united, and how small the differences among us are, and such as must be expected while we all know but in part.

5. Another reproach that the Papists cast on the Ministry, is Greediness, Covetousness, and being hirelings. And therefore they put these into the mouths of Quakers and other Sectaries. And whats their ground? Forsooth because we take Tithes, or other set maintenance. Because we have food and raiment, and our daily bread. I have said enough of the Cause itself in my several writings against the Quakers. If any doubt whether the Papists be their Teachers, or of the same mind, besides many greater Evidences, the Manuscript from Wolverhampton before mentioned may be full satisfaction. This tells men that [for filthy lucres sake we scratch itching ears with doctrines of liberty] and thus it learnedly versifieth.

With Pleasing words they scratch all ears that itch.
That Mammon (whom they serve) may make them rich.
For they are Mercenaries, that will be hired,
To preach what doctrines are by men desired.

Answ. I must profess unfeignedly that the experience of such horrid wickedness of men, is a great help to my faith against all temptations that ever would provoke me to doubt whether there be a Hell; When I see and hear that unreasonable villainy, that I should scarce have believed human nature could have been capable of, if God or such experience had not told it me. But when I see Abominations before my eyes as incredible or horrid as Hell itself almost, it silenceth temptations to such unbelief.

Reader, I will give thee a brief comparison between the Papists Priests and the Ministers of Christ, that thou mayest see whether these men be fit to rail at us as Mercenaries, and such as are the servants of Mammon.

Its a well known case that the Ministers of this Land, and of all the Reformed Churches commonly do many of them want necessaries, and some want food and raiment, and the rest of them for the most part have little more: Or if one of a hundred have two hundred pounds a year, its ten to one but taxes and other payments bringeth it so low, that he hath no superfluities. And some that have not Wives or Children, do give all that they can gather to the poor; and some upon my knowledge give more to charitable uses, then they receive for the work of their Ministry, living on their own means. And they have themselves been the means of taking down the Lordly Prelacy and Riches of the Clergy: and though they would not have had the Lands devoted to the Church to have been alienated, yet they would have had it so distributed as might but have reached to have made the maintenance of Ministers to be a hundred pounds a year. This was the height of their Covetousness and Ambition, as you call it.

And now will you take a view of the Popish Clergy, for Greatness, Riches, and Numerousness. 1. For Greatness, the Pope who is their chief Priest, pretendeth to the Government of all the Christian world. Emperors and

Kings have kissed his feet, and held him the stirrup. One Emperor was forced to wait bare foot at his Gates a long time in patience, till he pleased to open them. Another being forced to prostrate himself to him, the Pope set his foot upon his neck, profanely abusing the words of the Psal. 91:13. He shall tread on the Lyon and Adder, &c. diverse Princes hath he deposed: He hath claimed a Supremacy in Temporals and Spirituals, and his more moderate flatterers subject Princes to him *in ordine ad spiritualia*. General Councils approved by him, decree that he shall Excommunicate and depose Princes, that will not extirpate those that he calleth Heretics, and shall commit the Government to others, or give their Countries to the first that can seize on them; and absolve all their Vassals from their Allegiance, (in despite of Oaths and God's Commands.) He is a Temporal Prince himself, having large Dominions. He hath so numerous a Clergy in the Countries of all Popish Princes, as makes him great and formidable to them. His Cardinal Priests are equal to Princes, and greater than many Princes are. 2. And for their Riches and Numbers, to say no more of their Pope and Cardinals, they have such multitudes of Arch-bishops, Bishops, Priests, Abbots, Priors, Friars, Jesuits, and such others, as take up a great part of the Land where they live. I will at this time give you but one Instance, and desire you to compare it with our Ministers and their maintenance: and that is of the Popish Clergy in France.

Their own writers tells us as followeth. Bodin (a Judge in France) saith, (as Heylin *Geograph. p. 148*, reciteth it) That the Revenues of the Clergy there are twelve millions, and three hundred thousand livres, which is one million and two hundred thousand pounds of our English money per annum; and that they possess seven parts of twelve of the whole revenue of the Kingdom, which is above half. But we will take up with the lower

reckoning of the Book called Comment. de stat. and saith Heylin, this tells us that the Clergy have near a fourth part of the very Lands of all the Kingdom, besides the Offerings, Churchings, Burials, Diriges, and such like Casualties, which amount to as much as their Rents, (So that there is another fourth part, which comes to half the Kingdom) upon which Sr. Edwin Sands computes their revenue at six millions yearly: And for the number, that one Kingdom hath thirteen Arch-bishops, an hundred and four Bishops, a thousand four hundred and fifty Abbeys, five hundred and forty Arch-priories: twelve thousand three hundred and twenty Priories, five hundred sixty seven Nunneries: seven hundred Convents of Friars: two hundred fifty nine Commanderies of Malta; besides all the Colleges of the Jesuits. And the Parish Priests are a hundred thirty thousand of all sorts. And whereas the Kingdom is supposed to have about fifteen millions of people; the Clergy and their Ministers are judged to be three millions of them.

Judge now like men of reason and impartiality, whether the tongues of these men be fit to call us Mercenaries, or Hirelings, or such as preach for filthy lucre. Or whether ever greater impudence was manifested by the vilest Son of Adam, then for such men that Lord it over Emperors, Kings and Princes, and devour the wealth of the Christian world, to call poor Ministers of Christ, Covetous, or Hirelings, that are content with food and raiment, and a mean education of their children, and that have done so much to take down the Lordliness and Riches of the Clergy. Judge of this dealing; and if you had rather have the Popish Priesthood, with the numberless swarm of Friars and several orders, you may take them, and say, you had your choice.

CHAP. XXXIII. Their cavils against our Ministry, Ordination and Succession, confuted.

D*etect.* 24. Another of their designs, Conjunct with the last mentioned is, to persuade the world that they only have a true Ministry or Priesthood, and an Apostolical Episcopacy, and true Ordination: and that we and all other Churches have no true Ministers, but mere Lay men under the name of Ministers, because we have no just Ordination. And how prove they all this? Why, they say, that they have a Pope that is a true Successor of Saint Peter, but we have no Succession from the Apostles, and therefore no just Ordination, because no man can give that Power which he hath not. And we are Schismatics separated from the Church, and therefore our Ordinations are invalid: And some of our Churches have no Bishops, and therefore say they, we have no true Ministry there, nor are they true Churches. These are their Reasons.

In answer to which I shall first refer the Reader to my Second sheet for the Ministry in Justification of their Call; Where these Reasons are confuted, and our calling vindicated: and I shall forbear here to repeat the same things again: Also I refer you for a fuller *Answer to the London*

Ministers Jus Divinum Ministerii, and to Mr. Tho. Balls *Book for the Ministry*; and Mr. Masons Book in vindication of the Ministry of those Reformed Churches that have not Prelates, and to *Voetius Desper. Caus*.

2. Though we need not fetch our Ordination from Rome, yet, as to them, we may truly say, that if they have any true Ordination and Ministry, then so have we: For our first Reformers were Ordained by their Bishops, which is enough to stop their mouths. If they say that our Schism hath cut off our power of Ordination, I answer ad hominem, that (though it is they that are indeed the Notorious Schismatics, yet) if we were what they falsely say we are, it would not null our Ordination, Confirmation, or such other acts. And this is the Judgment of their own writers. I shall at this time only cite the words of one of them, and of many in that one: and that is *Thom. à Jesis de Conversione Gentium, lib. 6, c. 9*. Where he affirms it to be one of the Certainties agreed on [that Schismatics lose not, nor can lose any spiritual power consisting in the spiritual Caracter of Baptism, or Confirmation of Orders: For this is indelible, as Dr. Thomas teacheth here, *Art. 3*, and Turrecremata confirmeth, *lib. 4, sum. part. 1, c. 7*, and Silvester *verb. Schismatici*: and it appeareth by Pope Urbans *Can. Ordinationes, 9, q. 1*. Who judgeth those to be truly ordained, that were ordained by Schismatical Bishops: And from Austin *lib. 6, de Bapt. Cont. Donatist. c. 5*, where he saith that [A Separatist may deliver the Sacrament as well as have it.] He next addeth that yet such are deprived of the faculty of Lawful using the Power which they have, so that it will be their sin to use it, though it be not a nullity if they do use it: and that thus those are to be understood that speak against the Ordination, Confirmation, &c. of Schismatics; viz. that it is unlawful, because their power is suspended by the Church, but not a Nullity, because they have the Power, p. 316. He puts the Question

[Whether Schismatical Presbyters and Bishops do want the Power of Order, or only want Jurisdiction?] And he answereth out of *D. Thom. 22, q. 39, art. 3*, that [they want Jurisdiction, and cannot Absolve, Excommunicate, or grant indulgences, and so they cannot elect and give Benefices, and make Laws—But yet they have the holy Power of Orders; and therefore a schismatical Bishop doth truly make and consecrate the Eucharist, truly Confirm, truly Ordain; and when he Electeth and promoteth any to Ecclesiastical Orders, they truly receive the Character of Order, but not the Use, because they are suspended, if knowingly they are ordained by a Schismatical Bishop.] He next asketh, [Whether this punishment depriving them of Jurisdiction, take place with all Schismatics] And answers that [some say that before the Council of Constance this punishment belonged to all notorious Schismatics, but not to the unknown ones: but since that Council, it takes place only on those that are expressly and by name denounced, or manifest strikers of the Clergy] Others say otherwise: But he himself answers, that [If a schismatic be tolerated, and by the common error of the people be taken for lawful, there's no doubt but all his acts of Jurisdiction are valid, which we shall affirm also of Heretics: But if a Presbyter or Bishop be a manifest Schismatic, then some say that those acts that require Jurisdiction are invalid; but others say that they are all valid in case the Schismatic be not by name excommunicated, or a manifest striker of the Clergy] Thus far Thom. à Jesu opening the judgment of the Papists Doctors themselves in the point.

And by the way, our new super-prelatical Brethren that degrade others that want their Ordination, yea or commands, and nullify their Acts, should learn not to go beyond the Papists themselves, if they will go with them.

And observe, that it is but their own Canons, that is, their own wills, that the Papists here plead when the Council of Constance hath so altered the business.

2. Though this that is said is enough as to the Papists, yet I add for fuller satisfaction, that their succession is interrupted; and therefore they are most unfit to be our Judges in this. They have had so long schisms in which no man knew who was the right Pope, nor knoweth to this day; and so long removes and vacancies, and such interpositions of various ways of choosing their Pope, and interruptions by Heretical Popes, condemned by General Councils; besides Murderers, Adulterers, Simonists, and such as their own Writers (as Genebrard) expressly say, Were not Apostolical, but Apostatical; yea Popes that by General Councils have been judged or charged with infidelity itself (as I have formerly proved,) that there's nothing more certain then that their succession hath been interrupted.

3. They cannot be certain but its every age interrupted, and that theres no true Pope or Bishops among them, because the intention of the Ordainer or Consecrator is with them of necessity to the thing: and no man can be certain of the Intention of the Ordainers. And therefore Bellarmine is fain to take up with this, that though we cannot be sure that he is a true Pope, Bishop, or Presbyter that is ordained, yet we are bound to obey him. But where then is the Certainty of succession?

4. What succession of Episcopal Consecration was there in the Church of Alexandria, when Jerome (*Epist. ad Evagrium*) tells us that [At Alexandria from Mark the Evangelist even till Heraclus and Dionysius their Bishops, the Presbyters did always name one man that Bishop whom they chose from among themselves, and placed in a higher degree. Even as if an Army make an Emperor, or the Deacons choose one of themselves, whom they

know to be industrious, and call him the chief Deacon.] Thus Jerome shows that Bishops were then made by mere Presbyters. And in the same Epistle he proves from Scripture, that Presbyters and Bishops were then all one. And if so, there were no Prelatical Ordinations then at all. And your Medina accusing Jerome of error in this, saith, that Ambrose, Austin, Sedulius, Primasius, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophilact, were in the same heresy, as Bellarmine himself reporteth him. So that Presbyters now may either ordain, or make themselves Bishops as those of Alexandria did, to do it. And as Jerome there saith, [All are the successors of the Apostles,] and our Bishops or Presbyters are such, as much, at least, as yours: yet Apostles as Apostles have no Successors at all, as Bellarmine well teacheth, *lib. 4, de Pontif. c. 25*, saying, [Bishops do not properly succeed the Apostles, because the Apostles were not ordinary, but extraordinary, and as it were, delegate Pastors, who have no Successors. Bishops have no part of the true Apostolic Authority. Apostles could preach in the whole world, and found Churches, but so cannot Bishops. The Apostles could write Canonical Books, but so cannot Bishops. Apostles had the gifts of tongues and miracles, but so have not Bishops. The Apostles had Jurisdiction over the whole Church, but so have not Bishops. And there is no Succession, but to a Predecessor: but Apostles and Bishops were in the Church both at once, as appeareth by Timothy, Titus, Evodius, and many more. If therefore Bishops succeed Apostles, to what Apostle did Titus succeed? And whom did Timothy succeed? To conclude, Bishops succeed Apostles, but in the same manner as Presbyters succeed the seventy-two Disciples—But its manifest that Presbyters do not properly succeed the seventy-two Disciples, but only by similitude. For those seventy-two Disciples were not Presbyters, nor did they receive any Order of Jurisdiction from Christ. Philip, Stephen and

others that were of the seventy-two had never been after Ordained Deacons, if they had been Presbyters before] Thus Bellarmine.

See now what's become of the Popish Apostolical Successors among their Bishops? And the scope of all this is to prove, that all Bishops receive their Power from the Pope; and so their succession is confined to him alone: and therefore as oft as there have been interruptions in the Papal Succession, so oft the Succession of all their Church was interrupted.

But if Bishops succeed not Apostles, and have not any of the Apostolic Power, who then doth the Bishop of Rome succeed? Why, Bellarmine hath a shift for this: but how sorry a one it is, you shall bear, c. 25, he saith that [The Pope of Rome properly succeedeth Peter, not as an Apostle, but as an Ordinary Pastor of the whole Church.] Let us then have no more talk of the Apostolic seat, or at least no more Arguing from that name. You see then that Peter was not the Universal Vicar as an Apostle, nor doth the Pope so succeed him. And do you think this doth not give away the Vicarship? Which way hereafter will they prove it?

But an Objection falls in Bellarmine's way, that [If this be so, then none of the Bishops of Africa, Asia, &c. were true Bishops, that were not made by the Pope: To which he answers (as well as he can) that its enough that the Pope do Consecrate them Mediately, by making Patriarchs and Archbishops to do it: and so Peter did Constitute the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, who thus receiving authority from the Pope, did Rule almost all Asia and Africa] But 1. That [almost] marreth the whole Cause. For where now is the universal Headship? 2. Did Bellarmine think in good sadness that Alexandria and Antioch were made at first the seats of Patriarchs, having as large Jurisdiction as afterward they attained? 3. How will he prove that Peter made these two Patriarchates, and that not as an

Apostle, but as an Ordinary Vicar General? 4. Who made the Patriarchate of Constantinople, and gave them that vast Jurisdiction? Did Peter many hundred years after his death? Or did the Pope of Rome, that tooth and nail resisted, and still sought to diminish his Power? Or rather did not the General Councils do it by the Emperors Commands, the Pope excepting and repining at it. 5. Who made the Patriarch of Jerusalem? And who made James Bishop of Jerusalem? Did Peter? And who made Timothy and Titus Bishops? Did Peter or Paul? And who gave Paul that Power? Not Peter certainly. Reader, do not these men jest with holy things? Or is it like that they believe themselves?

6. Bellarmine confesseth that the *Potestas Ordinis, & interioris jurisdictionis* are both as immediately from God to every Bishop as to the Pope, c. 22. And why then should it be denied of the power of exterior Jurisdiction? 1. Is one part of the Essence of the Office given by the Pope, and the rest without him? 2. And what if it be proved that exterior and interior Jurisdiction of a Pastor is all one? Though the matter of obedience be exterior, yet the Jurisdiction is exercised only on the soul directly, in one case as well as another; it being the mind on which the obligation lieth, and the Pastoral Rule is powerful and effectual: and further then you procure consent, you are despised: For its the Magistrates work to use violence: Bishops as Bishops can but persuade and deal by words with the inner man.

And thus you see what is become of the Papists Succession.

5. Most of the Ministers in England, till within these few years were ordained by Bishops If that were of Necessity, they have it.

6. He that is ordained according to the Apostles directions, or prescript in Scripture, hath the true Apostolical Ordination; but so are we Ordained; therefore,—The Apostles never Confined Ordination to Prelates, much less

to those Prelates that depend on the Pope of Rome: The Bishops to whom the Apostles committed this Power, are the same that are called Presbyters by them, and they were the Overseers or Pastors but of one single Church, and not of many Churches. And such are those that Ordain among us now. *Gregor. Nazianzen. Orat. 18*, saith thus [I would there were no Presidency, nor Prerogative of Place, and Tyrannical Privileges; that so we might be known only by virtue, (or mere desert:) But now this Right side, and Left side, and Middle, and Lower Degree, and Presidency, and Concomitancy, have begot us many Contritions to no purpose, and have driven many into the Ditch, and have led them away to the region of the Goats.]

What Jerome saith, both in his Epistle to Evagrius, and on Tit. c. 2, is commonly known. The many plain Testimonies of Anselmn are commonly Cited, as plain as Jerome's *Alphons. à Castro adverse. Haeres. lib. 6, in nom. Episcop*. had more ingenuity than to join with them that would wrest Jerome's words to a sense so contrary to their most plain importance. Tertullian *c. 17, de Bapt*. thought Lay-men in Necessity might Baptize, (and so doth the Church of Rome now.) Why then may not Presbyters in such a case at least Ordain? When, as he there saith, [*Quod ex aequo accipitur, ex aequo dari potest*] And ibid. he saith, that it is but *propter Ecclesiae honorem*, that Bishops Rule in such matters, and that peace may be kept, and Schism avoided. But that *probati quique seniores* did exercise Discipline in the Assembly, he testifieth in *Apologet*.

Mr. Prin hath cited you abundance of Fathers that were for the parity of the Ministry, or against Prelacy *jure Divino*.

Isidore Pelusiat. *lib. 3. Epist. 223, ad Hieracem Episcopatum fugientem* saith [And when I have shown what difference there is between the ancient

Ministry, and the present Tyranny, why do you not Crown and Praise the Lovers of equality?]

If you would see more of the Ancients making Presbyters to be Bishops, and Consenting with Jerome, read Sedulius on *Tit. 1. Anselm. Cantuar in Enarrat. in Phil. 1:1*. Beda *on Act. 20*. Alcuinus *de Divinis officiis, c. 35,36*, and on John *lib. 5. Col 547. &c. and Epist. 108*. And that Presbyters may Ordain Presbyters, see Anselmn on 1 Tim. 4:14. And *Institut. in Council. Colon. de sacr. Ordin. fol. 196*, see also what's said by our Mart. Bucer script. *Anglic. p. 254,255,259,291, and sequ*. and Pet. Martyr. *Loc. Commu. Clas. 4. Loc. 1, sect. 23 p. 849*. And Wycliffe's *Arguments in Waldensis Passim*. And your own Cassander *Consult. Artic. 14*, saith [It is agreed among all, that of old in the Apostles days, there was no difference between Bishops and Presbyters, but afterwards for Orders sake, and the avoiding of Schism, the Bishop was set before the Presbyters.] And Ockam determineth, that by Christ's Institution all Priests of what degree soever are of equal Authority, Power and Jurisdiction.]

Reynold Peacock, Bishop of Chichester wrote a Book *de Ministrorum aequalitate*, which your party caused to be burnt.

And Richardus Armachanus, *lib. 9, c. 5, ad Quest. Armen*. saith [There is not found in the Evangelical or Apostolical Scriptures any difference between Bishops and simple Priests, called Presbyters; whence it follows, that there is one Power in all, and equal from their Order.] and *c. 7*, answering the Question, Whether any Priest may Consecrate Churches, &c. he saith [Priests may do it as well as Bishops, seeing a Bishop hath no more in such matters then any simple Priest: though the Church for reverence to them appoint that those only do it, whom we call Bishops—It seems

therefore that the restriction of the Priests Power was not in the Primitive Church, according to the Scripture.]

I refer you to three Books of Mr. Prynne's, viz. his Catalogue; his Antipathy of Lordly Prelates, &c. and his unbishoping of Timothy and Titus; where you have the Judgments of many writers of these matters. And also to what I have said in my Second Disputation of the Episcopal Controversies, of purpose on this point.

7. The chief error of the Papists in this cause is expressed in their reason, [No man can give the Power that he hath not:] wherein they intimate, that it is Man that giveth the Ministerial Power: whereas it is the gift of Christ alone: Man doth but design the person that shall receive it, and then Christ giveth it by his Law to the person so designed: and then man doth invest him and solemnize his introduction. As a woman may choose her a husband, but it is not she that giveth him the Power over her, but God who determineth of that Power by his Law, affixing it to the person chosen by her, and her action is but a condition fine qua non, or cause of the capacity of the matter to receive the form. And so is it here. When do but obey God in a right choice and designation of the person, his Law doth presently give him the Power, which for orders sake he must be in a solemn manner invested with. But matters of Order may possibly vary; and though they are to be observed as far as may be, yet they always give place to the Ends and substance of the work, for the ordering whereof they are appointed.

8. Temporal power is as truly and necessarily of God, as Ecclesiastical, and it was at first given immediately by him, and he chose the person: And yet there is no Necessity that Kings must prove an uninterrupted Succession. God useth means now in designing the persons that shall be Governors of the Nations of the earth: But not always the same means: nor

hath he tied himself to a successive Anointing or Election: else few Kings on earth would hold their Scepters. And no man (from any diversity in the cases) is able to prove that a man may not as truly be a lawful Church-governor, as a lawful Governor of the Commonwealth, without an uninterrupted succession of Ministerial Collation.

9. If Bellarmine be forced to maintain that with them it is enough that a Pastor have the place, and seem lawful to the people, and that they are bound to obey him, though it should prove otherwise. Then we may as well stand on the same terms as they.

10. In a word, our Ordination being according to the Law of Christ, and the Popes so contrary to it, we are ready at any time, more fully to compare them, and demonstrate to any impartial man, that Christ doth much more disown their Ordination then ours, and that we enter in God's appointed way. Mr. Eliot in New England may better Ordain a Pastor over the Indians converted by him, then leave them without, or send to Rome, or England for a Bishop, or for Orders. But again I must refer you of this subject to the Books before mentioned, and the Sheet which I have written, lest I be over-tedious.

CHAP. XXXIV. Their pretense of the Holiness of their Church, and the unholiness of ours.

D*etect.* 25. Another of their Deceits is, In pretending the Holiness of their Churches, and Ministry, and the unholiness of ours. This being matter of fact, a willing and impartial mind may the easier be satisfied in it. They prove their Holiness, 1. By the Canonized Saints among them. 2. By the devotion of their Religious Orders, and their strictness of living. 3. By their unmarried Clergy. 4. By their sanctifying Sacraments and Ceremonies: In all which they say that we are wanting, and so far wanting, that being out of the Church, there is no true Holiness among us.

When in the Preface of my Book against Popery, called The Safe Religion, I had truly spoken my experience, that I had never the happiness to be acquainted with any Papist of a serious spiritual temper, and holy life, but only some of a Ceremonious formal kind of Religion, and but with very few that lived not in some gross sin, I was passionately censured by some of the Papists, as one that condemned all for some. When as 1. I only spoke of my own acquaintance. 2. And I added withal, that yet I was confident that God had his servants among them, though I had not the happiness to know

them. 3. And is it not a ridiculous business, that these same men should be so passionate with me, for speaking but the truth, concerning the ungodliness of some of them, when at the same time they make it an Article of their faith, and an essential point of Popery, That no one Protestant hath charity, or can be saved; yea, that no Christian in the world is sanctified really, and can be saved, but a Papist. O the partiality of these men! 4. Yea when they necessitate us to mention their ungodliness, by calling us to it, and laying the stress of all our cause upon the point: yea laying the very Christian faith itself upon the Holiness of their Church. For we must not know that Scripture is God's word, or that Christianity is the true Religion, till we first know that the Church of Rome is the true Church, that we may receive it on their credit: And we must know that they are the true Church by being the only Holy people in the world. I must profess that if my faith lay on this foundation, I know so much of the falsehood of it, that I must needs turn infidel: and I can no more believe this, then I can believe that the snow is not white.

They confess (I thank them for nothing) that their common people are bad; but yet say they, [there is some good ones among us, *Inter haereticos autem nullus est bonus*: but among the heretics not one is good] So saith [*Thom. à Jesu de convers. omn Gent. p. 531*. And saith H. Turbervile *Manual p. 84*. [But I never yet heard of any Protestant Saints in the world.] O wonderful perverseness of the hearts of Sectaries! O wonderful Patience of God! Did not this man's heart tremble or smite him to write so horrid, so impudent a reproach against so many precious Saints of God? Durst he thus attempt to rob the Lord of the fruit of his blood? And to vilify his Jewels? And as Rabshakah, to reproach the Israel of God? To attempt to pluck them out of Christ's hand that are given him by his Father; and to shut them out

of heaven, that are redeemed and made heirs by so dear a Price; and to spit in their faces whom Christ hath washed with his blood? Did he not fear that dreadful threatening of Christ, Matth. 18:6. [but who so shall offend one of these little ones that believe in me, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea.] Though I see so much impiety among the Papists, I dare not say, I dare not think that God hath not some Holy ones among them. Its dangerous condemning those that Christ will Justify; and making his members to be the members of the Devil, and abusing so grossly the apple of his eye. If I see a man live wickedly, I dare say that he is of a wicked life; but I dare not say that All are so, unless it be among men, whose principles I am sure are inconsistent with godliness, and I know that they hold those principles practically or prevalently. And therefore I must say again, that I have been acquainted with some Papists, learned and unlearned. The unlearned few of them knew what. Christianity was, nor whether Christ were God or Man, Male or Female, nor whether ever he was the King, Prophet or Priest of the Church, nor for what end he died, nor what faith, or repentance is; but were infidels under the name of Papists, or Catholics. The learned and unlearned live in some gross sin or other, either all or near all that I have been acquainted with. The better sort would ordinarily swear, [by their Lady, and by the Mass.] and sometime greater oaths. The rest were some fornicators or adulterers, some drunkards or revelers, and gamesters, or such like: And never had I the happiness to be acquainted with one that would speak experimentally and savorily of the work of Grace upon his soul, of the life of faith, of communion with God, and of the life to come; but their Religion lay in being the Popes subjects, and in fasting on Fridays and in Lent from some sorts of meat, and in saying over so many Ave Mary's, Pater Nosters,

or the like; and in observing days, and hours, and Ceremonies. Yet I again say, I fully believe that there be better among them, though I am not acquainted with them.

But if these men that [never heard of a Protestant Saint] and that conclude [there is no one saved but a Papist,] and build their salvation on this as an Article of their faith, had known but those that I have known, and yet know, they would either have been of another mind, or have been left inexcusable in a malicious reproaching of the Saints of the most high. I bless the Lord that I can truly say, that I know many and many, that (as far as the heart of another can be known, by words and a holy life) do live in much communion with God; whose souls are daily longing after him; and some of them that have vacancy from worldly necessities, spending much of their lives upon their knees, having had many a special extraordinary return to their importunate requests: whose delight is in the Law of the Lord, in which they meditate day and night (which is locked up among the Papists.) Whose hearts smite them for vain words or thoughts, or the loss of a few minutes of time; that live in exemplary humility, meekness and self-denial, bearing wrongs patiently, and doing good to as many as they can, as the servants of all; contemning the Riches and Honors of the world, mortifying the flesh, and some of them longing to be dissolved and to be with Christ, in whom the world never knew either once drunkenness, fornication, or one rash oath, or any other gross sin, that I could ever hear of. And is it certain that all these shall be damned, because they believe not in the Pope? Nay is it not certain by Promise that all such shall be saved?

I must again profess, that when the Papists lay their faith and cause on this, that their Church is Holy, and ours and all other are every man unholy, its almost all one to me as if they said that no men but Papists have souls in

their bodies, and laid their faith on this; and as soon I think should I believe them, if this were their belief. Its a good preservative against Popery, when a man cannot turn Papist without putting out his eyes, and renouncing his wit, and reason, and common experience, as well as his charity; yea without denying of what he knoweth by his own soul!

But let us come to their Evidences. 1. They say, We have no Canonized Saints. I answer 1. All the Apostles and Saints of the first ages were of our Religion, and many of them have been beholden to the Pope for Canonizing them.

2. We have no usurper among us that pretendeth Infallibly to know the hearts of others, nor to number God's Saints. But with us, the Holy Ghost maketh Saints, and their lives declare it; and those that converse with them discern it, so far as to be highly confident, and men discern it in themselves, so far as to be Infallibly (though not perfectly) certain.

3. It seems the Pope takes Saints to be rare with them, that they must be named and written with red Letters in an Almanac: And H.T. *Man. p. 84*, is fain to send us for proof to their Chronicles and Martyrologies; and he nameth four Saints that they have had, viz. Saint Austin the Monk, Saint Bennet, Saint Dominick, and Saint Francis. Now we all know that none but Saints are saved, and that without holiness none can see God, Heb. 12:14. So that it seems if sanctity be so rare among the Papists, salvation must be rare.

But as for us, we make it our care to admit none but Saints to our Church Communion: though we preach to others to prepare them for it: For we believe that the Church is a Holy Society, and find Paul calling the whole Churches that he writes to, by the title of [Saints,] and we believe it is [the Communion of Saints] that is there to be held. And if we had no more

Saints in one County at once, yea in someone Parish at once, then would fill up the Popes Calendar, so as to have one for every day in the year, we should betake ourselves to bitter lamentation.

Whereas the Church of Rome takes in all sorts of the unclean, and is so impure and polluted a society, that its a wonder how they should have the face to boast of their holiness to men that live among them and know them. Thousands of their members are stark Infidels, as not knowing the Essentials of the Christian Faith. Its known here in Ireland, that abundance of them know not who Christ was, but that he was a better man than Saint Patrick: Bishop Usher saw it and lamented it, that they perished as Heathens for want of knowing Christianity itself, while they went under the name of Catholics: and therefore he would have persuaded the Popish Priests to have Consented that they should be all taught a Catechism of the common principles that we are agreed in; but he could not procure it: when Dr. Jo. White asked one of them in Lancashire, who Jesus Christ was? She answered, that [sure it was some good thing, or else it should not have been put into the Creed.]

And how much swearing, whoredom, drunkenness, and other wickedness is in their Church, is known not only by the complaints of their own writers, but by the too common experience of Travailers. We have known Papists that have turned from them by the experience of one journey to Rome, and seeing what is there. And for Church censures by which any of these should be purged out, they are laid by, and reserved for other uses, even as thunder-bolts for the Popes Adversaries, and the servants of Christ whom they take for Heretics; and for Princes whom the Pope would have deposed and murdered. These things are not mere words, but the lives of many Kings and Princes have been the sacrifice of the Roman Holiness.

And what need you any further proof that their Church is as the common wilderness, and not as the Garden of Christ, and is a Cage of all unclean birds, then that they actually keep them all in their Communion. It made my heart rise at their hypocrisy and filthiness, to read one sentence in one of the most learned, and sober, and honest of all their Bishops that have written, and that is *Albaspinaeus Observat. 1, p. 1*, saith he [*Siquis unquam hoc seculo, (quod nescio an acciderit) Communione fuit privatus, sola fuit Eucharistiae perceptione: in reliquis suae vitae partibus, quam ante Excommunicationem habuit, eandem cum caeteris fidelibus consuetudinem, & usum retinuit*.] That is [If ever any one man in this age was put from the Communion (which I know not whether such a thing hath come to pass,) it was only from the receiving the Eucharist; in the other parts of his Life, be retained the same familiarity and converse with other believers, which he had before his Excommunication.]

Here you see from a credible Bishop that lived in the thickest of their Clergy in France, that he knew not that any one person in the age that he lived in, was ever kept from the Lord's Supper; but if he were, yet that was all: he was still a member of their Church, and familiar with the rest. Let the Christian world then observe by their practice, what an abominable hypocritical contest they make, for to prove the Power of Church-government to be only in their Pope, and the Prelates to whom he giveth it; and when they have done, do make no more use of the Power which they so pretend to, as not to exercise the Censures of the Church upon one offender there in an age. How were that man worthy to be thought of, or to be used, that would set all the world on fire by contending, that no Schoolmaster or Physician should be suffered in the whole world, but himself and such as he giveth power to: and when he hath done, will not by himself or his subjects

and dependents teach or heal one person in an age? Were such a one meet to live on the earth? Or should we judge that man in his wits that would believe him? O what a stye is the Roman Society! What dunghills are in their Assemblies? And yet must not the Shovel or the Besom be used once in an Age? What! No weed pulled up? No superfluous branch cut off? Is this the use of all the Canons of their Church concerning Excommunication, and abstention? Must the Christian world be at such a vast expense, to maintain so rich and numerous a Clergy for this? And must we cast out our Pastors to receive such as these? When we should be ashamed, if we had not exercised more of the cleansing power of the Keys in one Parish Church, then Albaspinaeus knew of among the Papists in a whole age.

But perhaps there is little of this filth among them to be cast out: He that readeth their own writers, or liveth among them, and seeth their lives, will hardly think so. He that had but seen the Murders of their Popes for the obtaining of the Popedom, or how Pope Stephen raged against the Carcass of Pope Formosus, drawing it out of the grave, and changing its Pontifical habit to a secular, and cutting off his fingers; or he that had seen Pope Christopher casting the Corps of Pope Leo the fifth into the River Tiber; or Pope Sergius keeping the said Christopher bound in prison; or Pope Boniface the seventh putting out his Cardinals eyes; would scarce believe that the Holy Seat of Peter were indeed Holy: (all which Platina and others of their own writers give us notice of.) He that readeth Baronius himself telling us (*To. 10, an. 897, n. 6*.) how Pope Stephen the seventh defiled St. Peters seat with unheard of sacrilege, not to be named; and (*sect. 4, ib*.) and how the Princes of Tuscia were brought into Peters Chair and Christ's Throne, being monstrous men, of most filthy lives, and desperate manners, and every way most filthy.] He that shall read the same flattering Cardinal,

saying, (*Can. 900, sect. 1*.) [that ugly monsters were thrust into the Papacy, that it was daubed with dung, infected with stinks, defiled with filthiness, and collowed by these with a perpetual infamy] And (*an. 912, sect. 8*.) [that at Rome, the most powerful and the most sordid whores did Rule; at whose will the seats were changed, Bishops were made, and, which is horrid to be heard, and not to be spoken, their sweet-hearts false Popes were thrust into Peters seat.] And [that for a hundred and fifty years the Popes were wholly fallen from the virtue of their Predecessors; being disorderly, and Apostatical, rather than Apostolical, not entering by the door, but by the back-door] saith a passionate Papist, Genebrard, *Chron. l. 4, an. 901*. I say he that shall read these impartially, will scarce think the Head of their Church hath been Holy, which is an Essential part of it, (nor that their succession is uninterrupted.)

But if besides these you would read but *Nic. Clemangis, Alvarus Pelagius de planctu Ecclesiae* (*lib. 2, art. 2, fol. 104*.) and many such like; or their Poets Mantuan, Pantes, &c. or Petrarch, Mirandula, &c. you would think the Holiness of Rome- should be the poorest proof in the world of their being the only Church.

Their Espensaeus and others recite that Distich,

Vivere qui cupitis sancte, discedite Roma:

Omnia cùm liceant, non licet esse bonum.

Platina saith (in *vita Marcellini*) [Our vices are so increased, that they have scarce left us any place for mercy with God. How great is the Covetousness of the Priests! Especially of those that rule all! How great lust! How great ambition and pomp! How great ignorance of themselves, and of the Christian doctrine! How little Religion, and that rather counterfeit, then true! How corrupt manners! Even such as in the profanest

secular men were to be detested! Its not worth the speaking: when they sin so openly and so publicly, as if they sought Praise by it.

Their Claudius Espensaeus on *Tit. p. 75*, saith [Where is there under the Sun a greater liberty, clamor, impunity of all evil; that I say not infamy and impudency (then at Rome:) verily it is such as no man can believe but he that hath seen it, and no man can deny it that hath seen it] This was written since the Council of Trent.

And in the Council of Trent, their Cornelius Muss, a Bishop there, and the wonder of his age among the Papists, saith that [there was no monsters of filthiness, or sink, or plague of uncleanness, with which both people and Priest was not defiled: In the very Sanctuary of God, there was no shame, no modesty, no hope or regard of good living: but unbridled and untamed lust, singular audaciousness, incredible wickedness.] And after more of the like he adds, [Would they had not fallen from Religion to superstition, from faith to infidelity, from Christ to Antichrist, yea as men that had no souls, from God to Epicurus or Pythagoras, saying in an impious heart, and an impudent mouth, there is no God. And yet now of a long time, there hath been no Pastor that would require, (or seek them again) I say there was none to seek them, because they all sought their own things, but not one the things of Jesus Christ] The same Bishop Cornelius Muss after the Council writes thus (*To. 2. Serm 2. Dom. V. Quadr*.) [The Roman Name is hateful with all Nations; and see I pray you how little esteem the Church itself is of, because of the scandals that are heard, seen and felt. I speak not now of enemies that call it Babylon, Hell, the Whore, and say it is the sink of all Errors: But I speak of friends, that groan and daily sigh within themselves, saying, O holy City, how art thou thus profaned! O glorious City! That art thus become vile; thus contemned, and neglected.] These and many more

such Testimonies of their own writers, Rivet and many of ours have oft set before them.

Guicciardine their Historian saith, that [Those are called Good Popes, whose Goodness is not worse then other men's wickedness.]

And if you think that now the matter is much mended, read but Claud. Espensaeus in *Tit. 1, p. 75*, complaining that the promises made by the Pope of Reformation, at the Council of Trent were all broken, and nothing done but deceit and shows. And of Pope Sixtus the fifth Bellarmine gave out his judgment, that he thought when he died, he went to the Devil, saying, [*Qui sine paenitentia vivit, & sine paenitentia moritur, proculdubio ad infernum descendit*] [He that lives without Repentance, and dieth without Repentance, undoubtedly goes to Hell.] And saith Watson of him (*in Quodl. b. p. 56,57*.) Bellarmine said to an English Doctor [*Conceptis verbis, quantum capio, quantum sapio, quantum intelligo, Dominus noster Papa descendit ad infernum*] [As far as I can reach, as far as I have any wisdom, as far as I understand, in plain terms, our Lord the Pope is gone to Hell.] But which way he went thither, all the world knows not, but Barthol. Morisot. in the Life of Henry the Great of France, *c. 17*, saith [That when the Spaniards perceived his contrivances to forsake their party, lest he should join with the enemy, they caused him to be strangled in the night by a Franciscan, or one in a Monks habit; and the next day gave out that a Domestic Devil had strangled him, and to make good the report, a Book was written of his life, and printed, where all the wickedness of Pope Alexander the sixth is charged on him.]

And how the Popes are still chosen by impious Juggling's and combinations Rivet tells you out of your own champion, Cardinal Perron, his *Legationes & Negotiat*. And of the saying of Cardinal Ossatus *ad D.*

Ville roy Epist. 87, concerning Pope Clement the eighth, esteemed one of the very best of them, who persuaded the King of France to join with the Spaniard in the Invasion of England; and when the Cardinal answered that the King of France was under an Oath of Peace with the Queen of England, the Pope (their best Pope) replied, that [the Oath was made to an Heretic; but he was bound by another Oath to God and the Pope] and added that [that Kings and other Sovereign Princes tolerate themselves in all things that make for their commodity: and its now come to pass that it is not imputed to them, nor taken to be their fault;] and he alleged the saying of Francisc. Mariae Duke of Urbine, that a Nobleman, or Great man that is not the Sovereign, is blamed and counted infamous of all men, if he keep not his faith; but supreme Princes may make Covenants, and break them again without any danger to their credit, and may lie, betray, and commit such like practices.]

These are your best Popes! Poor men! That can forgive other men's sins, and pardon them the pains of Purgatory, and cannot save their own souls from Hell! Are they not like to Govern the Universal Church well, that can no better Govern themselves, or that one City where they dwell? And are not these men worthy to be consulted as infallible Oracles, by those that dwell at the Antipodes, though it cost them their lives to sail or travail to them? Can he be a Christian or be saved that believeth not in one of these men? Or can any man receive the Christian faith or Scriptures, till he first know these good men to be Christ's infallible Vicars?

And how many thousand Whores are licensed at Rome, how sumptuously they live, what revenues come to the Pope by them? Many of your own mention. And though some of you write for it, and your Pope still maintaineth it, yet Mariana one of your Jesuits (though he was for King-

killing) condemneth this, *lib. de Spectaculis, c. 16*. And your Claud. *Espensaeus lib. 3, de Continentia. c. 4*, sets it out with a witness, lamenting Rome, as if it were turned all into one Whore-house; and bewailing it, that the Jews should so far shame you, that no one of their children may play the harlots, unless they first turn (Popish) Christians and be baptized, and then they have their liberty.

Of the gain that comes to the Pope and Prelates by the Simoniacal Market of benefices, save me the labor of reciting, and read but Nicol. *Clemangis Archidiaconus Baiosensis Tractde Annatibus non solvendis, & Alvarus Pelagius de Planctu Eccles. lib. 2. Art. 15, and l. 1, art. 67, & Claud. Espensaeus in Tit. 1, p. 68, & Cardinel. Cusanum de Concord. Cathol. lib. 2, c. 40, & Marc. Ant. de Dom. Spalatensem. de Repub. Eccless. lib. 9, c. 9, & Budaeum li. 5, de Ass; & Duarenum I. C. de sacris Eccles. Minist. lib. 5, c. 8, & passim*, Rivet will direct you to many more.

Yea that the odious sin of Sodomy was common, or too frequent with many of the Clergy, and Popes themselves (gluttony, drunkenness and whoredom being the common smaller sins) see the same Rivet manifesting at large out of the express complaints of Maphaeus, Alvarus Pelagius, and many more of their own writers. Hoffmeister cited by Grotius Discussio Apol. Rivet. p. 72. [*At cum Ep scopi quidam ignorant, quid Sacramenti vox significet; cum ipsos pudent sacramenta per seipsos confer, cum omnia apud ipsos sint venalia, cum Ecclesiam defraudent suis sacramentalibus quae vocant, quae potest Sacramentis apud simplici ores reverentia? Jam quod ad Parachos & Ecclesiastas quod attinet, vix centesimus quisque de sacramentis ullam facit mentionem in suis ad plebem concionibus; hic ex ignorantia, ill ex negligentia.—Gravissime peccatum est ab Episcopis nostris, dum numerantur potius ordinandi, quam examinantur: & quantum*

quis nummorum tantum & favoris habet apud quosdam. Quae hic premo prudens lector intelligit. Nolim enim hic refer quales Episcopos, Decanos, Canonicos, Pastores, &c. Nobis subinde intrudat potiùs quam ordinet Romana Curia, Regum item & Principum aulae: qui omnes juxta jocum cujusdam, familiam suam satiant (si modo tales bestiae satiari possent) muneribus sacris—Ab equorum stabulis, e culina rapiuntur ad Sacerdotia, qui, quid Sacerdos sit, ne persomnium quidem cogitarunt, homines qui profession sunt indigni.]

Papirius Massonius that wrote the Deeds of the Popes for their honor, and sought his Reward from Sixtus Quintus, saith (*De Episcop. urb. lib. 6, in Gregor. 13*.) [No man doth now a days look for Holiness in Popes: those are judged the best, that are a little good, or less naught than other Mortals use to be.]

Pope Pius the second was one of the best that your Papal seat a long time had; and yet in his Epistle to his Father (Epist. 15.) that was angry with him for fornication, he saith, [*Ais dolerete*— i.e. You say you are sorry for my crime, that I begot a son in sin (or bastardy) I know not what opinion you have of me. Certainly you that are flesh yourselves did not beget a son that is made of stone or iron. You know what a Cock you were yourself. And for my part I am not gelded, nor one of them that are frigid (or impotent) Nor am I a hypocrite, that I should desire rather to seem good, then to be good. I ingenuously confess my error, for am not holier than David, nor wiser than Solomon. Its an ancient and usual sin; I know not who is without it. (A holy Church you are that while) This plague is spread far and near, if it be a plague to make use of our naturals, though I see it not, seeing Nature, which doth nothing amiss, hath bred this Appetite in all living creatures, that

mankind should be continued.] This was he that was the glory of your Papacy, that knew none without this beastly sin.

And Orichovius tells Pope Julius the third, that Pope Paul the second his predecessor had a Daughter in the eyes of all men.

And of this Pope Julius the third, Onuphrius himself saith, that [Being a Cardinal he followed voluptuousness as by stealth, but being made Pope, and having what he would have, he cast away all care, and gave up himself to his mirth and disposition] Of whom Thuanus saith (*Hist. lib. 6*.) that he was very infamous as a Cardinal, but after past his life in greater infamy.]

And Alvarus Pelagius, (*lib. 2, art. 73, fol. 241, &c*.) lamenting Whoredom as a common sin, but specially of the Clergy, tells us that the cause is, because [Commonly the Religious of that age were Gluttons or belly God's, Arrogant, Proud, incomparably beyond secular men, conversing with women, &c. And drink more wine in their Religious state then before, and are commonly carnal. And that the Monks had their female Devotaries, with whom, by the Prelates license they conversed. And being sent to preach, they go to play the whoremongers: And that there was scarce any one of the Holy Nuns without her carnal male Devotary, by which they broke their first faith with Christ, &c.] This was your Holy Church.

And *li. 2, art. 28*, he saith [That most of the Clergy mix themselves with gluttony, drunkenness and whoredom, which is their common vice, and most of them give themselves to the unnatural vice (Sodomy)—Thus continually, yea and publicly do they offend against that holy chastity which they promised to the Lord; besides those evils not to be named which in secret they commit, which Papers will not receive, nor pen can write.] Abundance more he hath of the same subject, and their putting their

choicest youth into houses of Sodomy. This book of Alvarus Pelagius Bellarmine calleth *Liber insignis* (*de Scriptor. Ecclesiast*.)

Math. Paris (*in Henr. 3, p. 819*.) tells us of Cardinal Hugo's farewell speech to the people of Lons when he departed with the Popes Court [Friends, (saith he) since we came to this City we have brought you great commodity and alms. When we came hither we found three or four whore houses, but now at our departure we leave but one: but that one reacheth from the East Gate to the West Gate.] O Holy Pope! And Holy Church!

But Costerus the Jesuit easily answers all that I have said, *Enchirid. c. 2, de Eccles*. that [The Church loseth not the name [Holy] as long as there is but one thats truly Holy.] Answ Is this your sanctity? I deny your conclusion. For 1. If the Head be unholy, an essential part is unholy; and therefore the Church cannot be Holy. 2. One person is not the Matter of the Church, as one drop of Wine cast into the sea doth not make it a sea of Wine; and one Italian in England makes not England Italian: nor one Learned man make England Learned.

And let the Papists observe, that it is from the very words of their own that I have spoken of them what is here recited, and not from their adversaries. And therefore I shall be so far from believing the Gospel upon the Account that their Church is Holy that recommendeth it, or from believing them to be the only Church of Christ, because of their Holiness, that I must bless God that I live in a sweeter air and cleaner Society, and should be loath to come out of the Garden into the Channel or sink to be made clean or sweet, but say, that the travaller learned more wit, that left us this Resolution,

Roma vale; vidi; satis est vidisse; revertar,

Cum leno aut meretrix, scurra cinadus ero.

2. The second Proof which they bring of the Holiness of their Church, is, the strict life of their Friars, as Carthusians, Franciscans, and others. *Answ.* Having been so long already on this point, I will be but short on this branch. In a word, 1. I have no mind to deny the Graces of the spirit in any that have them. Though travelers tell me lamentable stories of your Friars, and Guil. de Amore, and his companions said much more, and many other Popish Writers paint them out in an odious garb, yet I do not doubt but God hath his servants among them.

2. But I must tell you that this also shows the Pollution of your Church in comparison of our Churches; that Holiness and Religion are such rarities, and next to Miracles among you, that it must be cloistered up, or confined to certain orders that are properly called Religious, as if the People had no Religiousness or Holiness. When our care and Hope is to make all our Parish Churches far more Religious and Holy then your Monasteries or Convents: Yea were not this Church much more Religious and Holy where I live, I think I should have small comfort in it.

3. THeir third Proof of the Holiness of their Churches, is their unmarried Clergy. *Answ.* 1. I will not stir too long in this puddle, or else I could tell you out of your own writers of the odious fruits of your unmarried Clergy. Only (because the essential parts of your Church are they that nearliest concern your cause) I will ask you in brief, whether it was not Pope John the eleventh that had Theodora for his whore? Whether it was no Pope Sergius the third that begot Pope John the twelfth of Marosia? Whether John the twelfth, alias the thirteenth (saith Luitprandus, and others of your own) did not ravish maids and wives at the Apostolic doors, and at last was killed in the Act of Adultery? Whether it were not Pope Innocent of whom a Papist wrote this distich?

Octo Nocens pueros genuit, totidemque puellas.

Hunc merito potuit dicere Roma patrem.

And whose Son was Aloisus, made Prince of Parma by Pope Paul the third? And for your Arch bishops, Bishops, Priests, &c. I shall now add but the words of your Dominicus Soto *de Instit. & Jure qu. 6, art. 1*, cited by Rivet, [We do not deny (saith he) that in the Clergy, such as keep Concubines, and are Adulterers, are frequent.]

2. We have many that live unmarried, as well as you, but not on your terms.

3. We know that Paul directed Timothy and Titus to ordain him a Bishop that was the Husband of one Wife, and ruled well his house, having his children in subjection; and that the Church a long time held to this doctrine, and that Greg. Nyssen was a married Bishop. But if you are wiser then the Spirit of God, or can change his Laws, or can prove the Holy Ghost so mutable, as to give one Law by Paul and other Apostles, and another by the Pope, we will believe you, and forsake the Scripture, when you can so far bewitch us, and charm us to it.

We believe that a single life is of very great Convenience to a Pastor, when it can be held: and that Christ's Rule must be observed [Every man cannot receive this saying, but he that can, let him receive it] And whether Ministers be Married or not Married (as many now living in the next Parishes to me are not, no more than myself) it is a strange thing with us to hear of one in many Counties that was ever once guilty of fornication in his life: and if any one be but once guilty in the Ministry, he is cast out, though he should be never so penitent, as any man that readeth the Act for ejecting scandalous Ministers and Schoolmasters may see. As also you may there see, that if he were but once drunk, if he swear, curse, or be guilty of other

scandalous sins, he is cast out without any more ado. And none are so earnest for the through execution of this Law as the Ministers. If a Minister do but go into an Alehouse, except to visit the sick, or on weighty business, it is a scandalous thing among us: we do not teach as the Jesuits cited by the Jansenist Montaltus, that a man may lawfully go into a Whorehouse to exhort them from Whoredom, though he hath found by experience, that when he comes among them he is overcome, and plays the Whoremonger with them.

Lest the vices of your Clergy should be laid open and punished, you exempt them from the secular power, and will not have a Magistrate so much as question them for whoredom, drunkenness, or the like crimes. It is one of Pope Nicolas Decrees (as *Caranza p. 395*, recites them) that [No Lay man must judge a Priest, nor examine anything of his life. And no secular Prince ought to judge the facts of any Bishops or Priests whatsoever] And indeed that is the way to be wicked quietly, and sin without noise and infamy. But for our parts, we do not only subject ourselves and all our actions to the trial of Princes and the lowest Justice of Peace, as far as the Law gives him power, but we call out to Rulers daily to look more strictly to the Ministry, and suffer not one that is ungodly or scandalous in the Church. And if one such be known, our Godly people will all set against him, and will not rest till they cast him out (in times when there is opportunity for it) and get a better in his stead. The whole Country knows the Truth of this.

If you say, as the Quakers do, that yet the most among us are ungodly; I answer, that Those among us that are known ungodly and scandalous are not owned by us, nor are members of our Church, or admitted to the Lord's

Supper, in those Congregations that exercise Church-discipline; but they are only as Catechuments, whom we preach to and instruct, if not cast out.

Your eighth General Council at Constantinople, *Can. 14*, decreed, that [Ministers must not fall down to Princes, nor eat at their Tables, nor debase themselves to them; but Emperors must take them as Equals] But we are so far from establishing Pride and Arrogancy by a Law, that though we hate servile flattery and man-pleasing, yet we think it our duty to be the servants of all, and to condescend to men of low estate, and much more to honor our Superiors, and God in them.

The same Council decreed, *Canon. 21*, that [None must compose any Accusations against the Pope] No marvel then if all Popes go for Innocents. But we are liable to the accusations of any.

And because you charge our Churches with Unholiness, and that with such an height of Impudency, as I am certain the Devil himself doth not believe you, that provokes you to it; even that there is not One Good among us, nor one that hath Charity, nor can be saved (unless by turning Papist,) I shall therefore go a little higher, and tell you that I doubt not but the Churches in England where I live, are purer far than those were in the days of Augustine, Jerome, &c. yea and that the Pastors of our Churches are less scandalous then they were then; what if I should compare many of them even to St. Augustine, St. Jerome, and such others, both in Doctrine and Holiness of Life? Should I do so, I know you would account it arrogancy: but yet I will presume to make some comparison, and leave you to Judge impartially if you can.

As for the Heavenliness of their writings, let but some of ours be compared with them, and you will see at least that they spake by the same spirit: and for their Commentaries on Scripture, did we miss it as oft as

Ambrose, Jerome and many more, we should bring ourselves very low in the esteem of the Church: Even your Cajetan doth more boldly censure the Fathers Commentaries then this comes to.

And as to our lives, the Lord knows that I have no pleasure in opening any of the faults of his Saints, nor shall I mention any but what are confessed by themselves in Printed Books, and mentioned by others; and to boast of our own Purity I take to be a detestable thing, and contrary to that sense of sin that is in every Saint of God. But yet if the Lord's Churches and servants are slandered and reproached as they were by the Heathens of old, the vindicating them is a duty which we owe to Christ.

Those Ministers that I Converse with are partly Married, and partly unmarried. The Married live soberly, in Conjugal Chastity, as burning and shining lights before the people, in exemplary Holiness of Life. The unmarried also give up themselves to the Lord, and to his service: and I verily think that of many such that converse with me, there is not one that ever defiled themselves by incontinency, and I am confident would be ready to take the most solemn Oath of it, if any Papist call them to it. And for the people of our Communion, through the mercy of God such sins are so rare, that if one in a Church be guilty once, we all lament it, and bring them to penitence, or disown them.

And were the Churches better in the third, fourth, fifth, sixth, or following Ages? I doubt not. And I judge by these discoveries. 1. By the sad Histories of the Crimes of those times.

2. By the lamentable complaints of the Godly Fathers, of the Bishops, and people of their times. What doleful complaints do Basil, Gregory Nazianz. and Greg. Nyssen, and Chrysostom, Austin, &c. make? (it were too long to recite their words.) What complaints made Gildas of the British Church?

What a doleful description have we of the Christian Pastors and People in his days, from Salvian, through his whole Book de Gubernat.?

3. I judge also by the Canons, and by the Fathers directions concerning Offenders. For example; Gregory Mag. saith of drunkards [*Quod cum venia suo ingenio sunt relinquendi, ne deteriores fiant, si à tali consuetudine evellantur*.] And was this the Roman Sanctity even then? And was this St. Gregory's Sanctity? That Drunkards must be let alone with pardon, lest if they be forced from their custom, they be made worse! Then fair-fall the Ministers of England: If such advice were but given by one of us, it would seem enough to cast us out of our Ministry. We dare not let one drunkard alone in our Church-communion, where Church-discipline is set up.

So Augustine saith [that Drunkenness is a mortal sin, *Si sit assidua*, if it be daily or usual. And that they must be dealt with gently and by fair words, and not roughly and sharply.] If one of us should make so light of Drunkenness, what should we be thought? I cite these two from Aquinas *22, q. 150, art. 1,4, ad 4 m. & art. 2, 1*.

Many Canons determine that [Priests that will not part with their Concubines, shall be suspended from officiating, till they let them go.] Whereas with us, a man deserveth to be ejected, that should have a Concubine but one night in his life.

Gratian *Distinct. 34*, citeth *c. 17*, of a Toletane Council, saying, that he that hath not a Wife, but a Concubine in her stead, shall not be put from the Communion. His Corrector reciteth the whole Canon thus [If any Believer have a wife and a Concubine, let him not Communicate. But he that hath no Wife, and hath a Concubine instead of a Wife, may not be put from the Communion: only let him be content with one woman, either Wife or

Concubine, which he will. He that liveth otherwise, let him be cast off, till he give over, and return to penitence.]

In an English Council at Berghamsted *an. 697*, the seventh Canon is this [If a Priest leave his Adultery, and do not naughtily defer Baptism, nor is given to drunkenness, let him keep his Ministry, and the privilege of his habit] *Spelman, p. 195*. King Alfred in the Preface to his Laws tells us, that except Treason and Desertion of their Lord's, the Councils of the Clergy did lay but some pecuniary mulct on other sins, *Spelm. p. 362*.

All this shows that the Church then was much more corrupt than ours now in England.

Yea the best of the Fathers had such blots, that I may well make their Confessions another discovery, that our Churches are as pure and holy as theirs. I will name but few of the chief, because I would not rake into their faults needlessly, who are pardoned, glorified Saints in Heaven. St. Augustine whilst he leaned to the Manichees had a bastard, and confesseth himself guilty of fornication. St. Jerome that was so vehement for Virginity, and lived a Monastic life, doth yet confess that he was not a Virgin. St. Bernard that lived so Contemplative a life, in his *Serm. de beata virgins post serm. 5, de Assumpt. confesseth, se carere virginitate*, that he lacked his virginity. And though Bellarmine (*de scriptor. Ecccles. p. 224*.) do from that only reason question whether it be Bernard's, yet it is in the second Tome among his undoubted writings, and this reason is a poor disproof.

Now if one of our ordinary Ministers should be but guilty of such a sin, though but once, and that before Conversion, no doubt but it would lie heavy on their Consciences; and I am sure it would leave such a blot on their names, that were never likely to be worn off while they live.

When we tell the Papists of their Licensing Whore-houses at Rome, Bononia, &c. they commonly fly to the words of Austin, *lib. de Ordine*, saying [*Aufer Meretrices de rebus humanis, & turbaveris omnia libidinibus*, i.e. Take away Whores from among men, and you will disturb all things with lusts.] Though this was written when Austin was but a young convert, and it seems that he after changed his mind, yet this shows that our times are far from the abominations of those; and our Pastors are far more strict than Austin then was.

4. As for the Holiness of their Church by Ceremonies, as Holy Water, Holy Oil, Relics, Altars, and a hundred such things, I think it not worth the speaking of: all things are sanctified to us by the word and prayer. We devote ourselves and all that we have to God, and then to the Pure all things are Pure. We neglect no Ordinance of God that we can know of and enjoy. He is a spirit, and seeketh such as will worship him in spirit and truth. This is the Holiness that we look after. But for numbering of Beads, and Ave Mary's, and going pilgrimages, and such inventions of arrogant men, we place no Holiness in them, as knowing that God desireth not a Mimical or Histrionical worship; and that none knows what will please him so well as himself.

CHAP. XXXV. Their demanding of us to tell them when every one of their Corruptions did begin.

D*etect.* 26. Another of their Deceits is, by calling us to tell them when everyone of their Errors did first begin, and what Pope did bring them in; or else they will not believe but they are from the Apostles.

To this Bishop Usher and abundance of our writers have answered them at large. I shall therefore speak but these few, but satisfactory words.

1. It belongs to you to prove the continuance of your Opinions or Practices, more then to us to prove the Beginning. 2. It sufficeth that we prove that there was a time when your errors were not in the Church, and that we can do from the Scriptures and the Fathers, and oft have done. 3. You know yourselves of abundance of changes which you know not who did first introduce. Who first administered the Lord's Supper in one kind only? Dare you say that this was from the beginning? Who first laid by the standing on the Lord's Day, and used kneeling? (forbidden *Can. 20. Council. Nicene. 1*, and in other General Councils.) Alvarus Pelagius *de planct. Eccles. li. 2, art. 2 fol. 104*, saith [The Church bewaileth the sins of the people, but specially of the Clergy as greater than the sin of Sodom: For

we see that faith and Justice have forsaken the earth. The Holy Scripture and sacred Canons are accounted as fables—He's now a man of no knowledge that inventeth not Novelties.] You see that then Novelties were brought in. The same Vincentius Lirinensis complaineth of: And not only complaineth of, but giveth Direction what to do in case that [*Novella aliqua contagio, non jam portiunculam tantum, sed totam Pariter Ecclesiam commaculare conetur*? If any novel contagion shall endeavor to stain not only a part of the Church, but the whole Church alike?] And then his advise is to appeal from Novelty to Antiquity, and not to the Pope or the present Church. And withal he addeth that This Direction is but for [new heresies at their first rising, before they falsify the rules of ancient faith (that is, before they corrupt ancient Writers, or can pretend to Antiquity) and before by the large spreading of the venom, they endeavor to corrupt the volumes of our ancestors. But dilated and inveterate Heresies are not to be set upon this way, because by the long tract of time, they have had a long occasion of stealing Truth: and therefore we must convince such ancient heresies and schisms by no means but by the only Authority of the Scripture, if there be need, or avoid them—] *Lirinens. c. 4 &c*.

Were there not abundance of Novelties introduced, when Augustine *ad Januarium* said that [They load our Religion with servile burdens, which God in mercy would have to be free, with a very few and most manifest Sacraments of Celebration, so that the condition of the Jews was more tolerable, that were subject to Legal Sacraments, and not to the presumptions of men] These words of Austin your own Joh. Gerson reciting (*de vita spirit. animae. lect. 2, par. 3*.) addeth of his own [*Si tuo tempore*, &c. If in thy days thou didst thus mourn. Oh wise Augustine, what wouldst thou have said in our time: where according to the variety, and motion of

heads, there is incredible variety and dissonant multiplicity of such servile burdens, and as thou callest them, of human presumptions. Among which, as so many snares of souls, and entangling nets, there's scarce any man that walks secure, and is not taken (or catched.)]

How think you now in the Judgment of Augustine and Gerson; whether there have any Novelties been brought into the Church; and whether all your Presumptions and burdens, and (as Gerson calls them) halters for souls, have come from the Apostles, or are your own? When all is thus overcome with Novelty, do you make any question whether anything be new?

It seems that Bernard thought that human Traditions were too much befriended, when he thus describeth the Assemblies that he approveth, *Epist. 91*. [Such a Council (do I delight in) in which the Traditions of men are not obstinately defended, or superstitiously observed; but they do diligently and humbly inquire, what is the good, and well pleasing, and perfect will of God.]

And it seems to me that General Councils by error introduced Novelties, when Later Councils were fain to undo what the former had done: For so doth blessed Augustine profess they did, saying, *De Baptis. cont. Donat. lib. 2, c. 6.* [And Councils themselves that are gathered through several Regions or Provinces, do without any scruple yield to the authority of more plenary Councils that are gathered out of the whole Christian world; and those same plenary Councils do often yield (or give place) the former to the later, when by some experiment of matters, that which was shut is opened, and that which lay hid is known] Sure here are alterations made even by General Councils that correct one another.

And what should hinder the Introduction of Novelty when General Councils do so often err? Nay if such Councils be Morally and Interpretatively the whole Church, as the Papists say, then the whole Church doth err in the reception of some Novelty, before they declare it by their decrees. If you say, that General Councils cannot err, nor introduce such Novelties, your Champion Bellarmine and many of your own, will give you the Lie: saith he *De Council. lib. 2, c. 1*1. [*Neque potest, &c*. It cannot be answered that those Councils erred because they were not lawful (that is the Arian and other Heretical General Councils, at that at Sirmium, Millanie, Ariminum, Ephesus, several at Constantinople disallowed by the Papists) For to most of them there was nothing wanting but the Popes assent. Yea the second at Ephesus was altogether like that at Basil: For both were called by the Pope; in both of them the Popes Legate was present at the beginning: from both of them the Popes Legate shortly after went away: in both of them the Pope was excommunicated; and yet that the Council of Ephesus erred, the adversaries will not deny.] Hence he concludeth that [the chief Power Ecclesiastical is not in the Church, nor in the Council, the Pope being removed formaliter vel suppletive.]

And what should hinder, when there is but one man's vote against it, even the Popes, but that Novelty and error may enter at any time; and when that one man is oft so wicked and Heretical as he is. For General Councils are but a mere name and mockery. The packing of them shows it: the Paucity and non-Universality of them shows it. The Management of their affairs shows it. They do nothing since the Papal reign, but what the Pope will (excepting the condemned Councils) They have no Being till he Will; nor make any Decrees but what he Will: Nor are their Decrees of any further power, then he is pleased to give them. So that his Will is the sense of the

General Council or universal Church. I need not turn you for this to Sleidan, or Vergerius Bishop of Trent, that tell us the Holy Ghost came to that Council in a Cloak-bag from Rome: nor to *Espensaeus in Tit. 1, p. 42*, seeing Bellarmine speaks it out, *De Council. lib. 2, c. 11*, saying, [We must know that the Pope is wont to send Legates instructed concerning the judgment of the Apostolic seat, with this Condition, that if the Council do consent to the Judgment of the Apostolic seat, it shall be formed into a Decree; If not, the forming of the decree shall be deferred till the Pope of Rome, being advised with, shall return his answer] And saith Bellarmine *de Council. lib. 2, c. 11*. [In the Council of Basil, *Ses. 2*, it was decreed by common consent, together with the Popes Legate, that a Council is above the Pope; which certainly is now judged erroneous] And the Council of Lateran and Florence decreed the contrary. And Pighius saith, Hierarch. *Eccles. l. 6*, that [the Councils of Constance and Basil went about by a new trick, and pernicious example to destroy the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, and instead of it to bring in the Domination of a promiscuous confused popular multitude, that is to raise again Babylon itself, subjecting to themselves, or to the community of the Church, (which they falsely pretended that they Represent) the very Head and Prince of the whole Church; and him that is the Vicar of Christ himself in this his Kingdom, and this against Order and Nature, against the clearest light of Gospel verity, against all Authority of Antiquity, and against the undoubted Faith and Judgment of the Orthodox Church itself.]

Mark Papists: General Councils with the Popes Nuncio may bring in Novelties in faith, against the clearest light of the Gospel, and the full Consent of Antiquity; and yet these Councils affirmed their opinions to be de fide, and the contrary to be Heretical and Damnable, and contrary to all

Antiquity. You see then that Novelties are among you in matters of faith. And the French to this day are guilty of those Novelties, and also charge their Adversaries with Innovation.

Nay what will you say, if General Councils themselves are but Novelties, though they are the foundation of the faith of one half of the Papists (as the Pope is of the other) I say not so, but judge whether your Champion Pighius say so, Hierarch. *Eccles. lib. 6, c. 1, fol. 230*, where he saith that [*Concilia universalia non habent Divinam, & c.* General Councils have not a Divine or Supernatural Original, but merely an human Original, and are the Invention of Constantine a Prince, profitable indeed sometimes to find out in Controversy, which is the Orthodox and Catholic truth, though to this they are not necessary; seeing its a readier way to advise with the Apostolic seat] How now Sirs? Is your Representative Church the foundation of your faith, a Novelty of Constantine's invention; and yet are you in the old way, and must we be put to prove you to be Novelists?

Do you think those Popes did go the Old way, of whom Alvarus Pelagius speaks (*de planctu Eccles. art. 15, lib. 2*.) that [they succeeded in authority, but not in Sanctity, intruding themselves, procuring, bargaining, &c. building Towers and Palaces in Babylon, that is, in Rome according to Jerome] Some foul innovation sure they were guilty of that so re-edified Babylon. So that this is my first proof that you are Novelists; from the General Accusations of others, and Confessions of your own.

2. Another proof that changes may be, and yet the time and Authors be unknown, is from the instance of other Churches that have been corrupted or subverted by Innovations, and yet the time and authors are unknown. You accuse the Churches in Habassia of many errors yourselves; and you are not able to tell us when they came in, or who introduced them. The same may

be said of the Georgians, Armenians, Egyptians, yea and of the Greeks and Russians. Can you tell us when, and by whom each error was introduced that corrupted the Churches mentioned in the Scripture? As Corinth, Philippi, Colossae, Thessalonica, Ephesus, Laodicea, and the rest: you know you can give us no better an account of this, then we can of the Authors of your Corruptions, nor so good.

You know that among the Primitive Fathers, whose writings are come to our hands, many errors had the Major vote, as that of the Corporeity of Angels, (which your second General Council at Nice owned) and their Copulation with women before the flood, the Millenary conceit, and many more which you confess to be errors. Tell us when any of these came in, if you can (unless you will believe that Papias received the last from John, and then its no error.) Who did first bring the Asian Churches to celebrate Easter at a season differing from yours? Who first brought the Britons to it? Nay we know not certainly who first Converted many Nations on earth, nor when they first received their Christianity: and how then should we know when they first received each error?

And we find that good men did bring in Novelties; and what was by them introduced as indifferent, would easily by custom grow to seem Necessary: and what they received as a doubtful opinion, would easily grow to be esteemed a point of Faith. The Presbyters and whole Clergy of Neo Caesarea were offended with Basil for his Innovations, viz. for bringing in a new Psalmody, or way of singing to God; and for his new order of Monastics: and they told him that none of this was so in Gregory's days; and what answereth Basil? He denieth not the Novelty of his Psalmody, but retorts again on them, that their Litany also was new, and not known in the time of Gregory (Thaumaturgus) yea, saith he, How know you that these

things were not in the days of Gregory? For you have kept nothing unchanged to this day of all that he was used to] you see what chopping and changing was then in the Church among all sorts, when such an alteration was made in less than forty years. Yet Basil would not have unity to be laid on any of these things, but addeth, [But we pardon all these things, though God will examine all things: only let the principal things be safe] Basil *Epist. 63. Isidore Pelusiota lib. 1. Epist. 90*, saith, that [the Apostles of the Lord studying to restrain and suppress unmeet loquacity, and showing themselves Masters of modesty and gravity to us, did by wise Council permit women to sing in the Churches. But as all God's documents are turned into the contrary, so this is turned to dissoluteness, and the occasion of sin. For they are not affected with deep compunction in singing Divine Hymns; but abusing the sweetness of the singing, to the irritating and provoking of lust, they take it for no better than stage-play songs:] therefore he adviseth that they be suffered to sing no more.

Here you see 1. That changes had happened about many Divine things. 2. That he adviseth himself the introducing of this novelty, that women be forbidden singing in the Church, because of the abuse, though he confess it a wise Apostolic Order. So that for Novelty by good men to creep into God's worship, is not strange.

3. Moreover the Nature of the thing may tell all the world, that neither you nor we can be accountable of the beginning of every error that creepeth into the Church: For 1. The distance of time is great. 2. Historians are not so exact: and what they tell us not, neither you, nor we can know. 3. Much History is perished. 4. Much is corrupted by your wicked forgeries, as hath been oft proved to you. 5. Mixtures of Fables have hindered the credit of much of it. 6. Nations are not individual persons, but consist of millions of

individuals: And as it is not a whole Nation that is converted to the faith at once, so neither is it whole Nations that are perverted to Heresy at once, but one receiveth it first, and then more and more, till it over-spread the whole. Paul saith that such doctrine eateth like a Gangrene; and that is by degrees, beginning on one part, and proceeding to the rest. 7. As I said before, that which is at first received but as an Opinion and an Indifferent thing, must have time to grow into a Custom; and that Custom maketh it a Law, and makes Opinions grow up to be Articles of Faith, and Ceremonies grow to be Necessary things. You know that this is the common way of propagating opinions in the world.

4. I have in another Book shown you out of many of your own writers the rise of diverse of your vanities. And Usher hath told the Jesuit more: and so he hath told you of your thriving to your present height, in his Book *de success. & statu Eccles.* And so hath Mornay in his Mystery of Iniquity, and Rivet in the Defense of him against Cofferellus; and Pet. Molinaeus hath purposely written a Book *de Novitate Papismi, & Antiquitate veri Christianismi*, showing the Newness of Popery in the several parts of it. To these therefore I remit you for Answer to this Objection.

5. Can you tell us yourselves, when many of your doctrines or practices sprung up? When took you up your Sabbaths fast, for which you have been condemned by a Council? You know that when the twentieth Canon of the Nicene Council was made, and when the Canons at Trull. were made, it was the Practice of the Church through the known world, to pray and perform other worship standing, and to avoid kneeling on the Lord's Day. Tell us when this Canon and Tradition was first violated by you, and by whom? It was once the custom of your Church to give Infants the Eucharist; who first broke it off? It was once your practice to Communicate in both kinds: who

first denied the Cup to the Laity? At first it was only a doubtful Opinion, that Saints are to be Prayed to, and the dead prayed for, which came into men's minds about the third or fourth Century? But who first made them Articles of faith? Augustine began to doubt, whether there were not some kind of Purgatory: But who first made this also a point of faith? Who was it that first added the Books of the Maccabees and many others to the Canon of Scripture, contrary to the Council of Laodicea, and all the rest of the consent of Antiquity, which Dr. Reynolds, Dr. Cosin and others have produced? Who was it that first taught and practiced the putting an Oath to all the Clergy of the Christian Church within your power to be true to the Pope, and to obey him as the Vicar of Christ? Who first taught men to swear, that they would not interpret Scripture, but according to the unanimous Consent of the Fathers? Who was the first that brought in the doctrine or name of Transubstantiation? And who first made it an Article of faith? Who first made it a point of faith to believe that there are just seven Sacraments, neither fewer nor more? Did any before the Council of Trent swear men, to receive and profess without doubting, all things delivered by the Canons and Oecumenical Councils, when at the same time they cast off themselves the Canons of many General Councils, and so are generally and knowingly perjured? (as e.g. the twentieth Canon of Nice forementioned) These and abundance more you know to be Novelties with you, if willfulness or gross ignorance bear not rule with you; and without great impudence you cannot deny it. Tell us now when these first came up, and satisfy yourselves.

One that was afterward your Pope (Aeneas Sylvins, *Epist. 288*, saith, that before the Council of Nice, there was little respect had to the Church of

Rome: You see here the time mentioned, when your foundation was not laid.

Your Learned Cardinal Nicol. Cusanus, *lib. de Concord. Cathol. c. 13. &c*. tells you how much your Pope hath gotten of late: and plainly tells you, that the Papacy is but of Positive right, and that Priests are equal, and that it is subjectional consent that gives the Pope and Bishops their Majority, and that the distinction of Dioceses, and that a Bishop be over Presbyters, are of Positive right, and that Christ gave no more to Peter than the rest; and that if the Congregate Church should choose the Bishop of Trent for their President and Head, he should be more properly Peters Successor then the Bishop of Rome] Tell us now when the contrary doctrine first arose?

Gregory *de valentia*, *de leg. usu Euchar. c. 10*, tells you that the Receiving the Sacrament in one kind, began not by the decree of any Bishop, but by the very use of the Churches, and the consent of believers: and tells you, that it is unknown when that Custom first begun, or got head, but that it was General in the Latin Church, not long before the late Council of Constance. And may you not see in this, how other points came in?

If Pope Zosimus had but had his will, and the Fathers of the Carthage Council had not diligently discovered, shamed, and resisted his forgery, the world had received a new Nicene Canon, and we should never have known the Original of it.

Its a considerable Instance that Usher brings, of using the Church service in a known tongue. The Latin tongue was the Vulgar tongue, when the Liturgy and Scripture was first written in it (at Rome and far and near it was understood by all.) The service was not changed, as to the language: but the language itself changed; and so Scripture and Liturgy came to be in an unknown tongue; And when did the Latin tongue cease to be understood by

all? Tell us what year, or by whom the change was made? Saith Erasmus (*Decl. ad censur. Paris. tit. 12. s. 41.*) [The Vulgar tongue was not taken from the people, but the people departed from it.

5. We are certain that your errors were not in the times of the Apostles, nor long after, and therefore we are sure that they are Innovations. And if I find a man in a Dropsy, or a Consumption, I would not tell him that he is well, and ought not to seek remedy, unless he can tell when he began to be ill, and what caused it.

You take us to be Heretical: and yet you cannot tell us when our errors did first arise. Will you tell us of Luther? You know the Albigenses whom you murdered by hundreds and thousands, were long before him? Do you know when they begun? Your Reinerius saith that some said, they were from Silvesters days, and some said since the Apostles; but no other beginning do you know.

6. But to conclude, what need we anymore, then to find you owning the very doctrine and practice of Innovation? When you maintain that you can make us new Articles of faith, and new worship, and new discipline, and that the Pope can dispense with the Scriptures, and such like, what reason have we to believe that your Church abhorreth Novelty? If you deny any of this, I prove it.

Pope Leo the tenth among other of Luther's opinions, reckoneth and opposeth this as Heretical [It is certain that it is not in the hand of the Church or Pope, to make Articles of faith] (in Bulla cont. Luth.)

The Council of Constance that took the supremacy justly from the Pope, did unjustly take the Cup from the Laity in the Eucharist, [*Licet in primitiva Ecclesia hujusmodi Sacramentum reciperetur a fidelibus sub utraque*

specie, i.e. Though in the primitive Church this Sacrament was received by Believers under both kinds.]

The Council of Trent say, *Sess. 21, c. 1,2*, that [this power was always in the Church: that in dispensing the Sacraments, saving the substance of them, it might ordain or change things, as it should judge most expedient to the profit of the receiver.]

Vasquez *To. 2. Disp. 216. N. 60*, saith [Though we should grant that this was a precept of the Apostles, nevertheless the Church and Pope might on just causes abrogate it: For the Power of the Apostles was no greater than the power of the Church and Pope in bringing in Precepts.]

These I cited in another Treatise against Popery, p. 365. Where also I added that of Pope Innocent [*Secundum plenitudinem potestatis, &c*. By the fullness of our power, we can dispense with the Law above Law] And the Gloss that oft saith [The Pope dispenseth against the Apostle; against the Old Testament. The Pope dispenseth with the Gospel interpreting it] And Gregor. de valent. saying (*Tom. 4, disp. 6, q. 8*.) [Certainly some things in later times are more rightly constituted in the Church then they were in the beginning] And of Cardinal Peron's saying, *lib. 2. Obs. 3, c. 3, p. 674*, against King James, of the Authority of the Church to alter matters contained in the Scripture: and his instance [of the form of Sacraments being alterable; and the Lord's command [Drink ye all of it] mutable and dispensable. And Tolets [Its certain that all things instituted by the Apostles were not of Divine right.] Andradius (*Defens. Council. Trid. lib. 2, p. 236*. [Hence it is plain that they do not err that say the Popes of Rome may sometime dispense with Laws made by Paul and the four first Councils—] And Bzovius [The Roman Church using Apostolical power, doth according

to the Condition of times, change all things for the better] And yet will you not give us leave to take you for changers and Novelists?

But let us add to these witnesses, some more of your worthies, August. *Triumph. de Ancon. q. 5, art. 1*, saith [To make a new Creed, belongs only to the Pope, because he is the Head of the Christian faith, by whose authority all things belonging to faith are confirmed and strengthened—] *Et Art. 2*. [As he may make a new Creed, so he may multiply new Articles upon Articles] And (in *Praefat. sum. ad Johan. 22*.) he saith that [the Popes power is Infinite, because the Lord is great, and his strength great, and of his greatness there is no end] And *q. 36, ad. 6*, he saith that [the Pope giveth the Motion of Direction, and the sense of Knowledge into all the members of the Church; For in him we live and move and have our being—And the Will of God, and consequently the Popes Will, who is his Vicar, is the first and chief cause of all motions corporal and spiritual.] And then no doubt may change without blame.

Abbas Panormitan, in *c. C. Christus de haeret. n. 2*, saith, [The Pope can bring in a new Article of faith] And *Petr. de Anchoran. in idic*. [The Pope can make new Articles of faith, that is, such as now ought to be believed, when before they ought not to be believed.]

Turrecre *Matth. sum. de Eccl. lib. 2, c. 203*, saith that [the Pope is the Measure, and Rule, and Science of things to be believed.] And August. de Ancona shows us that the Judgment of God is not higher than the Popes, but the same, and that therefore no man may appeal from the Pope to God] (*qu. 6, art. 1*.) And therefore be not offended, if we suppose you to have changes.

A Confutation of a Popish Manuscript on this point.

Just as I was writing this, I received another Popish M. S. sent from Wolverhampton to Sturbridge, to which I shall return an answer before I go to the next point.

Pap. M.S. An Argument for the Church.

It will not be denied but that the Church of Rome was once a most pure, excellent, flourishing and Mother Church; and her faith renowned in the whole world, Rom. 1:8, and 6, and 16. Whites *Def. p. 555*. King James speech to the Parliament. Whitaker in his *Answer to Dr. Sanders*. Fulk. *c. 21. Thesi. 7*. Reynolds in his fifth Conclusion.

This Church could not cease to be such, but she must fall either by Apostasy, Heresy, or Schism.

Apostasy is not only a renouncing of the faith of Christ; but of the name and Title of Christianity. No man will say that the Church of Rome had such a fall, or fell so.

Heresy is an adhesion or fast cleaving to some private or singular Opinion, or error in faith, contrary to the generally approved doctrine of the Church.

If the Church of Rome did ever adhere to any singular or new opinion, disagreeable to the common received doctrine of the Christian world, I pray you satisfy me in these particulars.

1. By what General Council was she ever condemned?
2. Which of the Fathers ever writ against her?
3. By what Authority was she otherwise reproved?

For it seems to be a thing very incongruous, that so great a Church should be condemned by every private person, who hath a mind to condemn her.

Schism is a departure or division from the unity of the Church, whereby the bond and Communion held with some former Church is broken and

dissolved.

If ever the Church of Rome divided herself from anybody of faithful Christians, or broke Communion, or went forth from the Society of any Elder Church, I pray you satisfy me in these particulars.

1. Whose company did she leave?

2. From what body went she forth?

3. Where was the true Church she forsook?

For it appears not a little strange, that a Church should be accounted Schismatical, when there cannot be assigned any other Church different from her (which from age to age since Christ's time hath continued visible) from whence she departed.]

Thus far the Papists Manuscript.

An Answer to the foregoing Argument.

IF the Author of this Argument thinks as he speaks, its a case to be lamented with tears of blood, that the Church of Christ should be abused, and the souls of men deluded by men of so great ignorance. But if he know that he doth but juggle and deceive, its as lamentable that any matter of Salvation should fall into such hands.

1. This Argument I have before answered, *Detect.* 13. The word Church here is ambiguous, and either signifieth, 1. A particular Church, which is an Association of Christians for personal Communion in God's worship. 2. Or diverse such Associations or Churches Associated for Communion by their officers or delegates, for unity sake. 3. Or else it may signify someone Mistress Church that is the Ruler of all the rest in the world. 4. Or else it may signify the Universal (Catholic) Church itself, which containeth all the particular Churches in the world.

The Papist should not have plaid either the blind man or the Juggler by confounding these, and never telling us which he means. 1. For the first, we grant him that Rome was once an excellent flourishing Church: And so was Ephesus, Jerusalem, Philippi, Colossae and many more.

2. As to the second sense it is human, or from Church custom, so to take the word Church, for Scripture, that I find doth not so use it: But for the thing, we are indifferent: Though it cannot be proved that in Scripture times Rome had anymore then a particular Church; yet its all one as to our cause.

3. As to the third and fourth senses, we deny, as confidently as we do that the Sun is darkness, that ever in Scripture times Rome was either a Mother to all Churches, or the Ruler and Mistress of all, or yet the Universal Church itself. Prove this, and I will turn Papist.

But there's not a word for it in the Texts cited, but an intimation of much against it. Paul calleth Rome a Church, and commendeth its faith. True, but doth he not so by the Thessalonians, Colossians, Ephesians, Philippians, &c. and John by the Philadelphians, Pergamos, Thyatira and others, as well? And will not this prove that Rome was but such a particular Church as one of them?

The citation of Protestants are done it seems by one that never read them, nor would have others read them; which makes him turn us to whole books to search for them, if we have nothing else to do, and to miscited places. But we know that all our Divines confess that Rome was once a true and famous particular Church, but never the Universal Church, nor the Ruler of the world, or of all other Churches, in Paul's days. Would you durst lay your cause on this, and put it to the trial? Why else did never Paul make one word of mention of this Power and honor, nor send other Churches to her to be Governed?

And now I pray consider to what purpose is the rest of your reasoning? What is it to me, whether Rome be turned either Apostate, Heretical, or Schismatical, anymore then whether Jerusalem, Ephesus, Philippi, or any other Church be so fallen? If you are not fallen I am glad of it; if you are I am sorry for it; and so I have done with you (unless I knew how to recover you.) Would you not laugh even at the Church of Jerusalem that was truly the Mother Church of the world, if they should thus reason [We are not fallen away: therefore we must Rule over all the world, and no man is a Christian that doth not obey us?] This is the sport you make in the cheating of souls.

Well; but let us follow you, though our cause be not concerned in it. 1. I answer, that we accuse you not of renouncing the name of Christ. 2. We must needs fear, that according to your own definition of Heresy, you are guilty of many Heresies.

And to your Questions, I answer. 1. I pray you tell us what General Councils did ever condemn one half of the Heresies mentioned by Epiphanius, Augustine or Philastrius? Was there ever a greater rabble of Heresies then before ever a General Council was known? And were they dead and buried before the first General Council was born? 2. Did you not smile when you wrote these delusory Questions? How can a General Council condemn you, or any great part of the Church: for instance the Greeks, &c. If you be not there its not a General Council? And will you be there to condemn yourselves? You have more wit and less grace then so. And I pray, what General Council did ever condemn the Greeks, for those many errors charged on them? If the Greeks themselves were not there, it was not a General Council; so considerable a part are they of the Church.

And what General Council hath condemned the Abyssinians, Egyptians, &c.

3. Do you think General Councils are so stark mad or horridly impious, as to condemn so many Kingdoms with one condemnation, for Heresy? Why, they know that men must be heard, before they be condemned, and a Kingdom consisteth of many millions of souls. And it is not enough to know every man's faith, if we know the faith of the King, or Pope, or Archbishop, or Bishops: And how long shall they be examining each person in many Kingdoms?

4. But yet I can say more of your Church then of others. He that kills the Head, kills the Man: Your Usurping Head is an Essential part of your New-formed Church: But your Head hath been condemned by Councils; therefore your Church in its essential part hath been condemned by Councils. Do you not know that all the world (as well as the feigned Council Sinuessan.) condemned your Pope Marcellinus for Offering to Idols? Know you not that two or three General Councils condemned Pope Honorius as a Monothelite? Yes: no doubt you know it. Know you not that the second General Council of Ephesus condemned and excommunicated your Pope? And that the Council of Basil called by him did the like? If you do not, see Bellarmine's parallel of them *de Conciliis lib. 2, c. 11*. Do I need to tell you what the Council of Constance did? Or for what John 22nd, alias 23rd, and John 13th, and other Popes were deposed by Councils?

2. And for Fathers, do I need to tell you how many condemned Marcellinus, Liberius, Honorius and others? How oft Hilary Pictav. (*in fragmentis in recit. Epist. Liberii*) doth cry out *Anathema tibi Liberi, prevaricator*: presuming to curse and excommunicate your Pope. Need I tell you what Tertullian saith against Zephernius: Yea what Alphonsus à Castro

and diverse of your own say against Liberius, Honorius, Anastasius, Celestine; and tell us that many Popes have been Heretics? At least give us leave to believe Pope Adrian the sixth himself. Read *Dom. Banns in 2. m. 2. a. q. 1, art. 10*. Where he proves at large against Pighius, that a Pope may be a Heretic, and laughs at Pighius that now after two hundred years would prove them false witnesses, which write that Pope Honorius was condemned for a Heretic by three Popes, viz. Agatho, Leo the second, and Adrian the second.

3. But perhaps you will say, that though your Popes have been condemned by Councils, yet so have not your maintained doctrines. *Answ.* Yes, that they have too. Did not the Councils at Constantinople condemn the Doctrine of the second Nicene Council for Image-worship, and the Council at Frankford do the like? And those two at Constantinople were as much General as your Council of Trent was, and much more.

And yet that same Council at Nice did condemn the doctrine of St. Thom. Aquinas, and your Doctors commonly of worshipping the Image of Christ, and Cross, and sign of the Cross with Latria, divine worship.

And did not your General Councils at Lateran and Florence declare that the Pope is above a Council, and that they cannot depose him? &c. And yet your General Councils at Constance and Basil determine the contrary as an Article of Faith, and expressly affirm the former to be Heresy. See then your own doctrine, even in a fundamental point condemned by General Councils of your own (which side soever you take, the Popes, or the Councils.)

And did not the sixth Council of Carthage, of which St. Augustine was a principal member, not only detect Pope Zosimus forged Canon of Nice, but also openly and prevalently resist and reject your Usurpation, and refuse

your Legates and Appeals to you? If you would cloak this, believe your own Pope Boniface, *Epist. ad Eulalium*, saying [Aurelius sometime Bishop of Carthage, with his Colleagues, did begin, by the Devils instigation to wax proud against the Church of Rome in the times of our Predecessors, Boniface and Celestine.]

And if you have learnt to except against this Epistle, see your Bishop Lindanus justifying it, *Panopl. l. c. 89*. Or at least believe your Champion Harding against Jewels Challenge, *art. 4, sect. 19*. [After the whole African Church had persevered in schism the space of twenty years, and had removed themselves from the obedience of the Apostolic seat, being seduced by Aurelius Bishop of Carthage.] Again note, that Austin was one of them.

But you will say, that this was not a General Council: *Answ.* True; for when part riseth against part, it cannot be the whole that is on either side.

Moreover do you not know that the Greeks have condemned you oft? And truly their Councils have been much more General than yours at Trent was, where about forty Bishops altered the Canon of Scripture, and made Tradition equal with it. I think verily this one County would have afforded a far better Council of a greater number.

But I will once more name one General Council that hath condemned your very foundation; and that is the fourth General Council at Calcedon before mentioned, *Act. 15. Can. 28, & Act. 16*, where you may find, 1. That the ancient Privileges of the Roman Throne were given them by the Fathers (in Council) 2. That the Reason was, because Rome was the Imperial City. 3. They give Equal Privileges to the seat of Constantinople, because it was now become New Rome. 4. That the Roman Legates would not be present at this act. 5. But the next day when they did appear, and pretended that this

act was forced, the Bishops all cried [No man was compelled: Its a just decree; we all say thus; we all approve it: Let that stand that is decreed; its all right.]

6. Here specially note that this General Council thought they needed not the Popes Approbation for the validity of their Decrees, when they pass them, and take them for valid, even contrary to the will of the Pope. Speak you that bear the least reverence to a General Council. Did this Council think that their Decrees were invalid, if the Pope approve them not? You see, if you be not willfully blind, they did not. And who is now to be believed? Bellarmine and his party, and the present prevalent party of the Papists, that say, Councils not approved by the Pope are invalid or without authority; or the Council of Calcedon that thought otherwise?

7. Note that the Popes Legates called this [A humbling, and depressing, and wronging of the Papacy, and therefore entered their dissent: see Bellarmine's Confession *lib. 2, de Pontif. c. 17*. Binius notes on this Council. Baronius *an. 451*.

8. Note also that the shifts of Bellarm. Binius, Baronius, Becanus, Gretser, &c. are apparently false, that say this Canon was surreptitiously brought into the Council: for Aetius, Act. 16, openly professed the contrary, and all the Bishops professed their consent to the last.

9. Note also that this is one of the four Great Councils which the Papists themselves compare to the four Gospels; and in it were six hundred and thirty Fathers.

10. Note also that this great Council is against them, and on the Protestant side in the very foundation of all our differences, Whether the Roman Privileges be *jure divino or humano*? And though it be but the Privileges,

and not the now claimed Vicarship that was in Question, yet the Conclusion is the stronger against them, because the lesser was denied.

But their last shift is, that this Clause or Canon was not approved, and so is Null. 1. Mark then you that wrote this Manuscript, that we have General Councils against you; but we want the Popes Approbation. And in good sadness was that the meaning of your Question [What Council, that is, what Pope condemned our Church?] Can it be expected that this one man should condemn himself? Or can you be no Heretic till then?

2. But let it be so this once. Did not your Pope approve of this Council, when Gregory the first did liken it with the other three to the four Gospels? And said of this [*Tota devotione Complector: integerrima approbatione custodio*] I embrace it with my whole devotion; I keep it with most entire approbation] Greg. *1. Regist. l. 1. Epist. 24*, cited in the Decrees, *Dist. 15, c. 2*. I think this is expressly a full Approbation, not without excepting any part only, but excluding all such exceptions. And the like Approbation of Gelasius in the Roman Council is cited there also in the Decrees, *ibid. p. 33*.

I did also before instance the sixth General Council against you, approved by Pope Adrian in his Epistle to Tharasius in the second Nicene Council.

And indeed it is no hard matter to prove you condemned by your own Popes also. If you could but understand the plainest words in a matter that is against your opinions and wills, there needed no talk to persuade you that Pope Gregory the first condemned the Title of Universal Bishop or Patriarch, professing earnestly that he was the forerunner of Antichrist that would usurp it. But the plain truth is, as sad experience teacheth us, no words of Fathers, Popes or Councils, much less of Scripture, are intelligible to you, when your wills are against the matter. But we may truly say of you, that lay all on the will of the Pope, as Austin's Observator, your Lodovicus

Vives freely speaketh (in *schol. in August. lib. 20, de Civit. Dei, c. 26*.) [Those are taken by them for Edicts and Councils, which make for them (or are on their side;) the rest they no more regard than a meeting of women in a workhouse or a washing place.] Do you understand this language of one of your own (but too honest to have much company.)

Well; but you have a third Question [By what Authority was she otherwise reproved?] *Answ.* By the Authority of that Precept, Lev. 19:17, and many the like. By the same Authority that Paul reproved Peter, Gal. 2, and withstood him to the face: by such Authority as any man may seek to quench a fire in his neighbors house, or pull a man out of the water that is drowning: or as any one Pastor may reprove another when he sinneth. By the same Authority as Irenaeus rebuked Victor, and the Asian Bishops withstood him, and as Cyprian and the Council of Carthage reproved Stephen; and the rest afore cited did what they did. By as good Authority as the Church of Rome condemneth the Greek Church, doth the Greek Church and many another condemn the Church of Rome.

3. The next case is about the Roman schism. To your Questions, I answer, 1. To Question whether Papists be Schismatics, is to question whether Ethiopians be black. Do you not at this day divide from all the Christian world, save yourselves? Do you not unchurch most of the Christians on earth (O dreadful presumption! When Christ is so tender of his interest and his servants, and is bound as it were, by so many promises to save them and not forsake them.) You ask, what Church you left? And when was it? And whose company? Senseless Questions. By a Church if you mean the Universal Church, there is but One in all: and therefore One Universal Church cannot forsake another: but when part of it forsaketh the other part, and arrogateth the title of the whole to themselves, do you doubt whether

this be Schism? If you mean a particular Church: How can Spain, Italy, France, and many more Kingdoms go out of a particular Church, that contain so many hundred particular Churches in them? No more then London can go out of Paul's Church. The Catholic is but One containing all true Christians on earth: and you have been guilty of a most horrid Schism, as ever the Church knew. For 1. You have set up a Church in the Church: An Universal Church in the Universal Church: A new form destructive to the old. Your Pope as Christ-representative is now an Essential part of it, and no man is a member of it, that is not a member of the Popes body, and subject to him. So that even the Antipodes and the poor Abassians that know not whether the Pope be fish or flesh, or never heard of such a name or thing, must all be unchristened, unchurched and damned, if you be Judges. Yea and Bellarmine tells us (which indeed your Church Constitution doth infer) that all that are duly baptized, are interpretatively or implicitly baptized into the Pope.

2. And as you have devised a New Catholic Church: so you hereby cast off and disown all the Christians of the world that be not of your party: determining it as de fide, that none of them can be saved; who yet had rather venture on your Curse and Censure, then into your Heresy and Schism.

3. And hereby you fix yourselves in this Schism, and put us (that unfeignedly long for peace) out of all Hope of ever having Peace with you: because you will hearken to it on no terms, but that all men become subjects to your usurping Representative-Christ, which we dare as soon leap into the fire as do. Do you know now where the Church or Body was that you forsook? It was all over the world where ever there were any Christians.

Were it not a great Schism, think you, if a few Anabaptists should say, We are the whole Church, and all others are Heretics or Schismatics? Or was it not a great Schism of the Donatists to arrogate that title to themselves, and unchurch so many others? And what Church did they forsake? Augustine tells them over and over what the Catholic Church was that they withdrew from? Even all true Christians dispersed over the earth: Or that Church which begun at Jerusalem, and thence diffused itself through the world. But he never blames them for separating from the Universal Roman Head or Vicar: but from the Church of Rome, as a conspicuous combination of particular Churches. Optatus and he do blame them for withdrawing, as also from other Churches.

What if John of Constantinople in prosecution of his title of Universal Patriarch, had concluded as you, that none in the world are Christ's members but his members, nor of the Church, but his subjects, had not this been a notorious schism? Tell us then what Church he had forsaken, and answer yourself.

But your last Caution in a parenthesis, doth condemn yourselves. What I Must that Church that's true be visible from Christ's time? Then as Constantinople, nor most other were never true Churches (which is false) so Rome itself was never a true Church (which is false also) Did you think that there was a Church at Rome in Christ's time? Sure you are not so ignorant. By this Rule there should be no true Church, but that at Jerusalem, and those in Judea.

But suppose you had said [since the Apostles time] This also had excluded most Churches on earth. But if you mean the Universal Church, we grant you easily, that it hath been visible ever since Christ's time: but not always in one place or Country. Is not the greater part of Christians in the world,

whom you schismatically unchurch, a visible company? Doubtless you know they are. Yea the Abyssinians and many Churches that being out of the Roman Empire, did never so much as submit to your Primacy of Order, nor had you ever anything to do with them (more then to own them as Christians) yet now are condemned by your Arrogancy, because they will not begin in the end of the world, to enter into a new Church, which they nor their Fore-fathers had ever any dependence on. It was a shrewd answer of an old woman, that the Emperor of Habassia's Mother gave to Gonzalus Rodericus the Jesuit, pressing her to be subject to the Pope as the Vicar of Christ, or else she could not be subject to Christ [*Neque ego, inquit illa, neque mei sancto Petro obedientiam negamus: in eadem nunc sumus fide, in quae fuimus ab initio: ea si recta non erat, cur per tot aetates ac secula nemo repertus est, qui nos errrantes commonerent*] i.e. We are in the same Belief as we were from the beginning: If it were not right, why did no man in so many ages warn us of our error till now?] Mark here a double Argument couched against the Pope, One from Tradition, even Apostolical Tradition, (for Godignus himself saith, that no man doubts but Ethiopia received the faith from the beginning, even from the Eunuch and St. Matthew.) The other is, that sure that Pope that cannot in so many ages look after his flock, no not so much as to send one man to tell them that they erred till about one thousand five hundred years after Christ, was never intended by Christ to be the Universal Governor of the world. What! Will Christ set any on an Impossible work? Or make it so necessary to people to obey one that they never so much as hear from? But what said the Jesuit to the old woman! Why he told her [*Non potuisse Romanum Pontificem, qui totius Christi Ecclesiae pastor est, praeteritis retro annis, Doctors in Abassiam mittere, eo quod Mahumetani omnia circumdarent, nec ullum ad*

ipsos additum relinquerant. Nunc vero aperta jam Maritima ad Aethiopiam via, id praestare quod nequivit prius] that is, [The Pope of Rome who is the Pastor of the whole Church of Christ, was not able in the years past to send Doctors into Habassia, because the Mahomitans compassed all, and left not any passage to them. But now the seas are open, he can do that which he could not before] *Liter. Gonzal. Roder. in Godign. de Reb. Abass. lib. 2, c. 18, p. 324*. A fair answer. As if Christ had set either the Pope, or the Abyssinians an impossible task: and appointed a Governor that for so many hundred years could not govern: or the people must be so many hundred years no Christians, though they believed in Christ, till the Pope could send to them? And how should these and all such Countries send Bishops to a General Council?

As your own Cano *Loc. Theol*. saith of the Jesuits; so say I of your New Church [*Vocati estis ad secietatem Jesu Christi, quae sine dubio societas cum Christi Ecclesia sit, qui titulum sibi illum arrogant, hi videant, an Haereticorum more penes se Ecclesiam existere mentiantur*. i.e. You are called to the society of Jesus Christ, which society being undoubtedly the Church of Christ, let them see to it, that arrogate this title to themselves, whether they do not imitate heretics by a Lying affirmation that the Church is only with them. *lib. 4, c. 2, fol. (mihi) 116*.

But we do not hence conclude that all that have lived and died in your profession, have been no members of the Church, because that your Church is guilty of Heresy, and notoriously of Schism. For we know that millions that live among you consent not to your usurpations; Nay do not so much as understand your errors thereabout. And some hold them but Notionally as ineffectual Opinions: And everyone is not a Heretic that holdeth a point that is judged Heretical, and which is Heresy in another that holdeth it in

another sort. And there are errors called Heresies by most, which are not destructive to the Essentials of Christianity, but only to some Integral part. And there is a schism that doth not unchurch men, as well as a schism that doth (of which this is no place to treat.) But ad hominem, me thinks your own writers put you hard to it, who conclude (as Bellarmine and many more do, though Alphonsus à Castro and others be against it) that Heretics and Schismatics are no members of the Church. And Melch. Cano (*Loc. Theol. lib. 4, c. 2, fol. 117*.) saith that [that Heretics are no parts of the Church, is the common conclusion of all Divines, not only of those that have written of late, but of them also that by their Antiquity are esteemed the most Noble; This is attested by Cyprian, Augustine, Gregory, the two Councils of Lateran and Florence: Rightly therefore did Pope Nicolas define that the Church is a collection of Catholics.] If this be true, it is an Article of faith: And then Alphonsus à Cast. and all of his mind are Heretics and lost men. And I pray you note what a case you are in. Two Approved General Councils have determined that a Heretic is no member of the Church: But multitudes of your own writers, and Pope Adrian, and many more of your Popes have judged that a Pope may be a Heretic: and consequently no member of the Church. And consequently judge whats become of your Church, when an Essential part of it is no part of the Church.

Your common shift (which Cano ibid. and others fly to) is, that He must be a judged Heretic before he is dismembered. But 1. Sure that is but for manifestation to men; for before God he is the same, if men never judge him. 2. Where the case is notorious, the offender is ipso jure cut off. 3. Then it is in the Popes Power to let whole millions of Heretics to be still parts of the Church. And so the world shall be Christians or no Christians as he

please: and why may he not let Turks and Infidels on the same grounds be parts of the Church? For he may forebare to judge them, if that will serve. 4. Then all the Christians in the world that the Pope hath not yet judged and cast out, are members of the Church: And then millions and millions are of the Church that never were subjects of the Pope. If you say, It is enough that there is a General condemnation of all that are guilty as they are: I answer, then it is enough to cut off a Pope, that there was a General condemnation against such as he.

5. But if all this satisfy you not, yet I told you before, that two or three Councils and three Popes did all judge Pope Honorius guilty of Heresy (and consequently both Popes and General Councils have judged that a Pope may be a Heretic) therefore you have been judged Heretical in your Head, which is an essential part of your Church.

And thus I have shown you what is the schism of the Church of Rome, which being but a part, hath attempted to cut off all the rest, and so hath made a new pretended Catholic Church: As a part of the Old Church which consisteth of all Christians united in Christ, we confess all those of you, still to be a part, that destroy not this Christianity: But as you are new gathered to a Christ-Representative, or Vicar General, we deny you to be any Church of Christ. If you be Church members or saved, it must be as Christians; but never as Papists. For a Papist may be a Christian, but not as a Papist.

And if yet you cannot see the Church that you separate from, open your eyes and look into much of Europe, and all over Asia almost where are any Christians: look into Armenia, Palestine, Egypt, Ethiopia, and many other Countries, and you shall find that you are but a smaller part of the Church. If you will not believe what I have before proved of this, hear what your own say. Anton. Marinarins in the Council of Trent complaineth [that the

Church is shut up in the Corners of Europe, and yet Domestic enemies arise, that waste this portion shut up in a corner.]

Sonnius Bishop of Antwerp (in *Demonstrat. Relig. Christian. lib. 2. Tract. 5, c. 3*.) saith [I pray you what room hath the Catholic Church now in the habitable world? Scarce three elnes long in comparison of that vastness which the Satanical Church doth possess.]

If yet you boast that you have the same seat that formerly you had; I answer, so have the Bishops of Constantinople, Alexandria, and others whom you condemn: And we say as Gregory Nazianz. *Orat. de land. Athanasii* [It is a succession of Godliness that is properly to be esteemed a succession: For he that professeth the same doctrine of faith, is also partaker of the same throne; But he that embraceth the contrary belief, ought to be judged an adversary, though he be in the throne. This indeed hath the name of succession; but the other hath the Thing itself, and the Truth] And he next addeth such words as utterly break your succession in pieces: saying [For he that breaketh in by force (as abundance of Popes did) is not to be esteemed a successor; but rather he that suffereth force: nor he that breaketh the Laws: but he that is chosen in manner agreeable to the Laws: nor he that holdeth contrary tenets; but he that is endued with the same faith: Unless any man will call him a Successor, as we say a sickness succeedeth health; or darkness succeedeth light, and a storm succeeds a calm, (or madness or distraction) succeedeth prudence] Thus *Nazianz. p. 377*.

We conclude therefore with one of your own (Lyra *Glos. in Math. 16*.) [Because many Princes and chief Priests (or Popes) and other inferiors, have been found to Apostatize, the Church consisteth in those persons in whom is the true knowledge and confession of Faith and Verity] And so much to this empty Manuscript.

CHAP. XXXVI. They charge us with New Articles, for denying their new Articles of Faith, and then bid us prove the Succession of our Negatives.

D*etect.* 27. Another of their Deceits is this: To charge us with introducing New Articles of faith or points of Religion, because we contradict the New Articles which they introduce; and then they require us to prove our doctrines which are but the Negatives of theirs.

We receive no Doctrines of faith or worship but what was delivered by the Apostles to the Church: These men bring in abundance of New ones, and say without proof, that they received them from the Apostles. And because we refuse to receive their Novelties, they call our Rejections of them [the Doctrines of our Religion;] and feign us to be the Innovators. And by this device, it is in the Power of any Heretic to force the Church to take up such as these men call New points of faith. If a Papist shall say, that besides the Lord's Prayer Christ gave his Disciples another Form, or two, or three, or many; or that he gave them ten New Commandments not mentioned in the Bible, or that he oft descended after his Ascension and conversed with them, or that there are many more worlds of men besides this earth; or that Christ instituted twenty Sacraments, how should we deal with these men,

but hy denying their fictions as sinful Novelty, and rejecting them as corrupt additions to the Faith? And were this any Novelty in us? And should they bid us prove in the express words of Scripture or antiquity, our Negative Propositions, [that Christ gave but one form of prayer, that he did not oft descend, that he gave no more Decalogues, Sacraments, &c.] Is it not a sufficient proof of any of these, that they are not written: and that no Tradition of them from the Apostles is proved; and that they that hold the Affirmative, and introduce the Novelty, must prove, and not we? Our Articles of faith are the same, and not increased, nor any new ones added: But the Papists come in with a new faith as large as all the Novelties in the Decretals and the Councils, and these innovations of theirs we reject Now our Rejections do not increase the Articles of our faith, no more than my beating a dog out of my house, or keeping out an enemy, or sweeping out the filth, doth enlarge my house, or increase my family They do not take all the Anathema and Rejections in their own Councils, to be Canons or Articles of faith.

For example, The Pope hath made it an Article of faith, that no Scripture is to be interpreted but according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers. This we reject, and make it no Article of our faith, but an erroneous Novelty. Do we hereby make a new Article? Because we reject a new one of theirs, (yea a part of the Oath of their Church made by Pope Pius after the Council of Trent) 1. If this be an Article, prove it if you can. 2. If it be a Truth, and no Novelty, I pray you tell us which be Fathers, and which not? And help us to know certainly when we have all, or the unanimous Consent. And then tell us whether every man is not forsworn with you that interprets any text of Scripture before he have read all the Fathers. or any text which six of them never expounded; or any text which they do not unanimously

agree on? And yet (though it be not our necessary task) we can easily prove to you, that this is a New Article of your devising. 1. Because else no man must expound any Scripture at all before these Fathers were born. For how could the Church before them have their unanimous consent? And 2. Because that otherwise these Fathers themselves wanted an Article of faith, unless it was an Article to them, that they must expound no Scripture but by their own Consent. 3. Because these Fathers do few of them expound all, or half, or the twentieth part of the Scripture. 4. Because they took liberty to disagree among themselves, and therefore do not unanimously consent in abundance of particular texts. 5. Because they tell us that they are fallible, and bid us not take it on their trust. 6. Because the Apostles have left us no such rule or precept, but much to the contrary. 7. Your own Doctors (for all their Oath) do commonly charge the Fathers with error and mis-expounding Scripture, as I shown before, Cano and many others charge Cajetan (a Cardinal and pillar in your Church) with making it his practice to differ from the Fathers, and choosing expositions purposely for the Novelty; *pro more suo*, as his custom: And when he hath highly extolled Cajetan: (*Loc. Theol. lib. 7, p. 223*.) he adds, that [yet his doctrine was defiled with a Leprosy of errors, by an affection and lust of Curiosity, or confidence on his wit, expounding Scripture as he list, happily indeed for the most part, but in some few places more acutely then happily, because he regarded not ancient Tradition, and was not verst in the reading of the Fathers; and would not learn from them the Mysteries of the sealed book] And in another place he blames him, that he always followed the Hebrew and Greek text: And many other Papists by him and others are blamed for the same faults: Andradius, and more of the later plead for it. And yet these men are counted members of your Church, that go against an Article of your new faith and Oath.

So Transubstantiation is one of your New Articles in that Oath. Do we make a New one now if we reject it? Or need we be put to prove the Negative? And yet we can easily do it: And Edm. Albertinus (among many others) hath done it unanswerably.

Another of your Articles is, that [it belongeth to your Holy Mother the Church to judge of the true sense of Scripture] And you mean the Roman Church; and that they must judge of it for all the Christian world. Prove this to be the Antient doctrine if you can. If we reject this Novelty, are we Innovators? Or need we prove the Negative? And yet we can do it, and have oft done it at large. Did Athanasius, Basil, Nazianzen, Nyssen, Augustine, Jerome, Chrysostom, Epiphanius, and the rest of the Fathers, send to Rome for the sense of the Scriptures which they expound, or did they procure the Popes Approbation before any of them published their Commentaries? You know sure that they did not.

The like may be said of all the rest of your New Articles, and Practices: We stand our ground. Some of your Novelties we reject as trifles, some as smaller errors, and some as greater: but still we keep to our ancient faith, of which the Scripture is a full and sufficient Rule (as *Vincentius Lirinens. ubi supra*) though we are glad of all helps to understand it, we say with Tertullian *de carne Christi, c. 6. Nihil de eo constat, quia Scriptura non exhibet.—Non probant, quia non Scriptum est—His qui insuper argumentantur nos resistemus*.

CHAP. XXXVII. They conclude that theirs is the safer Religion, because it is most uncharitable and damneth others, and ours the less safe because the more charitable.

D*etect.* 28. Another of their Deceits is this: They make advantage of our charitable Judgment of them, and of their uncharitable judgment of us and all other Christians, to affright and entice people to their sect. They say that we cannot be saved, nor any that are not of the Roman Church: But we say that a Papist may be saved: They say that we want abundance of the Articles of faith that are of necessity to salvation: We say that the Papists hold all that is necessary to salvation: Luther saith that the Kernel of true faith is yet in the Church of Rome; therefore say they, Let Protestants take the shell. And hence they make the simple people believe, that even according to our own Confessions, their Church and way is safer than ours.

I have answered this formerly in my [Safe Religion,] but yet shall here once more show you the nakedness of this Deceit.

1. The Papists denying the faith and salvation of all other Christians, doth no whit invalidate our faith, nor shake our salvation. Our Religion doth not cease to be true, whenever a peevish adversary will deny it, or accuse it.

Men are in never the more danger of damnation, because a Papist or any other partial Sectary will tell them that they shall be damned. We believe not that the Pope hath so far the Power of the Keys of Heaven, as that he can keep out whom he please. We have a promise of salvation from Christ, and then we can bear the threatening of a Pope. When Bellarmine judgeth Pope Sixtus damned himself, its strange that he should have a power before to dispose of Heaven for others, and shut out whom he pleased, that must be shut out himself. The Novatians, Donatists, Anabaptists, or any such Sect, that held the substance of the Christian faith, might have pleaded this Argument as well as the Papists: for they also have the courage to pass the sentence of damnation upon others, if that will serve turn: and we have the Charity to say, that some of them may be saved.

2. If by the Papists own confession, Charity be the life of all the graces or holy qualities of the soul, and that which above all others proveth a man to be Justified, and in a state of salvation, then judge by this Argument of their own, whether our charitableness, or their uncharitableness be the better sign: and whether it be safer to join with the charitable or the uncharitable? Yea with them that are so notoriously uncharitable, as to condemn the far greatest part of the Church of Christ, merely because they are not Papists.

3. When we say that a Papist may be saved, it is with all these limitations. 1. We say that a Papist as a Christian may be saved, but not as a Papist. As a man that hath the Plague may Live; but not by the Plague. 2. We say that Popery is a great enemy and hindrance to men's salvation; and therefore that those among them that are saved, must be saved from Popery, and not by it. 3. We say, that therefore salvation is a rarer thing among the Papists, then among the Reformed Catholics: where it is most difficult, it is like to be most rare: many more of the Orthodox are like to be saved then of the

Papists. 4. And we say, that where Popery prevaileth against Christianity, and so much mastereth the heart and life, that the Christian doctrine is not Practically received, there is no salvation to be had for such without Conversion. Thus is it that we say a Papist may be saved. And for my part, I will not be the more uncharitable to them, for fear of giving them advantage. I know Hunnius hath written a Book to prove them no Christians, and Perkins hath written another to prove, that a Papist cannot go beyond a Reprobate: and I must needs say so too, of all those in whom Popery is predominant practically, and overcometh Christianity. But yet I doubt not, but God hath thousands among them that shall be saved: partly of the common people that are forced to forbear contradicting the Priests; and that understand not, or receive not all the mysteries of their deceit: and partly among the Friars and Jesuits, where some of them take in the venom but speculatively: or not predominantly and practically give themselves to Mortification and an holy Life: though I have known none such, yet when I read the writings of Gerson, Kempis, Thaulerus, Ferus, Barbanson, Benedictus Anglus, the Life of Monsieur de Renty, and such others (though I see in some much of error, and mere affectation, yet) I am easily persuaded to believe, that they had the spirit of God, and that there are many more such among them. But I should be sorry if Holiness were not much more common among us, and freer from the mixtures of error and affectation.

4. And for our saying that they have the Kernel, and so much as is necessary to salvation, it is true; but it is the same Kernel that we hold: and we have it undefiled and unpoisoned, and the Papists mix it with the venom of their Errors. He that hath all things in his meat and drink that I have in mine, may yet make it worse than mine, if he will put dung or poison in it.

When you have all things necessary in a precious Antidote or other Medicine, you may soon mar all, by putting in more than all, as the Papists do.

The plain truth is, the Papists and Reformed Catholics are both Christians, and Christianity is enough to save them that mar it not, but keep it practically and predominantly: even as a man that takes poison, and he that taketh none, are both of them men: and he that takes the poison may be said to have all the same parts and members as the other; and yet not be so likely to live, as he that lets it alone: And I cannot say but many that take it may recover: and if you ask me Which be they? I say, All those that timely cast it up again, or else whose strength of Nature prevaileth against it, and keepeth it from mastering the Heart or vital Powers, shall be recovered and live: but those in whom the poison prevaileth and is predominant, shall die. So all those Papists that so receive the Errors of Popery, as either to cast them up again; or that they are not predominant to the subduing of the power of Christian Faith and Holiness, (by keeping them from being sincere, and practical, and predominant) these shall be saved, but not the rest.

Now if upon these grounds, any man shall think that Popery is the safer way, because we say, that they have all that is necessary to salvation (objectively in their Creed) and that a Papist may be saved; upon the same terms that man may be persuaded that it is safest taking poison, because that he hath all the parts of a man that takes it, and possibly nature may prevail, and he may live. But yet I shall choose to let it alone.

5. The same Papists that say, that a Protestant cannot be saved, do yet maintain that an Infidel may be saved, or one that believeth not the very Articles of the Christian faith. You will think this strange. But I will a little insist on the proof of it, to these uses. 1. That you may see, that their

censures proceed from mere design or partiality. 2. That you may see, that they make believing in the Pope to be more necessary than believing in Christ, or in the Holy Ghost. 3. That you may see, how holy their Church is that admitteth of Infidels. 4. That you may see, on how fair grounds they deny, that we may be one Catholic Church with the Fathers, Greeks, Egyptians, Abyssinians, Armenians, Waldensis, &c. because of some differences; when yet they themselves can be one Church with Infidels, or such as deny the Articles of the Creed, or at least believe them not. 5. And that you may see, how well their Religion hangs together, and also how well they are agreed among themselves, even about the essentials of Christianity itself, whether they be of Necessity to salvation or not.

I before cited the words of Albertinus the Jesuit. I shall now give you many more, and more fully, which Frans. à Sancta Clara hath gathered to my hands in his *Deus, Natura, Gratia, Problem. 15, and 16, p. 109 &c.*

And *1, p. 110*, he tells us himself that [the Doctors commonly teach, that a just and probable ignorance ought to excuse: and that it is probable, when one hath a probable foundation (or ground) as a Country-man, when he believes that a thing is lawful, drawn by the Testimony of his Parish Priest or Parents: or when a man seeing reasons that are probable on both sides, doth choose those which seem to him the more probable, which yet indeed are against the truth, to which he is otherwise well affected: in this case he erreth without fault, though he err against the truth, and so labor of the contrary ignorance] [Hither is it to be reduced, when the Articles of Faith are not propounded in a due manner, as by frivolous reasons, or by impious men: for then to believe, were an act of imprudence, saith *Aquin. 2. 2, q. 1, ar. 4*.]

So that if the truth of Scripture be so propounded as to seem most improbable, it is no sin to disbelieve it: and if such are excused, as by a Parent or Parish-Priest are seduced, and that have not a due proposal of the Truth, then it must follow, that the Heathens and Infidels are innocent, that never had Christ proposed any way to them, and by their Parents have been taught Mohammedanism, or Paganism. But what if I can prove, that even the want of a due proposal is a punishment for their sin? And that they ought themselves to seek after the truth? And that it is long of their own sins that necessary truths do seem improbable to them? Will sin excuse sin?

And p. 111, he telleth us, [That as to the Ignorance of things necessary as means (to salvation) the Doctors differ; for Soto *4, d. 5, q. 5, and l. denatur. & grat. c. 12*. And *Vega l. 6, c. 20, sup. Trid*. will have no more explicit faith required now in the Law of Grace, then in the Law of Nature. Yea Vega *loco citato, and Gab. 2, d. 21, qu. 2, art. 3, & 3, d. 21, qu. 3*, think that in the Law of Nature, and in cases in the Law of Grace, a man may be saved with only Natural Knowledge, and that the habit of faith is not required. And Horantius (being of the contrary opinion) saith, that they are men of great name that are against him, whose gravity and great and painful studies moved him, not to condemn them of heresy, in a doubtful matter, not yet judged] (O happy Rome that hath a judge that can put an end to all their controversies! And yet cannot determine whether it be Necessary to salvation to be a Christian!)

[Yea (saith S. Clara) Alvarez *de Auxil. disp. 56*, with others, seems to hold that to Justification is not required the knowledge of a supernatural object at all. Other say that both to Grace and to Glory an explicit faith in Christ is necessary, as Bonavent. *3, d. 25*, and others. Others say that to salvation at least an explicit faith in the Gospel, or Christ is required, though not to

Grace or Justification. And this is the commoner in the Schools, as Herera declareth, and followeth it.]

And for Scotus S. Clara saith [I take him to be of that opinion that is not necessary as a Means to Grace or Glory to have an explicit Belief of Christ or the Gospel. (*ut. 4, d. 3, q. 4.*) he seems at large to prove.]

Pg. 113, he adds [What is clearer, then that at this day, the Gospel bindeth not, where it is not authentically preached; that is, that at this day men may be saved without an explicit belief of Christ: for in that sense speaks the Doctor concerning the Jews. And verily whatever my illustrious Master hold with his Learned Master Herera, I think that this was the Opinion of the Doctor (Scotus,) and the common one, which also Vega, a faithful Scotist followeth; and Faber *4, d. 3. Petigianis 3, d. 25, q. 1*, and of the Thomists Banns, *22, q. 2, a. 8.* Cano, and others.]

And he gathers it to be the mind of the Council of Trent, *Ses. 6, c. 4*, and adds *p. 113*. [Its effectually proved by the Doctor, from Joh. 15. If I had not come and spoke to them, they had not had sin: I know the Doctors of the contrary opinion answer, that such are not condemned for the sin of Infidelity precisely, but for other sins that binder the illumination and special help of God. But verily the Doctor there argueth, that the Jews might by circumcision be cleansed from Original sin, and saved without the Gospel: and accordingly he may argue as to all others, to whom the Gospel is not authentically promulgate: Else his reason would not hold. And our most grave *Corduba l. 2, qu. Theol. q. 5*, subscribes to this opinion, saying —since the promulgation of the Gospel an Explicit Belief of Christ is necessary: except with the invincibly ignorant, to whom an implicit sufficeth to the life of grace but whether it suffice to the life of glory, is a problem; but it is more probable that here also an implicit sufficeth]

Pg. 114, he addeth the consent of *Medina re recta in Deum fide, lib. 4, c. ult*. and of Bradwardine *fol. 62*, that an Implicit belief of Christ is sufficient to salvation.

And p. 115, he saith that this is the way to the end debates of them that think the Article of the Trinity, of Christ, of the incarnation, &c. are necessary to salvation, though not to Justification: and answering them, he saith that [such are not formally without the Church.] You see then formally Infidels are in their Church and may be saved, in his opinion.

And p. 116, after a blow at Vellosillus he citeth also Victoria *Relect. 4 de Indis. & Richard. de Med. Villa, 3:25, art. 3, qu. 1*, and others for this opinion: And tells you what his Implicit faith is [to believe as the Church believeth.]

And p. 118, he answereth from Scotus the Question, Whether such persons may hold the contrary error to the truth that they are ignorant of: and saith, No, (out of Scotus:) while it is preached but in someone place, till he know it to be believed as a truth by the Church, and then he must firmly adhere to it. Which the charitable Friar applieth to England as excusable for not believing some of their Articles. And he citeth Petigianis saying, [If a simple old woman shall hear a false opinion from a false Prophet, (as that the substance of the bread remains with Christ's body in the Eucharist) and believe it: doth she sin because of this? No: This were too hard and cruel to affirm.]

Pg. 119, he citeth Angles, and agreeth with him, [that such as have no knowledge of these things to stir them up, are not bound so much as to seek information.]

And p. 120, he cites Vega *lib. 6, c. 18*, saying that as [*Ignorance purae negationis* about many Articles of faith, may be without fault: so there is the

same reason of *Ignorance pravae dispositionis*.] Which he maintains against Gerson and Hugo. And S. Clara adds of his own [To speak my sense freely, I think that the common people committing themselves to the instruction of the Pastors, trusting their knowledge and goodness, if they be deceived, it shall be accounted Invincible Ignorance, or probable at least: So Herera: which excuseth from fault. Yea some Doctors give so much to the Instruction of Doctors, on whom the care of the flock lieth, that if they teach *hic & nunc* that God would be hated, that a rude Parishioner is bound to believe them.]

And so p. 121, concludeth that he hopeth many of us are saved.

Pg. 122, he citeth the consent of Azorius, *To. 1, l. 8. Just. c. 6*, and Corduba again.

And p. 123, saith [It seemeth to be the common Opinion of the Schools and Doctors at this day, that the Laity erring with their Teachers or Pastors, are altogether excused from all fault: yea by erring thus many ways materially, they merit, for the act of Christian Obedience, which they owe their teachers, as Valentia saith, *Tom. 3, disp. 1, q. 2, p. 5*, and others, with Angles, Vasquez, &c.

Pg. 124,125. After Cajetan, he cites Zanchez, teaching that those that are brought up among Heretics are not bound presently to believe, and yet are not to be accounted Heretics, till they refuse Belief sufficiently propounded to them—] And he cites Alph. à Castro, and Simanchas, Aragon, and Tannerus, and Faber for the same.

And p. 126, he cites Eman: Sa, affirming that even among Catholics many are excused from the explicit knowledge of the Trinity and Incarnation, specially if there want a Teacher: For what (saith he) shall we say that an infinite number of Christians, otherwise good people, perish, that scarce

know anything aright of the Mystery of the Trinity and Incarnation; Yea judge perversely, (or falsely) of them, if you ask them?] And cites Rozella and Midina of the same mind. Lastly gives also the judgment of Gr. Valentia fully, for his opinion, *Analys. fid. lib. 2, c. 3, lit. D*.

In the sixteenth Problem p. 127, he puts another Question, Whether the Law of Nature and Decalogue may be unknown without fault? And saith that though Alex. Ales say, No, yet [It is the more common and received Opinion, (citing Adrian, Corduba, Herera, *& alios communiter*) that there may be such invincible ignorance in respect of the Law of Nature and the Decalogue.]

And note for the understanding of all this, that this which they call an Implicit faith in Christ, is no actual faith in Christ at all. He that only believes as the Church believes, and knows not that the Church believes in Christ, in the Resurrection of Christ, &c. hath no actual belief in Christ or the Resurrection at all. *Ignoti nulla fides*: If I believe that one of you is true of his word, it doth not follow that I actually believe the particular propositions which I never heard. This which they call an implicit Belief, is nothing but the explicit actual belief of the Formal Object of Faith, Divine or Human, as that God is True, or the Church True and infallible; but it is no belief at all of the particular material object.

And note that everyone in the world that believeth that there is a God, must needs believe that he is no Liar; and so hath in God an Implicit belief. Now if this will save men, without a particular belief in Christ, then Christianity is not necessary: Every Turk, and Jew, and Infidel that believeth in God, may then be said to have an Implicit faith in Christ, in the Popish language; because he believeth all that God revealeth to be true; But

if an Implicit faith in God will not serve, how should an implicit faith in the Church serve; unless the Church, that is the Pope, be better than God.

See here, whether they make any more of the Christian faith then a mere shooing horn, to draw and keep men to their side. By a General Council and the Pope it is determined that no man can be saved out of their Church; as headed by the Pope: To believe in the Pope is of Necessity to Salvation; but to believe in Christ, in his Incarnation, Death, Resurrection, is not so. An Implicit faith in the Pope or Church, yea or erring Doctors may save, and men may merit by following them in error; but an Implicit faith in God himself will not save, if we believe not in the Pope. So that if we were Infidels we might be saved, so we were of the Church of Rome, and believed in the Pope: but the Holiest Christian that believeth explicitly in God, and all the Articles of the faith, cannot be saved, if he believe not in the Pope. Do you think they believe these Doctrines themselves? Or rather frame them to the building of their Kingdom?

And what a wonder is it that Learned Doctors see not their own contradiction? They suppose a man to believe in the Pope, or as the Church believeth, and yet not to believe in Christ! And is not the Church essentially a company of Christians; the spouse, and body, and school, and Kingdom of Christ? And is not the Pope essentially the pretended Vicar of Christ? How then can they believe in Christ's Vicar, or Christ's School, or Kingdom, or followers, before they believe in Christ himself?

And by all this you may perceive the Holiness of the Roman Church, and the nature of that Discipline or Church Government that all the world must needs submit to, or be damned. Even such as takes in Infidels and all, and layeth the Church as common to the world, for as many as will but believe in the Pope and Clergy.

You see here also another mystery opened: that a man may have enough to Justify him, that yet will not save him: For most of them are here said to hold that a man may be justified without an explicit faith in Christ, or that the knowledge of Christ is not necessary to his Justification, but to his salvation it is (Though the other half say, that its necessary to neither) And if a man die in a Justified State, must he be condemned? When Paul saith, Rom. 8:30. Whom he justified, them he also glorified.

You see also here what their Baptism doth, that can *ex opere operato* infallibly put away the sins of all these Infidels, and so the Eucharist, &c. And yet they must not be saved for all that their sins are all done away. O what a Maze is the Romish Divinity! And you see how well they are agreed about these fundamentals, when half of them think that an Actual belief in Christ is necessary to salvation, and not to Justification; and others that its necessary to both: and a great part that its necessary to neither. And you see here the benefit of having an Infallible Living judge of controversies, and expounder of Scriptures: and how admirably he hath ended all their differences.

And again I say, If formally these Unbelievers are in their Catholic Church, they shall give us leave to say that the Greeks and other Eastern and Southern Christians are in the same Catholic Church as we are, when we differ not so much.

And when they have made the Non-belief of Articles of the faith consistent with salvation, they will never while they breath be able to confute him that on the same grounds affirmeth the contrary belief consistent with salvation, in case of the same want of teaching and sufficient means.

And by this time I hope you see of how small moment the Popish Censures are, when they judge that a Protestant cannot be saved.

Its true that S. Clara here judgeth otherwise: but 1. Its said his Book was burnt or condemned at Rome for it. 2. He alloweth Infidels as much. 3. And he proveth himself a Heretic by it at Rome; seeing a General Council and Pope have determined the contrary, even that it is necessary to salvation to be a subject of the Pope of Rome.

CHAP. XXXVIII. They win the Great ones and multitude by suiting their Doctrine and Worship to the fleshly conceits and inclinations of ungodly men.

D*etect.* 29. Another of their Deceits, and I think the most successful of all the rest is, Their suiting their Doctrines, and Government and Worship to the fleshly humors of the ungodly: by which means the Greatest and the Most are always like to be on their side: When on the contrary our Doctrine, Discipline and worship is all so contrary to carnal interest and conceits, that we are still like to lose the most, if not the greatest, and consequently to be a persecuted people in the world. This is their unanswerable Argument: By this means they captivate the Nations to their Tyranny. The Most are everywhere almost licentious, sensual, worldly and unsanctified: Wise men and Godly men are few in comparison of the rest of the world. And it is the multitude commonly that hath the strength, and the Great ones that have the wealth. So that I confess I take it for a wonder of mercy, that they are not Lord's in every Country, and that the Reformed Catholics be not used everywhere as they be in Spain and Italy. For where they have but opportunity to show themselves, the Principles and Practices of the Papists are such, as will be most likely to win the Rabble rout to

them, and make them Masters of the multitude, and of all except a few believing Heavenly persons: (For the flock is little that must have the Kingdom.) And then, when they have got the multitude thus to follow them, and clubbed the rest into prisons, or burned them in the flames, they reckon of this as one of the surest Evidences that they are the Catholic Church, because forsooth they are the greater number (in the Countries where they have advantage,) and it is but a few whom they were able to persecute or burn as Heretics that were against them. The very Argument of the Jews against Christ and his Disciples.

The Reasons why they have not by this Policy won the Christian world to their side, are (under God, the great Defender of the innocent) these four; 1. Because in the Eastern and Southern Churches they have not had opportunity to lay their snares, as they have had here in the West: And also those Churches have too many corruptions and neglects at home for the gratifying of the worser sort. 2. Because God hath been pleased in some places so to bless the endeavors of the smaller part, as to enable them against the multitude to preserve some liberty. 3. Because God hath sometime given Wise and Godly Princes to the people, that will not be cheated with the Popular deceits. 4. And principally because that the Papal Tyranny is directly contrary to Princes Rights, so that its only those that are blinded by ignorance, or strengthened by an extraordinary league with Rome, or forced by the multitude of Popish subjects and neighbors, that put their necks into the Romish yoke. For what by the Popes pretended Power in temporals, at least in *ordine ad spiritualia*, and what by his excommunicating Princes, and his pretended power to depose them and give their kingdoms to another, and to absolve their subjects from their oaths and fidelity, (which is an Article of their faith, agreed on by the Pope

and General Council, *Later. sub. Innoc. 3, c. 3*.) and what by his exempting the Clergy from their Princes Power, and what by the pilling their Countries for money, and what by their doctrine and practices of murdering Princes that are not of their mind, by these and many other Evidences, they have awakened many of the Princes of the earth to look about them, and consequently to befriend the Truth against these Tyrannous Usurpers. Had it not been for these helps under God, we had not been like to have a name where they can reach, nor to have had liberty to breath in the common air.

It would be a voluminous work to show you how all the Doctrines, Government, and worship of the Papists is suited to the humor of the sensual multitude, and fitted to take with ungodly men. I shall but instance in twenty particulars (which are far from all.)

1. The Reformed Catholics hold, that none should be taken into the Church by Baptism, unless themselves, or their Parents, if they be Infants, do make Profession of the Christian faith, and of an holy life, for the time to come, and seem to understand what they say and do, and be serious in it; which exasperateth the grossly ignorant and ungodly, when we deny them this Privilege of Believers. But the Papists admit of the ignorant, ungodly, and such as believe not explicitly in Christ, as you heard even now; and so please the people, and fill their Church.

2. The Orthodox hold, that Baptism giveth Remission of sin to none but true believers and their seed. The Papists persuade many millions more, that all their sins are not only pardoned, but actually abolished *ex opere operato*, in their Baptism, which is comfortable News to such ungodly souls.

3. The Protestants say, that Original sin liveth after Baptism in some degree; though it reign not, or condemn not those that are true believers; and that Concupiscence, that is, all inordinacy of the sensual appetite, or

inordinate inclination to sensual objects is a sin. The Papists tell them that when once they are baptized, there is no such thing in them as Original sin, and that Concupiscence is no sin at all.

4. The Orthodox hold, that none are to be admitted to the Eucharist and Communion of the Church therein, but those that believe actually (or profess so to do) the Articles of the faith, and understand the nature of the Sacrament, and live according to the Laws of Christ. But the Papists give it to all, and drive men to the Sacrament; so that Albaspinaeus before cited, saith, he knows not whether ever any one was kept away in his age.

5. The Protestants hold, that men are not to be let alone in scandalous sin, but admonished privately, and then openly before the Church, and if yet they Repent not, and Reform not, to be cast out; and not to be absolved or re-admitted, without a Public Confession and Penitence answerable to the sin: And this wicked people hate at the very heart, and will not endure. But the Papists have got a device to please them by Auricular secret Confession to a Priest, where if he will but confess and sin, and sin and confess again, he may have a pardon of course without any open shame or true Reformation. If we durst but imitate the Papists in this one particular, we should do much to please the people that are now exasperated: for I find, that almost any of them will confess in secret that they have sinned, that will not endure the open shame.

6. The Protestants hold, that every sin deserveth death, and that every breach of the Law is such a sin; (though God will not inflict the Punishment on them that have a pardon) But the Papists tell us of a multitude of sins that are but venial, that is, sins that deserve pardon, and yet deserve not Hell, and are indeed no sins, but analogically so called. And they make those to be such venial sins, which Protestants account abominably gross;

as some lying, some swearing in common talk, some drunkenness, some fornication, and the like, are with them but venial sins, which are properly no sins (And yet here also they are by the ears among themselves, some saying that venial sins are properly sins, and most denying it) Yea all sins that are not deliberated on, are with them but venial sins. So that if they will but sufficiently brutify themselves by suspending the exercise of reason, and will swear, curse, murder, without deliberation, they are then free from sin and danger. And how easy and pleasing is this to the ungodly? Those are but Evangelical Counsels with the Papists, that are the Precepts or Laws of Christ to the Protestants.

7. The Protestants teach men, that it is their duty to seek the understanding of the holy Scripture, and to meditate in it day and night: but the Papists do forbid the Common people to read it in a language which they understand, and save them all that labor that Protestants put them on: Nothing can win the people more than cherishing them thus in sloth and ignorance.

8. The Protestants say, that a man cannot be justified or saved without an actual faith in Christ (or being the Infant of a believer Dedicated to Christ) and that this faith must extend to all things that are Essential to Christianity. But what the Papists say of the Justification and Salvation of Infidels, if they believe in the Pope, you heard in their own words in the last Detection. A comfortable doctrine to the unbelieving world, to whom God hath spoken no such Comfort.

We confess that those that never had the Gospel, are under the Law of nature or works, and that the penalty of this is such as God can in some cases dispense with (or else we could not be saved by Christ) and so that all Pagans are not under the Peremptory undispensable threatening of the Gospel against final Privative unbelievers: But yet, though God may pardon

some of these, he hath made them no promise that he will; and therefore they can have no positive hope grounded on a promise; nor can any man say, that God will save any of them, or that he will not; it being certain that they are under the condemnation of the Law, which God can dispense with, in ways of security to his Justice and Ends, but uncertain whether he will or not; and therefore is to be left among his unrevealed things. The true believer is under a certain promise of salvation. The unbeliever that hath had the Gospel, or might have had it and would not, is under the Gospel sentence of damnation, which is certain and irreversible, if he die in that Condition. The negative unbeliever that never had or could have the Gospel, is under the Condemning sentence of the Law (of works or nature,) that is, his sin Deserveth eternal death; but this sentence is not peremptory and indispensable; but yet it is such as God will not dispense with rashly, but on terms that may secure his Ends and Justice. This is the true mean between extremes in this weighty point.

9. The Protestants say, that all our best works are imperfect, and the sin that adhereth to them deserves God's wrath, according to the Law of works, though he pardon it by the Law of Grace: and that when we have done all, we are unprofitable servants, and properly Merit nothing of God for the worth of our works, or in Commutative Justice. But the Papists take those very works to Merit heaven, *ex Condigno*, and (for here they are by the ears again) say some of them, by the Proportion of the work, and in Commutative Justice, which the Protestants say, deserve damnation for their sinful imperfections, and therefore need a pardon through the blood of Christ. Yea they take these works to be perfect, and the man to be perfect, and say, that by such works as these, they may Merit for others as well as

for themselves. And how easy and pleasing is this to proud corrupted Nature?

10. The Protestants think, that no Faith Justifieth, but that which is accompanied with unfeigned Love and Resolution for Obedience. But the Papists make Faith that's separated from Charity, and joined with Attrition, to be sufficient for admission to the Sacrament, which shall be instead of Love or Contrition, and so shall put away all sin.

11. The Protestants knowing that God is a Spirit, and will be worshipped in Spirit and truth, do teach people a spiritual way of worship, which Carnal men are undisposed to, and unacquainted with. But the Papists do accommodate them by a multitude of Ceremonies, Images, and a Pompous histrionical kind of worship, which is easy and pleasant to flesh and blood. To have an Image before them, and Copes, and Ornaments, and abundance of formalities, and to drop so many Beads, and be saved for saying over so many Ave Mary's, or such like words; what an easy kind of Religion is this, and how agreeable to flesh and blood? How much easier is it to say over their offices, then to Love God above all, and desire after Communion with him in the spirit, and to delight in him, and to pray in Faith, and heavenly fervor?

12. Protestants tell men of Hell-fire, as the remediless punishment of those sins, which Papists say deserve but a Purgatory: and they have hopes of coming out of Purgatory; but there's none of coming out of Hell.

13. Protestants tell them of no hope of ease or pardon of sin after this life, if it be not pardoned here. But Papists tell them, that when they are in Purgatory, the Pope hath power to pardon them, and the saying of so many Masses for their souls, may ease them, or rid them out; and the Merits of other folks may deliver them.

14. Protestants tell them, that they must be holy for themselves: but Papists tell them, that they may hire another man to say their prayers for them, which may serve turn.

15. The Protestants do ingenuously confess, that they have no way to end all Controversies in this life, but that we have a sufficient way so far to decide them as is necessary to the peace of the soul, of the Church, and of the Commonwealth; but no way for a final absolute Decision, till the day of Judgment. The Pastors of the Church are to be Judges, so far as they are to execute: And the Magistrates are to be Judges so far as they must execute: And every Christian hath a judgment of Discerning so far as he is to execute. But the absolute final judgment is reserved to the last day; when God will fully end our controversies. But this satisfieth not men that would have all in hand, and the sentence past before the Assizes: And therefore the Papists better fit their humor, and tell them (and they do but tell them) of an End of all their controversies at hand; of an easy cheap remedy by believing the Infallible Pope and Council; and so putting an end to all divisions and doubts.

16. The Protestants would have none but seeming Professing Saints in their Churches: But the Papists Canonize a Saint as a wonder; and shut them up in Monasteries, and call a few [Religious] that are separated from other Christians, as Christians formerly were from the world: which brings the people to think that Holiness and Religion is not necessary to all but to a few Devotaries that will be better than they are commanded to be.

17. The Protestants bind men to keep their vows, and fidelity to their Governors: But the Papists tell them that the Pope hath Power to free them from their fidelity, and dispense with their oaths.

18. The Papists teach men to fast: by eating the pleasantest meats: but the Protestants use a total abstinence while they fast, unless in mere necessity.

19. The main business and administration of Protestant Pastors, is against that flesh that is predominant in the unregenerate, and therefore must needs be distasteful to the multitude of the ungodly. Our preaching is to open men's sin and misery, and cause them to perceive their lost condition, and so to reveal to them a crucified Christ, and then to set them on the holy self-denying heavenly life that Christ hath prescribed them. And to speak terror to the rebellious, and to cast the obstinate out of our communion, and to comfort none as the heirs of heaven, either in life or at death, but only the truly sanctified and renewed souls. But for the Papists, their Preaching in most places is but seldom; but they have a Mass in Latin: And as the old saying is, [The Mass doth not bite.] It galleth not a guilty conscience to see a Mass, and here a many of Prayers which he understandeth not: And when they do preach, when they should show wicked men their misery, they flatter and deceive them too often by their false doctrine: They cannot humble them in the sense of their Original sin and Misery, for that they tell them was quite extinct and done away in Baptism: And for their following sins, Absolution upon their customary confessions, hath done away all the guilt at least: so that here is no Misery for the Miserable souls to see: but like a Constables presentment at a Sessions, an Omnia been: Unless perhaps some gross actual sin be apparent among them: and then they shall have an Oration against it, to drive them to auricular confession, and to receive the Body of Christ, and be Absolved. And so do they by Ceremonies and Sacraments *ex opere operato* quiet the Consciences of unsanctified men, and humor them in all their rites and customs, and at last turn them to Heaven or Purgatory with an Absolution, and Extreme Unction. And how

pleasing a Religion this is to the ungodly people, those Ministers can tell, that see the rage of such, against those that deny them even better Forms and Ceremonies when they desire them; to pacify their Consciences instead of real Holiness and Obedience.

20. Lastly, how the Jesuits have fitted their whole frame of Moral doctrine and Case Divinity to humor the unconscionable, Montaltus the Jansenist will fully show you through the whole (fore-cited) Mystery of Jesuitism. Those that would escape any worldly trouble or danger, the Jesuits have a help at hand for, even their doctrine of Equivocation, and Mental reservation (which makes the Popes Dispensation with oaths and promises needless.) What accommodations they have for him that hath a mind to Murder his adversary, to calumniate another, to take Use without Usury, to forbear restoring ill-gotten goods, to commit fornication, to rob another, and many the like, you may see in their own words cited in the said Book. Yea what comfort they have for a man that loveth not God, so he will not hate him. Trust not my report, but read the Book; for its worth the reading.

So that we see the advantage that the Papists have to sweep away the vicious ignorant multitude, and then to boast that they are the Catholics, and we but Schismatics, because they are the greater part: and then they are armed also by the Multitude, to oppress us by their violence.

Now what remedy to use against this Fraud, I cannot tell, but only to deal plainly and faithfully, though it do displease, and to administer God's Ordinances as he prescribeth, though never so distasteful to flesh and blood; and so to commit ourselves to God, and trust him with his Church and cause, who is able to preserve it, and is most engaged to appear for us when we lay all upon him, and have none to trust but himself alone. Let us not hearken in this case to flesh and blood that would advise us to remit the

reins of Discipline, and to bend our Administrations to some pleasing compliance with carnal minds. We disengage God when thus we begin to shift for ourselves out of his way. But withal we must acquaint those Princes that are faithful to Christ, how much it is their duty in this case to assist us; not by any cruelty to the Papists (that I desire not) but only by quieting the ungodly part of our People in a state of Catechumens, or expectants, or a Learning condition fitted to their state; and to restrain such in the meantime as would take advantage of their discontents, to seduce them by pleasing licentious doctrines to their undoing.

CHAP. XXXIX. They pick up the mistakes or harsh passages of some particular Divines, and persuade men that these are the Protestant Religion.

D*etect.* 30. Another of their frauds is, by culling out all the harsh, unhandsome passages, or mistakes that they meet with in any Protestant Writers, and charging all these upon the Protestant Religion, as if they were so many Articles of our Faith: or at least were the common doctrines of our Churches.

They will not give us leave to do so by them, when yet we have much more reason for it. For 1. They teach the People that they are bound to believe as their Teachers bid them: and they reproach us for confessing that we are not in all points of Doctrine infallible: And yet we still confess this fallibility, and say in plain terms, that we know but in part. 2. diverse of their particular Doctors that we use to cite, are such as the Pope hath Canonized for Saints: and they tell us that in Canonizing he is infallible: And therefore an Infallibly Canonized Saint must not be supposed to err in a point of faith. 3. They boast so much of Unity and Consent among themselves, that we may the better cite particular Doctors. And yet we think ourselves bound to stand to their own Law in this, and to charge nothing on

them as the faith of their Church but what their Church doth own: and therefore while they refuse to stand to particular Doctors, we will not urge them to it: for its good reason that all men should be the Professors of their own belief.

But what reason is there then that we may not have the same measure from them which they expect? We profess to take no man, nor Council of men, for the Lord's of our faith, but for the Helpers of our faith. They tell us, that they know not where to find our Religion. We tell them it is entirely in the written word of God, and that we know no other Infallible Rule; because we know no other Divine Revelation (supposing what in Nature is revealed.) They tell us that, All Heretics do pretend to Scripture, and therefore this cannot be the Test of our Religion? I answer, that so all cavilers, and defrauders and extortioners, may pretend to the Law of the Land, to undo poor men by quirks of wit, or tire them with vexatious suits: And yet it follows not that we must seek another Rule of Right, and take the Law for insufficient: And what if Heretics pretend to Tradition, to General Councils and the Decretals of the Popes (as you know how frequently they do) Will you yield therefore that these are an insufficient Rule, or Test of your own Religion? Open your eyes, and judge as you would be judged.

But I will come to some of the particular Opinions which they charge us with. And because I know not a more weighty renowned Champion of their cause then Cardinal Richleiu (then Bishop of Lucion:) I shall take notice of his twelve great errors which he so vehemently chargeth on the Reformed Churches, as contrary to the Scripture. And sure I shall do much to make clean our Churches, if I fully wipe off all the pretended blots of error, that so wise a man could charge upon them. In his *Defens. contra script. 4. Ministr. Charenton. c. 2, p. 12. &c*. he begins his enumeration thus.

1. [The Scripture saith, Jam. 2, that a man is not Justified by Faith only; but you say, that he is Justified by Faith alone, and by Faith only, which is found in no place of Scripture: and do you not then resist the Scriptures?]

Answ. 1. We believe both the words of Paul and James. that a man is Justified by Faith without the Deeds of the Law, and saved through Faith—not of works, lest any man should boast, Rom. 3:28; Eph. 2:8,9, and also that a man is Justified by works, and not by Faith only, Jam. 2. Did not this Learned man know that we believe all the Bible? Why then should he charge us with denying that which we retain, and publicly read in our Churches as the word of God? Did he think that we set so much by Luther's, or any man's writings, as by the Bible? 2. But if he can prove that we understand not these words aright, he should have evinced it better then by the use of the words [Faith alone] For our Churches by [Faith alone] do profess openly to mean no more than Paul doth by [Faith without works] And can they find fault with Paul? 3. Indeed we are not all agreed upon the fittest Notion of the interest of Faith and works in our Justification: but our difference is more in words and notions then matter, of which see my Dispute. of Justification. 4. And. why do you not quarrel with your own Cardinal Contarenus *de Justif.* and others of your own, that join with us in the doctrine of Justification.

His second Accusation is, [The Scripture saith, that we can Love God with all the heart: you say, that no man can Love God with all the heart, which is nowhere read in Scripture: and yet do you not resist the Scriptures?]

Answ. 1. Unprofitable Confusion! We distinguish between Loving God with all the Heart, as it signifieth the sincerity and predominant degree of Love, and so every true Christian hath it: and as it signifieth some

extraordinary degree above this mere sincerity; and so some eminent stronger Christians have it, and as it signifieth the highest Degree, which is our duty, and which excludeth all sinful imperfection: And thus we say, that no man actually doth Love God perfectly in this life: nor do we think he speaks like a Christian, that dare say, Lord I Love thee so much, that I will not be beholden to thee to forgive the imperfection of my Love, or to help me against any sinful imperfection of it. Your own Followers whom you admire as the highest Lovers of God, do oft lament the imperfections of their Love (as M. de Renty, for instance, in his Life.) But now if the question be only of the posse, and not the act, we say, that the *Potentia naturalis* is in all: and the *Potentia Moralis*, which is the Habit, is in the sanctified: but this Moral Power is not perfect itself, that is, of the highest degree, and without any sinful imperfection; though yet it hath the perfection of sincerity, and in some, the perfection of an eminent degree. And will not this content you?

His third Accusation is, [The Scripture saith, that the Eucharist is the Body and Blood of Christ, with the adjunction of those words that signify a true Body and Blood: you say that it is not Christ's Body and Blood, but only a figure, sign, and testimony, which the Scripture nowhere saith.]

Answ. 1. The Scripture saith not that it is his Body and Blood substantially, or by Transubstantiation: And we say not, as you feign, that it is not his Body and Blood, but a figure, &c. For we say, that it is his Body and Blood Sacramentally and Representatively: as he that personateth a King on some just account, is called a King; and as in actions of Investiture and Delivery; the delivering of a Key is the delivering of the House, and the delivery of a twig and turf, is the delivery of the Land; and the deliverer may say, Take, this is my House, this is my Land, which I deliver thee. If

you be among many Images in a room, you will not blame him that saith, This is Peter, and this is Paul, and this is the Virgin Mary. 2. The Scripture often calls it Bread after the Consecration; which you condemn us for: therefore we are taught to call it so. 3. The Scripture saith, 1 Cor. 10:4. [That Rock was Christ] and he saith, [I am the door, Joh. 10:7. I am the true Vine, Joh. 15:1.] David saith, [I am a worm and no man, Psal. 22:6.] we believe all this. But must we be therefore reproached, if we say, that David was a man; that the Rock was Christ typically; that he was a Vine and Door Metaphorically only? And yet these are as plain as, This is my Body, and This is my Blood.

His fourth Accusation is, [The Scripture saith, that Baptism saveth us, and that we are cleansed and regenerate by the washing of water: On the contrary you say, that Baptism doth neither save us, nor regenerate us, but is only to us a symbol of salvation, ablution, and regeneration, which is nowhere said in Scripture.]

Answ. A childish contest about words! We say, that two things go to our full possession of our state of Regeneration, Justification, and Cleansing: One is our fundamental Right, which the Promise of the Gospel gives us upon our Heart consent or Covenant with God: the other is our Solemn Investiture: in regard of the former, we are Christians, and Regenerate, and Justified before Baptism: In regard of the later, we are made Christians, regenerate, justified, saved by Baptism. This we commonly hold, and so never denied what you falsely say we deny. As a man is made a King by his Coronation, that yet in a sort was one before; or as Marriage makes them Husband and Wife by public solemnization, that were fundamentally so before by Private Covenant; or as possession is given by a Key, a twig and a turf (as I said) of that which a man had right to before; so are we solemnly

invested with those benefits by baptism, which we had a fundamental Title to before. Do not your own writers confess this of a man that is Baptized many years after he had Faith and Charity? Do you think Cornelius and the rest that had the Holy Ghost before Baptism, Act. 10, had not Justification before? Do you think that Constantine the great was unpardoned, unregenerate and no Christian till he was Baptized? Or rather would you make quarrels against your own Confessions?

His fifth Accusation is [Scripture saith, that Priests do forgive sin: on the contrary you say that they do not remit them, but only testify that they are remitted, which the Scriptures nowhere say.]

Answ. As if Testification could not be a Remission. We say, that whose sins the Pastors of the Church remit, they are remitted. Do you not know that these very words were used to every Presbyter in our Ordination here in England? We say 1. That Pastors do as God's Ambassadors, proclaim his General Conditional Pardon unto all. 2. That they are God's Ministers to make a particular Application, and delivery of pardon in Baptism, on supposition that the Baptized be qualified for pardon. 3. That they are as his Ministers, to make the same Application by Declaration and Delivery in the Absolution of the Penitent; on supposition that their penitence be sincere. 4. And as Church Governors, they may on good considerations sometimes remit some humbling disgraceful acts that were imposed on the penitent for the testification of his repentance, and the satisfaction of the Church. And are not these four concessions enough? Or are you minded to pick quarrels, that yourselves and others may have fuel for the rancor and uncharitableness of your minds?

But indeed we do not think that any man can primarily as the chief Agent forgive sins; but God must be the first pardoner: Nor that any man can

pardon the sins of the dead, and abate or shorten the pains of the soul in a fire called Purgatory. Here we leave you.

And verily if the Pope have power to remit but the very temporal punishment, he is a cruel wretch that will not forgive men, even good men, the torments of the Gout, and the Stone, and an hundred diseases; nay that will not remit them to himself, no nor the pains of death, when he is so loath to die: (But I forgot that the Pope hath nobody to forgive him, because none above him) He that cannot remit the punishments which we see, and feel, how shall we believe him (without any Divine Testimony) that he can remit a penalty that he never saw nor felt, nor no man else, that can be proved.

His sixth Accusation is [Scripture saith, If a Virgin marry she sinneth not: but you say that the just sin in all works: which Scripture mentions not.]

Answ. 1. Do you believe in your Conscience that the Scripture meaneth that a Virgin sinneth not at all in any circumstance or defect in the manner or Concomitants of her Marriage? Then I pray tell your Nuns so, that if they marry they sin not. Tell Priests so, that if they marry they sin not. Your own reason can expect no other sense in the words, but that Marriage, as such, is no sin to the Virgin. And this we grant: But yet if you think that in this or in any other work, you see God as apprehensively, and believe as strongly, and restrain every wandering thought as exactly, and Love God as much as you are bound to do by the very Law of Nature itself; so that you are perfectly blameless, and need not be beholden to the blood of Christ, to the Mercy of God, to the Spirit of Grace, either for the forgiveness of these failings; or the cure of them, you show then a proud Pharisaical spirit, unacquainted with itself and with the Gospel. Do you go on and say, Lord I thank thee that I am not as other men: and I will rather say, Lord be merciful to me a

sinner: and which shall be rather justified, Christ hath told us. The streams cannot be perfectly sinless, till the fountain be so: and [Who can say, I have made my heart clean, I am pure from my sin? Prov. 20:9.] [For there is not a just man upon earth, that doth good, and sinneth not, Eccl. 7:20.] Christ telleth us that the fruit will be like the Tree, the actions like the heart: and therefore an imperfect Heart will have imperfect duties. If you dare say there is no remnant of sin in your hearts, you have so much of it that hindereth you from seeing it. Humility and self-knowledge would soon end this controversy. We say not that all our works are sins, that is, either materially forbidden, or done in wickedness, and from vicious predominant habits; But that the same works which Materially are good, are tainted with our sinful imperfections, having not in them that measure of knowledge, faith, love, &c. as we ought to have; and therefore that we must beg pardon for our imperfections, and fly to the blood and merits of Christ, through whom God will accept both our works and us, for all the imperfections, which he pardoneth to us of his grace.

His seventh Accusation is [Scripture saith that there are wicked men and reprobates, that believe in Christ: But you contend that they believe not, but have only a shadow of faith: which no Scripture saith.]

Answ. Again, a quarrel about the name of faith, unworthy serious men! We say that Reprobates do believe, and we say that they believe not, taking belief in different senses. We believe whatever the Scripture saith, even that the Devils believe and tremble: and yet as Believers and Christians are all one, we are loath to call the Devils Believers and Christians; but you may do it, if you please. As Belief signifieth a bare ineffectual conviction or superficial Assent which you call *fides informis*, so we still confess that the wicked may believe. But as Belief signifieth our Receiving of Christ, and

Coming to him, and being planted into him as his members, and taking him heartily as Christ, our Lord and Savior, and so becoming Christians and Disciples: as it signifieth such a faith that hath the promise of pardon of sin, of Adoption, and of Glory, so we say that the wicked have but a show or shadow of it. And this is the sense of the words of Calvin, P. Martyr, Beza, and Danaus, whom you cite. And do you not think so yourselves? Indeed you know not what to believe in this, as I have shown in Postscript to my Dispute. of Sacraments.

His eighth Accusation is this [Scripture saith, that there are some that believe for a time, and after at another time believe not. You deny that there are any that believe for a time, and then fall from faith, and that he that once believeth doth ever lose that faith, which is not in any Scripture to be found.]

Answ. It is too light in serious matters, to play thus upon words. 1. We still maintain that there are some that believe but for a time, and afterward fall away: but we say it is but with an ineffectual or common assent that they believe, such as you call *fides informis*. Your accusation therefore is false. The semen vitae and faith that Calvin speaks of, in the place which you cite, is meant only of a saving faith, such as you call *fides charitate formata*. If any of you think that faith is called *charitate formata*, or justifying or saving faith, only by an extrinsical denomination, from a concomitant, and that there is no difference in the faith itself between that of the unjustified and of the justified, you are mistaken against all reason. Your own Philosophers frequently maintain that the will (which is the seat of charity) followeth the practical dictates of the Intellect (which is the seat of Assent.) And therefore according to those Philosophers, a Practical Belief must needs be accompanied with charity. And those that deny this, do yet

maintain that a powerful clear Assent of the Intellect will infallibly procure the determination of the Will, though every assent will not, and though it do it not Necessarily. So that on that account (and in common reason) there must needs be an intrinsic difference between that Assent which prevaileth with the will to determine itself, and that which cannot so prevail: And therefore your unformed and your formed faith, have some intrinsic difference.

2. The Lutherans that are half the Protestants, do think that justifying faith may be lost. So that (be it right or wrong) you cannot charge this on them all.

3. The rest which be not of their mind, do hold a brotherly communion with them; and therefore take not that point to be of so much moment as to break communion.

4. Are you not at odds among yourselves about perseverance? Some laying it first on man's free will, and some with Austin, ascertaining perseverance to the Elect, because Elect, and laying it on God's free Gift; and some Jesuits and School men affirming that the confirmed in Grace are not only certain to persevere, but that they necessarily believe and are saved, and cannot mortally sin (strange doctrine for a Jesuit!) Of all this controversy of perseverance, I desire the Reader to see a few sheets called An Account of my Judgment hereabout. When I wrote those I knew not whom Alvarez meant (*lib. 10. Disp. 104, p. 419. s. 1, de Auxil.*) When he disputed against this sort of men: But since I find it in his Response. ad *Obj. Lib. 2, c. 9, p. 522, &c*. Where he tells us that it is the Jesuit Greg. de Valentia, *Tom. 2, disp. 8, q. 3, punct. 4. s. 2, and Tom. 1, d 1, q. 23, punct. 4. s. 7. Ubi docet non solum esse praeelectos ut salventur, sed ut necessario*

salventur, ac per consequence non posse peccare Mortaliter, & Necessario persevere are in gratia, ac eatenus non libere, sed necessario salvari.

And also that he meant *Alexand. Ales. 3, p. q. 9. Et Almainin 3, d. 11, q. 2. Qui asserunt confirmatos in Gratia non habere libertatem, &c. Quam sententiam Medina impugnat. 3, p. q. 27, art. 4.*

This is more than Protestants say, And yet will you quarrel?

His ninth Accusation is this [Scripture saith, If thou will enter into life, keep the commandments: You say that there is no need of keeping the Commandments, and that he that saith, it doth deny Christ and abolish faith, of which the Scripture speaketh not a word.]

Answ. Still confusion plays your game, and you strive about words. We distinguish between the keeping of that Law of Works, or Nature, which made perfect obedience the only condition of Life: and the keeping of the Law of Moses as such, and the keeping of the Law of Christ. For the two first, we say that no man can be justified by the works of the Law. Is this a doubt among Papists, that believe Paul's Epistles? But as for the Law of Christ, as such, we must endeavor to keep it perfectly (thats necessary *necessitate praecepti*;) and must needs keep it sincerely (*necessitate medii*) if we will be saved. This all Protestants that ever I spoke with are agreed in: And dare any Papist deny it? If we be not all (nor you neither) agreed on the sense of that text of Scripture, yet are we agreed on the doctrine, and yet you quarrel.

His tenth Accusation is [Scripture saith, that some that were illuminated and made partakers of the Holy Ghost, did fall, and crucify again to themselves the Son of God. But you defend, that whoever is once partaker of the Holy Ghost, cannot fall from his Grace: which Scripture speaketh not.]

Answ. The same again: and a mere untruth! We still maintain that those words of Scripture are of certain truth. But we distinguish between the common and the special gifts of the Spirit. The common gifts may be lost: we never denied it: The special gifts that accompany salvation, some of us judge are never lost: others of us think are left only by those that are not predestinate, as Austin thought, and your Dominicans think. And what cause is here of your quarrel?

His eleventh Accusation is this [Scripture saith that God taketh away, and blotteth out our iniquity as a cloud: and puts our iniquities far from us, as the East is from the West, and maketh us as white as snow; You say, that he takes not away, nor blotteth out our sin, but only doth not impute it, and doth not make us white as snow, but leaveth in us the fault and uncleanness of sin: which Scripture nowhere speaks.]

Answ. This is half falsehood, and half confusion, raked up to make a matter of quarrel with. 1. Its false that we say, He doth not take away, nor blot out our sin, nor make us white as snow: Do not all Protestants in the world affirm all this? 2. There are these things here considerable. 1. The Act of sin. 2. The Habit. 3. The guilt, or obligation to punishment. 4. The culpability, or *reatus culpae*. 1. As for the Act, how can you for shame say, that God takes it away, when it is a transient act that is gone of itself as soon as acted, and hath no existence, as Scotus and all your own take notice. 2. As to the Culpability, you will not sure for shame say, that God so put away, e. g. David's Adultery, as to make it reputable as a virtue, or not a vice. 3. As to the *Reatus ad paenam*, the full Guilt, we maintain that it is done quite away: and if your eyes be in your head, you may see that it is in regard of this guilt and punishment that the Scriptures mentioned by you speak (or principally speak at least) For I pray you tell us, what else can they mean,

when they speak of actual sins that are past long ago, and have no existence. Learned wranglers! Would you make us believe, that Grace is given to David to put away the Act of his Murder and Adultery, so that it may be *quid praeteritum, & non jam existens*? A thing past and gone, which it is without grace? So that when you feign us to say, that God takes not away sin, but only not imputeth it, you feign us to make synonymal terms to be of different senses. He takes them away by not imputing them.

4. But if you speak not of the sense of a particular Text, but of the Matter in difference, it can be nothing but the habit of sin that you mean, that we say, that God takes not away. And here you play partly the Calumniators, and partly the erroneous Pharisees. 1. You Calumniate, in feigning us to deny, that habitual sin is done away. Because our Divines say, that it is not the work of mere pardon (which we call Justification) to put it away, therefore you falsely say, that we hold it is not put away at all: whereas we hold (without one contradicting vote that ever I read or heard) that all that are Justified, are Sanctified, Converted, Regenerate, Renewed, and must live an holy life: And that all their sins are so far destroyed, that they shall not have dominion over them: that Gross and Willful sin they forsake, and the least infirmities, they groan, and pray, and strive against to the last, and then obtain a perfect conquest. 2. But if you mean, that no degree of habitual or dispositive sin, or absence of holy qualities remaineth in the Justified soul, it is a Pharisaical error, yea worse than a Pharisee durst have owned. And it seems this is your meaning, by the words of Calvin's which you cite. And dare you say that you have no sin to resist, or purge, or pardon? Are you in Heaven already? The whole have no need of the Physician, but the sick: and have you no need of Christ to heal your soul? Would you be no better than you are? O proud souls! And strange to

themselves and the purity of the Law! Hath not the Holy Ghost pronounced him a Liar and Self-deceiver, that saith he hath no sin, 1 Joh. 1:8,10. In many things we offend all, Jam. 3:2. I shall but recite to you two Canons of a Council, which if you use the Lord's prayer, are fit for you to consider. *Council. Milevit. cont. Pelagianos Can. 7*. [*Item placuit, ut quicunque dixerit in Oratione Dominica ideo dicere sanctos, Dimitte nobis Debita nostra, ut non pro seipsis hoc dicant, quia non estea jam necessaria ista, sed pro aliis, qui sunt in suo populo peccatores, & ideo non dicere unumquemque sanctorum, Dimitte mihi debita mea; sed Dimitte nobis debita nostra, ut hoc pro aliis potius quam pro se Justus petere intelligatur, Anathema sit.*

Can. 8. *Item placuit, ut quicunque verba ipsa Dominicae Orationis, ubi dicimus, Dimitte nobis debita nostra, ista volunt à Sanctis dici, ut humiliter, non veraciter hoc dicatur, Anathema fit. Quis enim ferat Orantem, & non hominibus, sed ipsi Domino mentientem, qui labiis sibi dicit dimitti velle, & Corde dicit, quae sibi dimittantur debita non habere?*]

You see here the Council curseth all those as intolerable Liars, that say the Lord's prayer, desiring him daily to forgive or remit their sins, and yet think that they have no sins to forgive, yea or that every Saint hath not such sins. What can a Papist say to this, but by making Councils as void of sense, as they feign the holy Scriptures to be?

Hus twelfth and last Accusation is this [The Scripture saith, that Blessedness in the Reward, the Prize, the Penny, the wages of Laborers, and the Crown of Righteousness: you contend that its merely the free gift of God, and not a Reward, which no Scripture doth affirm]

Answ. A mere Calumny, and perverting of Calvin's words, who often saith, as we constantly do, that Eternal life is given as a Reward and Crown

of Righteousness. But we distinguish between the Act of God in his Gospel Promise, which is a Conditional Deed of Gift of Christ and Life to all that will Accept them, and the execution of this by Judgment and Glorification. And we say that it was Antecedenter merely of God's free Grace that he made such a Deed of Gift (the blood of Christ being the purchasing cause,) and nothing of our works had a hand in the procurement (Dare you deny this?) But that our Justification in Judgment, and our Glorification, which are the Execution of the Law of Grace, do make our works the Reason; not as having merited it *ex proportione operis*, or in Commutative Justice, but as having performed the condition of the free Gift, and so being the persons to whom it doth belong. And this is the sense of Scotus and of one half of the Papists, (for still you are together by the ears) who say that Merit of Condignity is but *ex pacto* by virtue of God's Promise.

And now I leave it to the Conscience of any sober Papist, whether we be guilty in any one point that this great Cardinal chargeth us with? And whether Papists and Protestants were not in a fair way for reconciliation, if we differed not more in other things then in these?

And here again I must let them know, that Scripture only is the Rule and Test of our Faith and Religion. Their Polidor Virgil in this speaks truly of us, saying [They are called Evangelical, because they maintain that no Law is to be received in matters of Salvation, but what is delivered by Christ or his Apostles] (so sapless and putid is their scorn of the *Evangelium quintum*.) If therefore Luther, Calvin, or any man speak in any word amiss, blame the man that spoke it for that word; but blame not all, or any others for it, if you are men. Austin Retracted his own errors, and which of us dare Justify every word that hath fallen from our mouths or pen, before God? How many hundred points do Schoolmen and Commentators charge on one

another as Erroneous, among yourselves? Shall all the errors of the Fathers be charged on the Catholic Church, or all your writers errors upon yours?

And that we do well to stick to the Holy Scriptures as the sufficient Rule, we are the more encouraged to think, by the concessions of our adversaries of greatest Note (as well as by the Testimony of the Scripture itself, and the consent of the ancient Doctors of the Church, and the unprovedness of their pretended additionals.) Among others even this great Cardinal Richlieu saith thus, p. 38. [*Nos autem nullam aliam, &c*. i.e. As for us we put (or assert) no other Rule but Scripture, neither of another sort, nor total: Yea we say that it is the Whole Rule of our Salvation: and that on a double account, both because it containeth immediately and formally the sum of our salvation; that is, all the Articles that are necessary to man's salvation, by necessity of means (N.B.) and because it mediately containeth whatsoever we are bound to believe, as it sends us to the Church to be instructed by her, of whose infallibility it certainly confirmeth us.]

Note here that 1. He grants us that all Articles necessary to our Salvation, as Means, are immediately and formally in the Scripture: And then surely they may be saved that believe no more than is in the Scripture: 2. That we are to believe no Church but that which the Scripture sends us to, and to believe its infallibility no further than the Scripture doth confirm it. And that the Scripture is our whole and only Rule. O that all Papists would stand to this! But let them not blame us now for standing to it. Had this Cardinal done no more by Policy and Power then by Disputing against the Reformation, he might easily have been dealt with.

CHAP. XL. Ranking the Protestants among the rabble of Sects and Heresies that are in the world.

D*etect.* 31. Another of their frauds is, By ranking the Protestants among the rabble of Sects and Heresies that are in the world, and then asking ignorant souls, If you will needs be of any sect, how many are here before you? And what reason have you rather to be of the Protestants, then of any other?

Answ. Indeed this question is worth the considering by a Papist, or any sectary; but the true Catholic is quite out of the reach of it. The Church of Christ is one, and but One. This one Catholic Church containeth all the true Christians in the world. This is the Church that I am a member of, which is far wider than the Roman Church. The Church that I profess myself a member of, containeth three parts; 1. The most sound and healthful part; and that is the Reformed Churches. 2. The most unsound in doctrine, though possessed of many Learned men; and that is the Papists themselves; (not as Papists simply, but as Christians, though infected with Popery.) 3. The middle part, which is sounder than the Papists in doctrine, but less learned; and below the Protestants in both: and that is all the Greeks and

other Eastern and Southern Churches that are no subjects of the Pope. All these, even all true Christians, are members of the Church that I belong to, though some of them be more sound, and some be leprous or lamentably polluted. To these I may add many particular lesser sects, that subvert not the foundation, as some Anabaptists, and diverse others. And will you ask me now why I will not be of another sect, as well as of the Protestants? Why, my answer is ready: A Sect divided from the body, I abhor: I am of no Sect, It is the Unity, Universality and Antiquity of the Church that are its honorable attributes in my eyes. Protestants that unchurch all the rest of the world, and count themselves the whole Church of Christ, do in some sort make themselves a Sect: But where is there any such? I know none such, nor I hope ever shall do: And therefore I may say that Protestants are no more a sect, then the Patients in an Hospital that are almost healed, or then the higher form of Scholars in a school, or then the Merchants or richer sort of Tradesmen in a City: And such a Sect God grant that I may be of, even one in the Church that shall be of soundest understanding, and of purest worship, and of the most careful, holy, honest life; But still I shall acknowledge them of the lowest form, even them that learn the A.B.C. to be in the same School with me: And if they (Papists or any others) will disclaim me, that shall not unchurch me, as long as Christ disclaims me not: Nor shall it provoke me to disclaim them any further then I see Christ leading me the way. So that the Papists may see that if they will deny the Church that I am of, they must deny their own, and all the Christian world.

But how will they answer this themselves? Seriously I profess, that besides their other errors, it is one of the greatest reasons why I dare not be a Papist, because then I know I must be a Sectary. What is a Papist but as mere a sectary as any that retaineth a name in the Church? They are a

company of men that have set up a Human Usurping Head or Vice-christ over the Catholic Church, owning him themselves, and unchurching and condemning all the Church that will not own him. The Church that I am of is near thrice as big as the Papists Church is. Theirs is but a piece, and a polluted piece, that would divide itself from all the rest by condemning them.

And now I would seriously desire any Papist living to resolve the question, If he will needs be of a sect, and forsake the Universal Church, why of the Popish sect rather than another? If because it is the greatest, I answer, its less than the whole. If because it is the purest, it is one of the most impure: If for Antiquity, it is founded (as Papal) upon Novelty. If because it is the Richest, their money perish with them that measure the Church and truth of Christ by the Riches and splendor of this world. For my part I cannot help you out of this snare.

CHAP. XLI. Another of their juggling's is, By working upon the people's natural affections, and asking them, Where they think all their forefathers are that died in the communion of the Roman Church?

D*etect.* 32. Another of their juggling's is, By working upon the people's natural affections, and asking them, Where they think all their forefathers are that died in the communion of the Roman Church? Dare they think they are all damned? Intimating that its cruelty to say their ancestors are in Hell; and if they say they be in Heaven, then there is but one way thither, and therefore you must go the way that they went.

But a weak understanding may easily deal with this kind of Sophistry, if it be not mastered by affection. For 1. What if we grant that many of our forefathers that died Papists are in Heaven? Doth it follow that we must therefore be Papists? No: because it was not by Popery that they came to Heaven, but by Christianity. What if many recover and live that eat not only Earth and Dirt, but Hemlock or Spear-wort, or other poisons; must I therefore eat them? Or doth it follow that there is no other way to health?

2. Our forefathers were all saved that were holy, justified persons, and no others. But among so many and great impediments as Popery cast in their way, we have great reason to fear that far fewer of them were saved, then are now among the Reformed Churches. And must I needs go that difficult way to Heaven, because that some of them get thither? Must I needs travail a way that is commonly beset with thieves, because some that go that way do scape them? This is our case.

3. If this were a good way of Reasoning, then may all the Heathens, Infidels, Mohammedans, use it, that have been educated in darkness. And indeed it is the Argument which the barbarous Heathens use, when the Gospel is preached to them; [What think you, say they, is become of our fathers? If they were saved without the Gospel, so may we.] The story of that Infidel Prince is common, that being ready to go to the water to be baptized, stepped back, and asked, Where are all my Ancestors now? And when he was told that they were in Hell, and that the Christians go to heaven, he told them then he would be no Christian, for he would go where his Ancestors are.

4. If this be good reasoning, then we may use it much more then you. For we would ask you, where be all our fore fathers that are dead since the Reformation? And where be all those that died between the Resurrection of Christ and the appearing of Popery, or the prevailing of it in the world? And where be all that die in the Eastern and Southern Churches, that are no subjects of the Pope of Rome? Have we not as little reason to think that all these millions of men are damned, as to think so of our Popish Ancestors.

5. Why should we be more foolish for our souls then for our bodies? I would not be poor because my Ancestors were so: Nor would I have the Stone or Gout because my Ancestors had them: Nor will I say that they are

no diseases, for fear of dishonoring my Ancestors that had them. And why then should I willfully lick up any Popish errors, because my Ancestors by the disadvantage of the times and of their education were cast upon them.

6. It is not our forefathers but God that we must follow: It is he, and not they, that is the Lord of our faith and of our souls. It will not excuse us in judgment for disobeying God, to say that our forefathers led us the way; Nor will it ease us in Hell to suffer with our forefathers. Christ tells us, Luk. 16, of a Rich man that in Hell would have had his brethren warned, lest they should follow him: But these men would have us to follow our forefathers, even in their sin against God. Whereas the Scriptures constantly make it an aggravation of a people's sin, when they follow their fathers in it, and take not warning by their falls. The Jewish Christians were redeemed from the vain conversation, received by Tradition from their fathers, 1 Pet. 1:18. Stephen tells the Jews, Act. 7:51,52. [As your Fathers did, so do yet which of the Prophets have not your Fathers persecuted?] Christ condemneth the Jews for allowing the deeds of their fathers, Luk. 11:47,48; Matth. 23:32. Nay God asketh wicked men where their fathers are, with a clean contrary meaning to this question of the Papists, [Zach. 1:4,5,6. Turn unto me saith the Lord of Hosts be not as your fathers unto whom the former Prophets have cried, Turn—your fathers, where are they, and the Prophets, do they live forever?] Ezek. 20:18,27,30. [I said unto their children,—walk ye not in the Statutes of your Fathers, neither observe their judgments, nor defile yourselves with their Idols: I am the Lord your God, walk in my Statutes—30. Say unto the house of Israel, Thus saith the Lord God; Are ye polluted after the manner of your fathers? And commit ye whoredom after their abominations? Jer. 44:9. [Have ye forgotten the wickedness of your fathers —They are not humbled even to this day.] The 18th of Ezek. is almost all of

this, that the son that followeth his father in his sins, shall die, and he that takes warning and avoideth his fathers sins, shall live. A hundred more such texts there are.

7. Our forefathers might be saved that sinned in the dark, and yet we be damned if we will follow them in the Light, or at least we shall be beaten with more stripes than they, if both must perish. They had not our means, or liberty: If they had seen and heard what we have done, many of them would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes. Shall we sin willfully after the knowledge of the Truth, because our fathers sinned ignorantly for want of information?

CHAP. XLII. Their presence of a Divine institution, and Natural Excellency of a visible Monarchical Government of the whole Church.

D*etect.* 33. Another of their frauds is, By pretending to a Divine Institution and Natural excellency of a visible Monarchical Government of the Church. And so they would derive it from Peter, from Christ yea from Nature, and God the Author of Nature.

All their writings take this as their strength. I shall at this time tie myself to Boverius his Cheating Consultation, *de Ratione verae fidei, &c. ad Carolum Principem*, intended for the perverting of our late King then in Spain.

In his *Part. 1. Reg. 6*, he asserteth that [besides Christ the invisible Head of the Church, there is a necessity that we acknowledge another certain visible Head subrogate to Christ, and instituted of him, without which none can be a member of Christ, or any way subsist alive.] (Yet Cardinal Richlieu will not have the Pope called Another Head.)

He begins his proof with a cheat, as gross as common, even an abuse of Cyprians words, *l. 1. Ep. 3*, where Cyprian speaks for the necessity of obeying One in the Church, meaning a particular Church, (as the whole

scope of his Epistle testifieth): And this man would make them simple believe that he speaks of the Universal Church.

His Reasons proceed thus: First (p. 128. &c.) he tells us, that [the invisible God thinks meet to Govern the world by visible men.] *Answ.* And who denies that Christ also governeth his Church by men?

But he concludeth hence [Num alia ration, &c. Shall we believe that Christ doth govern his Church in another way then God governeth the whole world?] *Answ.* Reader, doth not this man give up the cause of the Pope, and say as much against it fundamentally as a Protestant? Saith Boverins [We must not believe that Christ doth govern the Church in another way then God doth govern the world.] But (saith common sense and experience) God doth not govern the whole world by any one (or two, or ten) Universal Vice-monarch: Therefore Christ doth not Govern the Church by any one Universal Vice-monarch.

His next Reason is, [Because Christ was a visible Monarch once on earth himself. And if the Church had need of a visible Monarch then, it hath need of it still.] *Answ.* 1. Here the Reader may see, that it is to no less then to be Christ's successor, or a Vice-christ, that the Pope pretendeth. And then the Reason, if it were of any worth, would as well prove, that there must be one on earth still that may give the Holy Ghost immediately, and make Articles of Faith de novo, and Laws for the Church (with promise of Salvation) and may appoint new Offices and orders in the whole Church, &c. And why not one also to live without sin, and to die for our sins, and rise again, and be our Savior? And why not one to give us his own body and blood in the Sacrament?

2. Christ himself doth oppose himself to all terrestrial inhabitants, saying, [One is your Master, even Christ.] And what then? Why [Be not ye called

Masters? But he that is greatest among you, shall be your servant.] And [Be not ye called Rabbi, for one is your Master, even Christ, and all ye are Brethren,] Matth. 23:8. 9-12, where most evidently he shows that neither Peter, or any of his own Disciples were to be called Masters, as Christ was, nor was any such to be on earth, and so no Vice-christ; yea that all his Apostles being Brethren, were not to be Masters one to another, but servants: so that here is a plain bar put in against any of Peters Mastership or Headship of the Universal Church.

3. We do on these and many other Reasons, deny your consequence. It follows not that we must still have a Christ on earth, because we once had.

4. Christ hath chosen another Vicar (though invisible) as Tertullian calls him: and that is, the Holy Ghost, whom he sent to make such supply as was necessary, by various gifts proportioned to the several states and members of the Church.

5. If Christ would have left a Vice-christ upon earth, which should have been an Essential part, even the Head of his Church; he would doubtless have plainly expressed it in Scripture, and described his Office and Power, and given him directions to exercise it, and us directions how to know which is he, and to obey him: But there is not a word of any such matter in the Scripture, (nor Antiquity) when yet it is a point (if true) of such unspeakable importance.

6. You might at well feign, that if it were then necessary to have twelve or thirteen Apostles, it is so still: and if then it was necessary to have the gift of tongues and miracles, it is so still: which yet the Pope himself is void of.

7. It is not enough for your silly wit, to say its fit that Christ have a Successor, therefore he hath one: but let him that claimeth so high an honor

as to be the Vice-christ, produce his Commission, and prove his claim if he will be believed.

8. Christ is still the visible Head of his Church, seen in Heaven, and as much seen over all the world, except Judea and Egypt, as ever he was. When he was on earth, he was not visible at Rome, Spain, Asia, &c. He that is Emperor of the Turkish Monarchy, perhaps was never personally a hundred miles from Constantinople. The King of Spain is no visible Monarch in the West-Indies. And if all the world except Judea might be without a Present Christ, then why that may not as well as the rest, you must give him an account, if you will tie him to be here resident.

9. And yet if the Pope would usurp no more Power than Christ exercised visibly on earth, it would not be all so bad as it is or hath been. He would not then divide inheritances, nor be a temporal Prince, nor wear a Triple Crown, nor keep so glorious a Court and Retinue, nor depose Princes, nor deny them tribute, nor exempt his Prelates from it, nor from their judgment Seats, nor absolve their Subjects from their fidelity, &c. nor trouble the world as now he doth: He would not exercise the power of putting any to death: much less would he set up Inquisitions, to burn poor people for reading the Scriptures, or no being of his mind.

Pg. 133. He makes Christ the visible Pope while he was on earth, and tells us that Promulgating the Gospel, sending Apostles, instituting Sacraments, &c. were *Pontificalia munera*, Papal Offices. *Answ.* And indeed was Christ a Pope? And is the Pope a Christ? Jesus I know, and Peter and Paul I know: but this Vice-christ I know not. If indeed the Vice-christ have power to do these Papal works, to promulgate a new Gospel, to send out Apostles, to institute Sacraments, &c. as Christ did, let us but know which be the Popes Sacraments, and which be Christ's; which be the Popes Apostles, and which

be Christ's; and which is the Popes Gospel, and which is Christ's, and we shall use them accordingly. The Law and Testimony will help us to distinguish them.

Pg. 134. He comes to prove that Christ hath a Successor: and his first proof is from Mic. 2. Let the Reader peruse it, and judge without any help of mine, what proof there is that the Pope is a Vice-christ.

The next is in Hos. 1, which speaketh of the return of the Israelites from Captivity. Let the Reader make his best on it for the Pope, for I think it not worth my labor to confute the Papists impudent perverting such Texts as these.

By the way he tells us (as Card. Richlieu and the rest commonly do) that [its no dishonor to Christ to have a Deputy, no more than for the King of England to have a Deputy, or Vice-king in Ireland.] *Answ.* 1. But our first question is, Whether de facto such a thing be? Prove that Christ hath Commissioned a Vice-christ, and we will not presume to say that he hath dishonored himself.

2. Thought it should not dishonor Christ, it is such a transcendent honor to man, as we will not believe that any man hath, that proveth not his claim. It was no dishonor to the Godhead to be united to the manhood of Christ in Personal union; but if the Pope say, that the Godhead is thus united to his manhood, verily I will not believe him.

3. Though we should not have presumed to question Christ if he had done it, yet we must presume to tell the Pope that he is guilty of dishonoring Christ by his usurpation. 1. Because he sets up himself as Vice-christ, without his Commission; and takes that to himself, that is, Christ's Prerogative. God saith, This is my beloved Son in whom I am well-pleased, Hear him] And the Papists say of the Pope, This is the Vice-christ, Hear

him] 2. Because the Power of a King is more communicable, then the Power of Christ, it being such as is fit for one mere man as well as for another. But the Power of Christ is such as no mere man is fit for. The capacity of the Subject is Considerable as Necessary to the reception of the form of Power. He that is God as well as Man is fit for a Universal Monarchy, when he that is mere man is not. From whence we argue thus.

If there was never such a thing by God's institution as a mere man to be the Christ or Universal Head of the Church, then there is no such thing to be imagined now: But there never was such a thing: Therefore there is no such — Christ that was the visible Head was God and Man: when the Pope is so, we will believe in him as his Successor.

4. It would ruin the Church to have built on so sandy a foundation, and to have laid so much work on one that is so unable to perform it. Doubtless common reason tells us, that if God made any one man the Monarch of the whole world (especially leaving his Commission as obscure, as the Popes is, were it any) and should not give him a divine or supra-human strength to execute it, it would be the confusion of the world. I am not well acquainted with the Power of Angels; but I hope without dishonoring them, I may suspect, that the due managing of such a Universal Monarchy is above their abilities: At least I am confident, it is an honor that their Modesty and Reverence of Christ will not permit them to own, as the Pope doth. If this Vice-christ be not a false Christ, he may apply that of Heb. 1. [Being made so much better than Angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name then they: For unto which of the Angels said he at any time] thou art the Successor of Christ, thou art the Universal Head of the Church? Whether the Pope will be called the Vice-son of God, the Vice-savior, and say, [Let all the Angels worship him; sit thou on my right hand, &c.] I leave

to his modesty to consider? But I must profess here to the Reader, that though my modesty and consciousness of my weakness, hath made me so suspicious, lest I understand not the Apocalypse, as to suspend my judgment, whether the Pope be the Antichrist, the Beast, &c. yet the reading of their serious immodest arguing's, to prove the Pope to be the Vice-christ on Earth, doth exceedingly more increase my suspicion that he is The Antichrist. For to be Peters Successor, as a first Apostle, is a contemptible thing in these men eyes. This is not it that they plead for. Bellarmine (ubi supr.) expressly tells us, that the Pope succeeds not Peter as an Apostle. No, it is as a Vice-christ to the whole Church, as Boverius here professedly maintaineth. And this they make the Foundation of their Catholic Church, and the acknowledgement of it Essential to every member of it. Which I even tremble to read and think of.

Next Boverius comes to his proofs from the New-Testament. And those are the same that I have answered (as Bellarmine's) in my [Safe Religion] and are a hundred times answered by our writers, and therefore the Reader may excuse me, if I put him to no long trouble about them.

The first is the old [Tues Petrus, and in *hanc Petram*, &c.] *Answ.* 1. He doth not say [Thou art Christ, or the Vice-christ, or my Successor, or the Universal Monarch of the Church: No such words as these. 2. It is Christ himself her that is called the Rock, and not Peter. q. d. [Thy name is Peter who confessest me, in allusion to which I tell thee, that I whom thou hast confessed am Petra, the Rock upon which I will build me a Church, which the gates of Hell shall not prevail against.] As the Apostle saith of the spiritual Rock, 1 Cor. 10. That Rock was Christ.] So may I of this.

3. But if it had been spoken of Peter, it had been no more than is spoken of the other Apostles, on whom as on a Foundation the Church is said to be

built, Jesus Christ himself being the head corner stone, Eph. 2:20.

But what need we more, if we put not out our eyes, then to find in all the New Testament, that Peter was never called or taken for a Vice-christ by the Apostles, (unless Secundum quid, as every Ambassador of Christ is that speaks his message in his stead, 2 Cor. 5:19,20.) and that he never is said to exercise any Universal Government over the rest of the Apostles, nor so much as give them a Law, or Convent them before him, or send them out, or do anymore in Ruling them, then they in Ruling him, nor so much as Paul did in rebuking him to his face for disorderly walking, &c. Gal. 2. Yea when Paul calls them carnal that sided with Peter, though but in the same over-valuing way as others did of Apollos and Paul, saying [I am of Paul, and I am of Apollo, and I am of Cephas,] 1 Cor. 1:12. He saith to them that said [I am of Christ] [Is Christ divided?] as showing that he was the common Universal Head and Master of them all. But when he mentioneth mere men, he hath no such word: He saith not [Is Peter divided] But implying all in one, he saith [Was Paul crucified for you, or were ye baptized into the name of Paul?] And [Who then is Paul, and who is Apollo? (implying also, Who is Peter) but Ministers by whom ye believed as the Lord gave to every man, 1 Cor. 3:5.] See 1 Cor. 4:6.

Pag. 144. Boverius plays his game with Metaphors and Similitudes, and saith [The Church is Christ's Kingdom, an Army, a Sheepfold, a House, a Ship, or Noah's Ark; and whats a Kingdom without a visible King: or an Army without a Visible General: or a Flock without a visible Shepherd: or a House without a Housholder: or a Ship without a Pilot?] *Answ.* 1. The whole earth is God's Kingdom! And can he not Govern it without a Visible Monarch? Why then did the world never hear of such a man? Yea the whole world is the Kingdom of Christ himself, though not in that special sort as

his Church is: For all Power in heaven and earth is given him, Matth. 28:18,19, and for that end he Dyed, Rose and Revived, that he might be Lord of the Dead and Living, Rom. 14:9, and he is made Head over all things to the Church, Eph. 1:22,23. And hath this Kingdom a Universal Visible Monarch? Yes: the Pope is the man: Long hath he laid claim to it. Princes, you see whose hands your Crowns and Kingdoms are in: Deceive not yourselves, they are the Popes: For certainly they are all Christ's; and if he be to be believed, he is the Vice-christ, and so succeedeth him in the Monarchy of the world. But then why doth not this simple Pope lay claim to the Empire of Indostan, and Tartary, and China, and Constantinople, as well as of these smaller Kingdoms of Europe?

2. And for the Metaphorical title of an Army, I answer, It sufficeth that it hath an Universal General in Heaven, that can command it twice as well there as the Pope can on earth, yea and is as Visible to the Antipodes, yea to me, as ever the Pope was. All the world is God's Army: But I will not say that the Pope or any man is General of it (save Christ) nor will I call him, The Lord of Hosts.

3. And for the Sheepfold of Christ, he hath appointed particular Shepherds to watch for the several parts of the flock. But if one man were to look to all the sheep in the world, he would make such work as the Pope would do with the sheep of Christ. If you tell us still that Christ is out of sight, I answer, He is even at hand: he is coming: he will not be long: In the meantime it is the duty of every Pastor [to feed the flock of God that is among them—not as Lord's over God's Heritage (as the Vice-christ would be:) and when the chief Shepherd doth appear, we shall receive the Crown,] 1 Pet. 5:1-4. Peter never dreamed, poor man, that he was the chief Shepherd himself.

4. For the Metaphor of a Family, I answer, That God can Govern all the Families in the world: and when the Pope can do so, then all the world shall acknowledge him the Master of the Family. Till then we have learned that the whole Family of Heaven and Earth is named of God, and of the Redeemer-God-and-Man: but not of the Pope of Rome.

5. And for the similitude of a Ship, I answer, One man can Govern a ship of the common size; but a ship as big as all the world, I think no man but Christ can govern: And so confident am I in this opinion, that I profess I will not be in that ship as big as the world which the Pope shall undertake to Govern, if I do but know how to get out of it.

Pg. 146. He goes on to tell us, that even the bruits have their Governors, and instanceth in the Bees. *Answ.* I am not well acquainted with Irrational Governors or Governments: but seriously it is no Article of my faith, that one Be can Govern all the Bees in the world: Nor one Ape all the Apes in the world. Let it suffice the Pope that every particular Church be a Be-hive, and every Hive have its proper Governor.

Next he again tells Prince Charles [that we should not deny that to the Church which we see is necessary to all human Societies] *Answ.* Was this man in his wits! Have all Societies, or any Society a Universal Human Governor? Who is it that is the Universal Chancellor of all the Academics on Earth? Who is it that is the Ruler of all the Colleges of Physicians in the world? I know what Schoolmaster we have in our own School here; but I never heard of a Universal Schoolmaster for all the world; nor for all England: who is the Universal Governor of all the Companies of Merchants in the world? Or who is the Universal King?

In the Conclusion he gathers up all into seven reasons, Why the Church should have a Vice-christ [1. That the militant Church might be like the

triumphant, who have one Invisible Head.] *Answ.* 1. Christ is visible to the Church in Heaven. 2. When you have proved that any mere man is Christ, or Head in Heaven, then we will grant that a mere man shall be Christ and Head on earth. 3. Earth is not yet fit to be conformed to Heaven in its Government. 4. Is it not the truest conformity, that Heaven and Earth have one and the same Lord, though visible to them and not to us, yet ruling us by visible officers? 5. But if this will not serve, lets have on earth a visible Government: therefore let us have no Pope that is invisible to almost all the world; but Pastors that are visible in their particular Churches.

The second Reason is [That the militant Church differ not from itself, but as each particular Church hath one Visible Head or Pastor, so the whole should have.] *Answ.* 1. Content, if the Pope can show as good a Commission for the whole, and be as able to Govern the whole, and will really be present with the whole, and visible to them. 2. Is the world unlike itself, if all the world have not one King, as every particular Kingdom hath? Or one Schoolmaster, as every particular School hath?

The third Reason is [For preserving Unity.] *Answ.* 1. And well it is done by you? And what unity will you keep at the Antipodes? Or in the vast dominions of Heathen and Mahometan Princes, where Christians are dispersed, but you come not near them? 2. We have a better unity already in One God, One Christ, One Spirit, One Gospel, One Baptism, One Hope, &c. 3. The Mohammedans have more unity than you.

The fourth Reason is [To fulfill the doctrine of the Prophets and Christ.] *Answ.* You should have better shown such a doctrine before you had made use of it as a reason.

The fifth Reason is [That the Christian Church may be like the Jewish] *Answ.* When the Christian universal Church is no bigger than the Jewish,

that one may Govern it as well, we will hearken to you: Let the Pope undertake no larger a Circuit.

The sixth Reason is [That there may be someone Supreme judge to punish Bishops, and define matters of faith, call Councils, extinguish heresies and schisms.] *Answ.* 1. One Christ is enough for the Catholic Church for all these uses. I find the Articles of saith as well defined by Christ, as by the Vice-christ. I have searched the writings both of Christ and the Vice-christ, and in my poor judgment there is no comparison between them, nor hath the Pope one jot mended the Scripture. 2. And for Heresies and Schisms, Christ hath extinguished many, but for ought I see the Pope rather increaseth them. In good sadness, did God send John the twenty second, alias the twenty third, to extinguish Heresies, with all those Abominations and all that Infidelity that was charged on him by a General Council? And was John the thirteenth a Vice-christ to extinguish Heresies by all that diabolical villainy that he was deposed for by a Council? 3. And for calling Councils, they have learnt more wit, since Constance and Basil have let them know what Councils mean to do by them. Unless they can pack up forty or fifty (or what if it were a hundred, or two hundred) as they did at Trent, to say their lesson, as it was brought to them from Rome, and to call themselves a General Council for folks to laugh at them. Is this all that we must have a Vice-Christ for? How many General Councils did the Pope call for six hundred years after Christ? Tell us without Lying, and let us see why he was created.

The seventh Reason is [That the Divine Institution of Christ, and the plain Scripture about Peters Primacy may take place.] *Answ.* 1. Where shall a man that hath eyes find your pretended institution? The blind may sooner find it by the half. 2. Primacy and Monarchy are not all one. And

Bellarmine can tell you, that its one thing to be the first Apostle, and another thing to be the Vice-christ to the Church Universal. Peter was none such. 3. No nor was he properly anymore the Bishop of Rome then of many another place. Antioch claims the inheritance by birth-right, as Peters first supposed seat, and Jerusalem before them both.

Well, Reader thou seest now how Babel is built, and what is the strongest stuff that the learned Spaniards had to assault Prince Charles with: For verily I have not bawked their strength: And were it not for the loss of precious time to you and me, I would quickly thus show you the vanity of abundance more of their most applauded writings.

CHAP. XLIII. Their new device of receiving nothing as Scripture Evidence; but the express words.

D*etect.* 34. Another of their Devices is, to take nothing as Evidence from Scripture, but the Letters or express words.

They will not endure to hear of consequences, no nor Synonimal expressions. Bellarmine himself saith (*de verb. Dei, lib. 3, c. 3.*) [*Convenit inter nos & adversarios, ex solo literali sensu, peti de bere argumenta efficacia: nam eum sensum qui ex verbis immediate colligitur, certum est sensum esse spiritus sancti*.] But this may admit a fair interpretation. It was Cardinal Peronius in his Reply against King James that is judged the deviser of this Deceit: but Gonterius and Veronius the Jesuits have perfected it. I shall say but little of it, because it is already detected and refelled by Paul Ferrius 1618, and Isaaccus Chorinus 1623, and Nic. Vedelius 1628, at large. Yea Vedelius shows, *c. 6, p. 50. &c*. that it was hatched in Germany by the Lutherans for the defending of Consubstantiation, and from them borrowed by the Revolter Perron.

For our parts, the cunning Sophisters shall find us very Reasonable with them in this point: but if they be fallen out with Reason itself, there's no

way to please them but by turning bruits. And we will not buy their favor at those rates.

Our judgment in this point, I shall lay down distinctly, though briefly, as followeth. 1. The Holy Scripture is the Doctrine, Testament and Law of Christ. And we shall add nothing to it, nor take ought from it. The use of it as a doctrine, is to inform us of the will of God in the points there written. The use of it as a Testament, is to signify to us the last will of our Lord concerning our duty and Salvation. The use of it as a Law, is to appoint us our Duty and Reward, or Punishment; and to be the Rule of our obedience, and in a sort, the Rule by which we shall be judged.

2. All Laws are made to Reasonable creatures, and suppose the use of Reason for the understanding them. To use Reason about the Law, is not to add to the Law.

3. The subject must have this use of Reason to discern the sense of the Law that he may obey it. And the judge must Rationally pass the sentence by it.

4. This is the Application of the Law to the fact and person: And though the fact and person be not in the Law, yet the Application of the Law to the fact and person is no addition to it. Otherwise to use any such thing would be to add to it.

5. As the fact is distinct from the Law, so must the sentence of the Judge be, which results from both.

6. To speak the same sense or thing in equipollent terms, is not to add to the Law in matter or sense.

7. Yet we maintain the Scripture sufficiency in *suo genere*, in terms and sense: So that we shall confess that equipollent words are only Holy Scripture as to sense, but not as to the terms.

8. But there is no Law but may many ways be broken, and no Doctrine but may be diverse ways opposed. And therefore though we yield that nothing but the express words of God are the Scripture, for terms and sense, yet many thousand words may be against Scripture, that be not there expressly forbidden in terms.

9. The Law of Nature is God's Law, and the Light of Nature is his Revelation. And therefore that which the Light of Nature seeth immediately in Nature, or that which it seeth from Scripture and Nature compared together, and soundly concludeth from these premises, is truly a revelation from God.

10. The Conclusion followeth the more debile of the Premises, in point of evidence or certainty to us. Where Scripture is the more debile, there the conclusion is of Scripture faith: but where the fact or Proposition from the Light of Nature is more debile, there the conclusion is of Natural Evidence: But in both, of Divine discovery. For there is no Truth and Light but from God the Father of Lights. This is our judgment herein.

Now for the Papists, you may see their folly thus; 1. If nothing but the bare words of a Law may be heard in Trials, then all Laws in the world are void and vain. For the subjects be not all named in them; nor the fact-named: And what then have witnesses, and jurors, and judges to do? The Promise saith, He that believeth shall be saved: But it doth not say that Bellarmine or Veronius believeth: Doth it follow, that therefore they may make no use of it for the comforting of their souls in the hopes of Salvation: The Threatening saith, that he that believeth not is condemned: But it saith not that such or such a man believeth not: should they not therefore fear the threatening?

2. By this trick they would condemn Christ himself also, as adding to the Law in judgment. He will say to them, I was hungry and ye fed me not, &c. But where said the Scripture so, that such or such a man fed not Christ? It needs not: Christ knows the fact without the Scripture. The Scripture is sufficient to its own use, to be Rule of Obedience and Judgment: but it is not sufficient to every other use which it was never made for. The Law said to Cain, Thou shalt not murder. But it said not to him, Thou hast killed thy brother, therefore thou shalt die. It was the Judges part to deliver this.

3. By this trick they would give a man leave to vent any Blasphemy, or do any villainy, changing but the name. But they shall find that the Law intended not bare words, but by words to signify things: And if they do the things prohibited, or hold the opinions condemned, whatever names or words they clothe them with, they shall feel the punishment.

4. By this they would leave almost nothing provable by the Scripture, seeing a Papist or Heretic may put the same into other terms, and then call for the Proof of that. For example, they may ask where God commandeth or instituteth any one of the Sacraments in Scripture? And when we tell them where Baptism and the Lord's Supper were instituted, they may reply, that there is no mention of Sacraments; and so turn real Controversies into verbal.

5. Yea it seems by this they would make all Translations to be of little use. And a man might lawfully sin in English, because God for bad it only in Hebrew and Greek.

6. If this be the way of it, let us remember that they must in Reason stand to their own Rules. Let them tell us then what Scripture saith, that Peter was the Vicar of Christ, or the Head of the Catholic Church: or the Bishop of Rome, or that the Pope is his Successor, or that the Pope is the Vice-christ,

or Universal Bishop. Where is there express Scripture for any of this? Yea so much as Bellarmine's Literal sense.

7. And why do not these blind and partial men see, that the same course also must be taken with their own Laws? And that all their Decretals and Canons are insufficient, according to these Rules. It's easy for any Heretic to form up his Error into other words then those condemned by Pope or Council: And if you go again to the Pope, and get him to condemn those new expressions, the men in Mexico may use them long to the detriment of the souls of men, before the damnatory sentence be brought to them. And when it comes, they can again word their Heresy anew. The Jansenists in France show how well the Popes decision of wordy Controversies is understood, and doth avail. But really if they will hold that no part of the Popes Laws oblige but in the literal sense, or that none offend that violate not the Letter, they will make a great alteration in their affairs. And perhaps any of their subjects may Blaspheme the Pope himself in French, Dutch, Irish, English, Slavonian, &c. because he forbids it only in Latin; For if Translations be not God's Word, then they are not the Popes word neither. A pretty crochet for a Jesuit. It is mendacium, and not a Lye, that the Pope forbids. It is said that a Traitor or Murderer may be hanged: but it is not said that such or such a man shall be hanged; or that he was a traitor or murderer.

Their common instance is, [The Scripture nowhere calls itself the whole word of God; nor nowhere tells us which be Canonical Books, &c. and yet these are Articles of Faith.] *Answ.* 1. The Scripture doth call itself the Word of God, and signify its own sufficiency, and several Books have particular testimonies to be Canonical. 2. Though secondarily so far as Scripture affirmeth its own Divinity, it be to be believed: yet Primarily, that this is

God's Word, and that these are the Books, and that they are not corrupted, and that they are all, &c. are points of knowledge antecedent in order of nature to Divine Belief of them. There are two great Foundations antecedent to the Matter of Divine Faith. The one is God's veracity; that God cannot lie: The other is, His Revelations; that This is God's Word: The first is the Formal Object of Faith: The second is a Necessary Medium between the formal object and the subject; sine quo non, without which there is no possibility of Believing. The Material object called the Articles of Faith, presuppose both these, as points of Knowledge, proved to us by their proper evidence. And that this is All the Word of God, is a mere Consequence, from the actual Tradition of this much and no more.

To give you an undeniable illustration by instance. Let us inquire which be the Administering Laws of this Common-wealth. And we shall find that 1. The Authority of the Law-givers is none of them, for that is in the Constitution, before the Administration; and it is the formal objectum of every Law, which is more noble than the Material object: 2. And the Promulgation of these Laws, is not itself a Law; but a necessary Medium, sine quo non, to the actual obligation of the Law. 3. And that there is no other Laws but these, is not a Law; but a point known by the non-promulgation of more. 4. And that all these Laws are the same that they pretend to be, and that they are not changed or depraved since, this is not a Law neither, but a Truth to be proved by Common Reason, from the Evidences that may be brought from Records, Practice, and abundance more.

So is it in our Case. 1. That God is True, and the Sovereign Rector, is first a point to be known by evidence; the one being the formal object of Faith, and the other the formal object of obedience: and easily proved by Natural

Light, before we come to Scripture. 2. And that this is God's Revelation, or Promulgation of his Law, is a point also first to be proved by Reason, not before we see the Book or hear the Word, but out of the Book or Doctrine itself, (*propria luce*) together with the full Historical Evidence, and many other reasons, which in order of Nature lie before our Obligation *fide divina* to believe. So that this is not Primarily an Article of Faith, but somewhat higher, as being the Necessary Medium of our believing. 3. And that there is no other Law, or Faith, is not Primarily a Law or Article of Faith, but a Truth proved by the Non-Revelation or Promulgation of any other to the world. He that will prove us obliged to believe more, must prove the valid Promulgation or Revelation of more. 4. And that these Books are the same, and not corrupted, is not directly and primarily an Article of Faith, but an Historical verity to be proved as abovesaid. And yet secondarily, Scripture is a witness to all or most of these, and so they are de fide. But of this I refer the Reader for fuller satisfaction to my Preface before my second Part of the Saints Rest.

And thus it is manifest, that it is an unreasonable demand of the Papists to call for express Scripture, for these that are not Articles of Faith in proper sense.

CHAP. XLIV. They choose such persons to dispute with against whom they have some notable advantage.

D*etect.* 35. One of their Practical Deceits consisteth in the choosing of such persons to dispute with, against whom they find that they have some notable advantage.

1. Commonly they deal with women and ignorant people in secret, who they know are not able to gainsay their falsest, silliest reasonings.

2. If they deal with a Minister, it is usually with one that hath some at least of these disadvantages. 1. Either with some young or weak unstudied man, that is not verst in their way of Controversy. 2. Or one that is not of so voluble and plausible a tongue as others. For they know how much the tonguing and toning of the matter doth take with the common people. 3. Or with one that hath a discontented people, that bear him some ill will, and are ready to hearken to any one that contradicteth him. 4. Or else with one that hath fixed upon some unwarrantable notions, and is like to deal with them upon terms that will not hold. And if they see one hole in a man's way of arguing's, they will turn all the brunt of the Contention upon that, as if the discovery of his peculiar Error or weakness were the Confutation of his

Cause. And none give them greater advantage here, then those that run into some contrary extreme. They think to be Orthodox by going as far from Popery as the furthest; About many notions in the matter of Justification, Certainty of Salvation, the nature of Faith, the use of Works, &c. they will be sure to go with the furthest. And a Jesuit will desire no better sport, then to have the baiting of one that holds any such opinion, as he knows himself easily able to disgrace. One unsound Opinion or Argument is a great disadvantage to the most learned Disputant. Most of all the insulting's and success of the Papists, is from some such unsound passages that they pick up from some Writers of our own (as I said before.) And they set all those together, and tell the world that This is the Protestant Religion. Just as if I should give the Description of a Nobleman from all the blemishes that ever I saw in any Nobleman. As if I have seen one crook-backed, another blind, another lame, another dumb, another deaf, another a whoremonger, another a drunkard, &c. I should say, that A Nobleman is a whoremonger, and drunkard, &c. that hath neither eyes, nor ears, nor limbs to bear him, &c. So deal they by Protestants; And what a Character could we give of Papists on these terms?

But I would entreat all the Ministers of Christ to take heed of giving them any such advantage. By over-doing, and running too far into contrary extremes, you will sooner advantage them, and give them the day, then the weakest Disputants that stand on safer grounds. Inconsiderate heat, and self-conceitedness, and making a faction of Religion, is it that carrieth many into extremes: when Judgment, and Charity, and Experience, are all for Moderation, and standing on safe ground. A Davenant, a Lud. Crocius, a Cameron, a Dallaeus, &c. will more successfully confute an Arminian, then a Maccovius, a—so it is here. The world sees in the Answer of Knot, what

an advantage Chillingworth had by his Principles; when the Jesuit having little but the reproachful slander of a Socinian name and cause to answer with, hath lost the day, and shown the world how little can be said for Popery.

CHAP. XLV. Their designs to divide us, or sow Heresies among the Vulgar, and then draw them to some odious practices.

D*etect.* 36. Another of their Practical frauds is in seeking to Divide the Protestants among themselves, or to break them into Sects, or poison the ductile sort with Heresies, and then to draw them to some odious practices, to cast a disgrace on the Protestant Cause.

In this and such Hellish practices as this, they have been more successful than in all their Disputations. But whether the Cause be of Heaven or Hell that must be thus upheld, I leave to the considerate to judge.

What they have done abroad in this way, I leave others to inquire that are more fit; But we all smart by what they have done at home.

Yet this I may well say, that if their own secular Priests are to be believed, (as Watson and many more) It is their Jesuits that have set many Nations in those flames, whose cause the world hath not observed. And I may well set down the words of a Priest of their own, John Brown, aged seventy-two, in his Voluntary Confession to a Committee of Parliament, as it is in *Mr. Prynne's Introduct. p. 202*.

Saith he [The whole Christian world doth acknowledge the prediction which the University of Paris doth foresee in two several Decrees they made Anno 1565. When the Society of Jesuits did labor to be members of that University: *Hoc genus hominum natus est ad interitum Christianae Reipubliae & subvertionem literarum*. They were the only cause of the troubles which fell out in Muscovie, when under pretense to reduce the Latin Church, and plant themselves, and destroy the Greek Church, the poor King Demetrius and his Queen, and those that followed him from Polonia were all in one night murdered by the monstrous Usurper of the Crown, and the true progeny rooted out. They were the only cause that moved the Swedes to take Arms against their lawful King Sigismund, and chased him to Poland: and neither he nor his successors were ever able to take possession of Sweden. For the Jesuits intention was to bring in the Romish Religion, and root out Protestants. They were the only cause that moved the Polonians to take Arms against the said Sigismund, because they had persuaded him to marry two sisters, one after the other; both of the house of Austria. They have been the sole cause of the war entered in Germany since the year one thousand six hundred and nineteen, as Pope Paulus 15th, told the General of their Order, called Vicelescus, for their avarice, pretending to take all the Church lands from the Hussites in Bohemia to themselves; which hath caused the death of many thousand by sword, famine and pestilence in Germany. They have been the cause of civil wars in France, during all which time moving the French King to take Arms against his own subjects the Protestants, where innumerable people have lost their lives, as the siege of Rochell and other places will give sufficient proof. For the Jesuits intentions were to set their society in all Cities and Towns conquered by the King, and quite to abolish the Protestants. They were the cause of the

murder of the last King of France. They were the only projectors of the Gunpowder Treason, and their Penitents the actors thereof. They were the only cause (namely Father Parsons) that incensed the Pope to send so many fulminate Breves to these Kingdoms, to hinder the Oath of Allegiance and lawful Obedience to their temporal Prince, that they might still fish in troubled waters. Their damnable doctrine to destroy and depose Kings, hath been the cause of the Civil wars, likely to befall these Kingdoms, if God in mercy do not stop it] So far the Popish Priest.

You see here, if their own pens are to be credited, those very Actions of the Swedes, Germans, French, which they cast as a reproach in the face of the Protestant; (as you may see in a Book called The Image of the two Churches) were indeed their own, and to be laid at their own doors. I omit abundance of better proof, because I will give them the words of none but themselves in this.

How far they were the causes of the old broils in Scotland, Knox, and Spotswood, and all their later Histories will tell you.

How busy they were in England in Queen Elizabeth's days, the Popes Bulls, and the many Treacheries committed signify. Even in King James his days, who wrote against them, they so far prevailed, as to cause him to swear to those Articles for Toleration of Popery, in order to the Spanish Match, which you may read in Prynne's *Introduct. p. 44,45*. Yea so far as to prevail with King James before the Lord's of his Council to say, that [His Mother suffered Martyrdom in this Realm for the profession of the Catholic Religion; a Religion which had been publicly professed for many ages in this Realm, confirmed by many great and excellent Emperors, and famous in all Ecclesiastical Histories, by an infinite number of Martyrs, who had sealed it with their blood: that the Catholics well knew that there was in him

a grand affection to the Catholic Religion in so much that they believed at Rome that he did but dissemble his Religion to obtain the Crown of England: That now he had maturely considered the penury and calamities of the Roman Catholics, who were in the number of his faithful subjects, and was resolved to relieve them; and therefore did from thenceforth take all his Roman Catholic subjects into his protection, permitting them the liberty and entire exercise of their Religion, and liberty to celebrate the Mass with other Divine offices of their Religion without any inquisition, process or molestation from that day forwards.] And so he goes on restoring them to their estates, commanding all Officers to hold their hands, and for what cause so ever it be, not to attempt to grieve or molest the said Catholics neither in public or private in the liberty of the exercise of their Religion, upon pain of being reputed guilty of high Treason, &c.] *Prin. ubi sup. p. 30, and Mercur. Gal. To. 9, p. 485*.

So far prevailed they with Prince Charles our late King, as to cause him to write that Letter to the Pope which you may read *Mercur. Franc. To. 9. An. 1623, p. 509,510*, and in Prynne's *Introduct. p. 38*, which I have no mind to recite: and also they prevailed with him to swear to the Spanish conditions, and also that he would [permit at all times, that any should freely propose to him the Arguments of the Catholic Religion, without giving any impediment: and that he would never directly or indirectly permit any to speak to the Infanta against the same.]

What a hand the Papists had in the late Innovations, and wars in England, and Scotland, and Ireland, is too evident. How they designed the reducing of England to the Pope in the Spanish, and after in the French match, and how in prosecution of it, they had their Nuntio's here at London, and erected their houses of Jesuits, Capuchins, and Nuns; how far they

instigated the Court and Prelates to silence, and suspend, and banish Godly Ministers, and to ensnare them by the bowing to Altars, by the Book for dancing on the Lord's days, and many such things; how far they urged them on against the Scots, I had rather you would read in Mr. Prynne's Works of Darkness brought to Light, and Canterburies Trial, and his Rome's Master piece, and his Royal Favorite, then hear it from me: And if any reader be disaffected to the reciter of it, let them at least peruse impartially the Evidences produced by him.

It was one of their own Religion, who in remorse of Conscience opened the Plot in which they were engaged, to Andreas ab Habernfield, Physician to the Queen of Bohemia, who told it Sr. Will. Boswell, the Kings Agent at Hague; which was to subvert the Protestant Religion, and set up Popery, and reconcile us to Rome; and to that end to attempt the perverting of the King, and to engage us in a war with Scotland, and if the King would not be perverted, then to poison him.

The Jesuits (of whom four sorts were planted in London, and had built them a College, having Cardinal Barbarino for their Protector) crept into all Societies, and acted all parts, (save the peace-makers,) and being a foreseeing Generation, they looked further before them then the short witted men whom they over-reached. When they had by the Countenance of the Queen got so considerable a strength at the Court, and so much interest in the Prelates, and influence on all Ecclesiastical affairs, they set afoot the foresaid innovations in worship, against the Lord's Day, &c. and the foresaid persecutions of faithful, yea and conformable Ministers; and still they went Dilemmatically to work, thinking to make sure which way ever things went, to effects their ends. They see that either their first attempt would prevail without opposition or not: If it do, then the Calvinists, and

Puritan, and Protestant Preachers will be removed, and the places filled with Arminians, and masked Papists, and ignorant men, unable to resist them, and ductile worldlings, that will always be on the stronger side, and their ends will be easily attained. But if there be any Opposition, Murmuring, Discontents, either it will provoke the Discontented to open Defense and Resistance, or not: If not, their Discontents will hurt none but themselves. If it do, then either they will be crushed in the beginning, or able to bring it to a war. If the first; then we shall have the Day, and this to boot, that they will lie under the Odium of Rebellion, and be trod the lower, and be the less able ever to rise: and we shall be able with ease to drive on the change to a higher degree, in Opposition to so odious a party. But if they he able to make a war of it, either they will be conquered, or conquer, or make Peace. The last is most unlikely, because Jealousies and Engagements will presently be multiplied, so that an apparent necessity will seem to lie on each party not to trust the other: And the flames are easier to be kept in then kindled: And if so unlikely a thing should come to pass, yet it must needs be to our advantage. For we will openly all appear for the King, and so in England and Ireland we shall be considerable: He will remember that he was helped by us, and look on the Protestants and Puritans as Rebels, and take his next advantage against them, or at least be at a greater distance from them then before: For such a war will never out of his mind, nor will he think himself safe till he hath disabled them from doing the like again. But if one part conquer it will be the King, or the Puritans (for so the Protestants must now be called) If the King prevail, then will the Puritans be totally trod down, and we by whose help the victory was got, shall certainly be incomparably better than we are, if not have presently all our will. For our fidelity will be predicated: the Rebells will be odious: So that

their very names will be a scorn, and there will be no great resistance of us (For saith Mr. Middleton in his Letter to the A. B. of Canterb. in Prynne's *Introduct. p. 142,143*. The Jesuit (at Florence, lately returned from England, who pretends to have made a strict discovery of the state of England as it stands for Religion) saith, that the Puritans are shrewd fellows, but those which are counted good Protestants are fair conditioned honest men, and think they may be saved in any Religion.) But if the Puritans get the day (which is a most unlikely thing) yet shall we make great advantage of it; For 1. They will be unsettled and all in pieces, and not know how to settle the Government: And saith the Jesuits Letter, found in the A. B. of Cant. Study in Prynne's *Introduct. p. 89,90*. [Our foundation must be Mutation: this will cause a Relaxation; which serves as so many violent diseases, as the Stone, Gout, &c. to the speedy destruction, &c.] 2. We shall necessitate the Puritan Protestants to keep the King as a Prisoner, or else to put him to death; If they keep him as a Prisoner, his diligence, and friends, and their own divisions, will either work his deliverance, and give him the day again by our help, or at least will keep the State in a continual unsettledness, and will be an Odium on them. If they cut him off (which we will rather promote, lest they should make use of his extremities to any advantage) then 1. We shall procure the Odium of King-killing to fall upon them, which they are wont to cast upon us and so shall be able to disburden ourselves. 2. And we shall have them all to pieces in distractions. For 3. Either they will then set up a new King, or the Parliament will keep the power, changing the Government into a Democracy. The first cannot be done without great concussions, and new wars; and we shall have opportunity to have a hand in all. And if it be done, it may be much to our advantage. The second will apparently by factions and distractions give us footing for continual

attempts. But to make all sure, we will secretly have our party among the Puritans also, that we may be sure to maintain our Interest which way ever the world go] The event with common reason and many full discoveries show, that this was the frame of the Papists plot.

And what power and interest they had in the Kings Armies and Counsels in the wars, is a thing that needs no further discovery. But had they any Interest in the Councils and Forces of the Parliament? *Answ.* It will be expected that he that asserteth anything in matters of this moment, should prove it by more than moral evidence of greatest probabilities: and therefore I shall be sparing in my Assertions: but yet I shall say in general, that though the business would be troublesome, chargeable and tedious, to call together the Witnesses that are necessary, yet Witnesses and Evidences may be had, to prove that the Papists have had more to do in our affairs, then most men are aware of, without any positive Assertions; therefore I desire them that can see a cause in its effects, but to follow these streams till they find the Fountain. 1. Whence came those motions against the Ministry and Churches into our Councils? Whence was it that so many men of note did call the friends of the Ministry [Priest ridden fellows] and the Ministers [Jack Presbyters] to teach the Nation to bring them into scorn? I well know that all this came from Hell. But whether by the way of Rome. I leave to your inquiry. Yea, whence was it that motions have been made to pull down all the Ministry at once? Was this by Protestants?

2. Whence came the doctrine contended for by Sir H. V. and others, against the Power of the Magistrate in matters of Religion, and for Universal Liberty in Religion? I know the Papists are not for such liberty in Spain, or anywhere, where they can hinder it: but with all I know, that it is one of their fundamentals, that such matters belong only to the Pope and

Prelates, and Magistrates must but be their Executioners; and I know that its truly the Magistrates Power for which the usurping Pope contendeth: and I know that the Papists are most Zealous for Liberty of Conscience in England, though deadly enemies to it elsewhere.

3. And whence came the Hiders Body of Divinity, that hath infected so many high and low? How come so many called Seekers to seem to be at a loss; whether there be any Scripture, Church, or Ministry? Or which be they?

4. How came we contrived into a war with Scotland and Holland, when we could keep Peace with Spain? With them, or us, or both, there was some sorry cause.

5. How came our Armies so corrupted with principles of impiety, Licentiousness and Anarchy, that so many turned Levelers (to say nothing of all the rest), and rose up against their Commanders, and were fain to be subdued by force, and some of them shot to death, and many cashiered? &c.

6. How came it to pass that Papists have been discovered in our Armies, and in the several parties in the Land?

7. And where are the swarms of the English Jesuits and Friars, that are known to have emptied themselves upon us from their Colleges beyond Sea?

8. How came it to pass, that the Petitions of the Protestant Presbyters of London, and of other Protestants for the Life of the King, could not be heard? But that the Levelling party carried on their work, till they had set the foreign and domestic Papists on reproaching the Protestants as King-killers? And had (though very falsely) turned the odium of that horrid kind of crime upon the innocent Protestants, which the Papists are known to be most deeply guilty of: And now in all Nations they make the ignorant

people believe, that the death of that King was the work of the Protestants or Presbyterians, and the blot of their Religion.

9. Whence came it to pass, that Levelling went on with continued success till the House of Lord's, with the Regal Office was taken down, and an engagement put (on all those ductile souls that would take it) to be [True to the Common-wealth, as established without a King or House of Lord's?]

10. Whence came it that the Weekly News Books contained the Letters of the Agents of the Agitators from France, telling us how good men the Jesuits were, and how agreeable to them in their principles for a Democracy, (which they vainly call a Republic, as if there were no Common-wealth, but a Democracy) and telling us what exceeding meet materials for such a Common-wealth the Jesuits would be. The Agencies of particular men with Jesuits I shall purposely omit.

11. Whence came it that all the maddest dividing parties had their liberty; and the reproach and envy was most against the united Ministry? And if the Lord Protector had not stepped in, they had been likely to be taken down.

12. And whence came it that Sexby, and others, that have been Soldiers in our Armies, have confederated with Spain to murder the Lord Protector? And whence came their Jesuitical Treasonable Pamphlets (such as Killing no Murder) provoking men to take away his life?

Much more may be proposed tending to a discovery, how far the Papists have crept in among us, and had to do in our affairs. But I think God hath yet much more in season to discover. Truth is the daughter of time.

As concerning the death of the King, I shall not meddle at this time with the Cause, nor meddle with the Reasons brought for it or against it. But, suppose as bad of it as you can, the Providence of God hath so contrived it, that nothing but ignorance or blind malice can lay it upon the Protestants,

Episcopal, or Presbyterian, that strove so much against it, and suffered so much for it as they have done. When many on the other side, charged the Scots, and the imprisoned Ministers of London, with those that were put to death, for going too far on the other side, in manifesting their distastes: Of which I take not on me to be judge, but mention it only as Evidence that clears them from the deed.

And to vindicate the Protestants openly before all the world, and to all posterity, from that Fact, it is most publicly known, 1. That both Houses of Parliament in their Protestations engaged themselves and the Nations, to be true to the King. 2. That they openly professed to manage their war for King and Parliament: Not against his Person or Authority, but against Delinquents that were fled from Justice, and against evil Counselors. 3. That the two Nations of England and Scotland did in the midst of the wars swear in the Solemn League and Covenant to be true to the King. 4. That the Committees, Commanders, Ministers and people through the Land, professed openly to go only on these terms, as managing but a defensive war against the Kings miscarriages, but an Offensive against Delinquent subjects. 5. In that it was known that the Army was quite altered (not only by a new modelling, but) by an intestine Jesuitical corrupting of multitudes of the Soldiers, before this Odious fact could be done. 6. And it was known, that the corrupted part of the Army, though the fewer, did so excel the rest in industry and activity, that thereby they hindered their opposition. 7. And it is known that the Jesuited part (that afterward so many of them turned Levelers) did draw into them the Anabaptists, Libertines, and other Sects, upon a conjunction of Interests, and by many sly pretenses, especially tying all together by the predicated Liberty for all Religions. 8. And yet after all this, the world knows they were fain before they could accomplish it, to

Master the City of London, to Master the Parliament, to imprison and cast out the Members, and to retain but a few that were partly of their mind, and partly seduced or over-awed by them, to join with them in the work. 9. It is known that before they were put out, and imprisoned by the Army, the Commons voted the Kings Concessions in the Treaty to be so far satisfactory, as that they would have proceeded on them towards a full Agreement. See Mr. Prynne's large Speech in the House to that end. And if they had not suddenly been secluded and imprisoned, they had agreed with the King. 10. And it is well known to all that dwell in England, that before and since the doing of it, the thing is disowned, distasted and detested by the main Body of the English Nation, Nobility, Gentlemen, Ministers and people: Yea, to my knowledge multitudes that are now firm and loyal to the present Power, supposing it to be set over us by God, (and therefore would abhor the like practices against them) do yet detest that fact that intervened and made way to it. So that experience may satisfy all men, that Protestants, even those called Puritans, were the Enemies, and not the Actors of it. 11. And it is well known how the Protestant Ministers that had engaged in the war for King and Parliament, were so great Adversaries to the putting of the King to death, that they opposed it, and dissuaded from it, and thereby drew the Odium of the Corrupted part of the Army upon them; and that the London Ministers unanimously concurred in an Address to the Lord Fairfax to prevent it, and printed their abhorrence of it, and published it to the world: And that many of them were imprisoned, and Mr. Love beheaded, and many others put to death, or other sufferings, for being against these designs, and endeavoring to oppose the progress of them. 12. And lastly, it is known, that the Kingdom of Scotland disowned it from first to last, and so far proceeded in opposition to it, and in adhesion to the ancient line, as

cost them the miseries of a grievous war, and a conquest of their Kingdom. I speak but of the matter of fact that is known to the world. So that it is against all human Reason and Equity, that when we have all sworn to the contrary, and endeavored it, and the Parliament men of one Kingdom are secluded, and Imprisoned for it, and the other Kingdom conquered for it, and the Protestants still generally disown it, that yet it should be charged on the Protestants, or their Religion, that they put to death their King. This is most unreasonable in justice; especially from those men that were the causers of it.

I do therefore leave it here to posterity (having been myself a member of the Army four years, or thereabouts) that it was utterly against the mind and thoughts of Protestants, and those that they called Puritans, to put the King to death; the twelve Evidences fore-mentioned are undeniable Arguments that it was the work of Papists, Libertines, Vanists, and Anabaptists, and that the Protestants deeply suffered by opposing it; as the face of Scotland and England sadly testify to this day. And yet (though we have such open Evidence that this cannot be charged on our Religion or us), I must needs add, that every wise man sees that the Case itself much differs from the Papists. If the Body of a Common-wealth, or those that have part in the Legislative Power, and so in the Supremacy, should unwillingly be engaged in a war with the Prince, and after many years blood and desolations, judicially take away his life as guilty of all this blood, and not to be trusted anymore with Government, and all this they do, not as private men, but as the remaining Sovereign Power, and say they do it according to the Laws; undoubtedly this case doth very much differ from the Powder-plot, or Papists murdering of Kings, and teaching that its lawful for a private hand to do it, if he be but an Heretic, or be but deposed, yea or excommunicated

by the Pope. A war and a treacherous murder are not all one: Nor is a part of the Sovereign Power all one with a private hand, or foreign Prelate, pretending to a Dominion over the lives and states of Princes, and over the Kingdoms of the world, and that the Vice-christ, and Vice-God on earth.

It is a grievous case that the Senate or Body of a Nation should think themselves necessitated to defend themselves, and the Church and State against their Prince, or any that act by his commands. It will strongly tempt them to think that the end is to be preferred before the Means; and that it ceaseth to be a Means which is against and destructive to the End: and that it is essential to a Governing Power to be for the common good: and therefore that it is no Authority which is used against it: It will tempt them also to think that God never gave power to any against himself or above his Laws, or against the Ends of Government. And a Senate or the Body of a Nation will be apt to think themselves fit to discern when the public safety is dangerously assaulted; and will hardly be brought to trust any One to be the final Judge of their Necessity, as thinking such a public Necessity proves itself, and needs no judge but sense and reason to discern it. And if they also think that the fundamental Constitution of the Government doth make the Senate the highest Judge of the safety or danger of the Republic, and so that the Law is on their side, and that it is Treason against the Common-wealth (and as Politicians say, against the *Majestas Realis*) to rise against them; the temptation then is much the stronger. And where the Legislative power, and highest Judicial power is by the Constitution of the Government divided between the Prince and Senate, and so the Sovereignty divided, many will be ready to think with Grotius *de jure Belli, lib. 1. s. 13, p. 91*, that the Prince invading the Senates right, may justly be resisted, and may lose his right: *Quod locum* (saith Grotius) *habere censeo, etiamsi*

dictum sit, belli potestatem penes Regem fore: Id exim de bello externo intelligendum est: cum alioqui quisquis Imperii summi jus partem habeat, non possit, non jus habere, eam partem tuendi. Quod ubi fit, potest Rex etiam suam Imperii partem belli jure amittere.] And indeed when a war is once begun, the difficulty of re-uniting is exceeding great: If a Prince engage either hired strangers, or fugitives, or homebred delinquents, or others, to rise up against the Senate or people, either its lawful to Defend themselves by Arms; or not. If not (especially if they have a share in the Sovereignty) then is his power absolute and unlimited, and neither Laws nor anything below are any security against his will to the common safety (The contrary whereto our late King declared in his notable Answer to the nineteen Propositions.) But if their Defense be lawful, then if their Soldiers must know before hand, that if they do purchase a victory by their blood, when they have all done they must be all Governed by him whom they have conquered, and lie at his Mercy, they would hardly ever have an Army to defend them: For who will do the utmost that is possible to exasperate him that he knows must rule him when all is done? I speak not this by way of Justification, or any way deciding such cases as these, but leaving that (as a controversy that I am not here to decide) to the judgment of others, I only show the world again that there's a great deal of difference between such a war and conquest of a Prince by the Senate and Body of the people, and their allowing Popes to depose them and alienate their Dominions, and private men to rebel, and to murder them, if the Pope consent, or excommunicate them. Whether they were in the right or wrong, I am not the judge, but surely it was the judgment of the Parliament, that upon the Division, the power was in them to defend themselves and the Commonwealth, and suppress all subjects that were in Arms against them;

and that those that did resist them, did resist the higher powers, set over them by God, and therefore were guilty of the damnation of resisters: And this they assured the people was the Truth. And the forecited concessions of the King, (against the nineteen Propositions) acknowledging their part in the Legislative power and defense of the people, (which is known to be the highest part of Sovereignty,) did much incline many to believe the Parliament: Especially knowing that they had so long exercised the said Legislative power, and that we were all governed by Laws of their making. So that those that did obey the Parliament, did verily think that they obeyed the highest power that upon the division was left in the Common-wealth; and that they had the Laws on their side, and did adhere to the Common good, which is the end of Government.

And as they have thus caused our wars, and miseries, and scandals, so have they continued to multiply sects among us of all sorts; so that there is scarce a sect but is a spawn of the Jesuits and Friars; and scarce an honest party but they creep in among them to work their ends. And here I shall briefly mention some of the parties with whom they have insinuated to work their ends, and then some of the sects that they have bred or animated.

1. As for the old English Bishops and conformable Ministers, who were of the faith and doctrine publicly here professed, I confess I find but little evidence that ever the Papists had much to do with them, save only to instigate them against the Puritans, and draw some of them to a compliance with such as did out-go them. Yet in their times Bishop Goodman of Gloucester was suspected to be a Papist, and so professed himself by his last Testament at his death, since the wars.

2. As for the Presbyterians, I do not see any reason to think that ever the Papists had any interest in them of any men, there being none that they

more hate then these two sorts (the old sound Episcopal men, and the Presbyterians) But yet both in France and Scotland they have cunningly wrought upon them ab extra, alarming them into disturbances by the wild-fire which they have cast in.

3. As for the new Episcopal party that followed Grotius (Arminius in doctrine) and the Greek Church, and were for a reconciliation with Rome, on those terms (which doubtless Rome would never have yielded to) the interest that the Papists had among them, and influence that they had on them or their proceedings, is evident from what is said before; and much from the copious Proofs produced by Mr. Prin in his forementioned Book (*Canterburies Trial, with the Introduct*.) The Jesuits Letter cited by Prin*, ib. p. 89*, saith [Now we have planted that Sovereign drug Arminianism, which we hope will purge the Protestants from their heresy, and it flourisheth and bears fruit in due season.] The Articles exhibited in Parliament against many of the Bishops will tell you by their works who were the instigators of them. Of themselves I know of none but Goodman that hath professed himself a flat Papist; and I shall not think it my duty to suspect any one man of holding an Opinion which he professeth not himself, unless the evidence be very strong to move suspicion. But that many Papists were at work with them in that pretended Reconcilement, Francis. à S. Clara and diverse others put us past doubt. And that Papists crept into places in the Church under the garb of conformable Arminians, is too well known. It is no wonder therefore that Dr. Bailey, Dr. Goffe, Dr. Vane, Hugh Paul de Cressy, and many more of them did openly revolt when the game seemed to be spoiled that was plaid underboard. It had been far less hurt to us I think if all the rest had been as open.

As for the King himself that was their Head, if any conjecture that he was a flat Papist, as I have heard many rashly say, I think there is much evidence to confute them. 1. That very Letter to the Pope (forementioned) on which the suspicion is most grounded, if you mark it exactly, doth intimate no more than a desire of a union and Reconciliation, with some additions that may bear a tolerable sense. 2. His own Profession of the Protestant Religion is sufficient evidence. 3. His Disputation with the Marquess of Worcester cleareth it. 4. His speech at death, and Papers since published clear it more. So that I think we may be confident that he was no nearer to Rome then was the reconcilable part of the Greeks: and that he desired no more than Bishop Bromhal, and other of his Bishops offer them, to have the Church governed by Patriarchs, and the Pope to be *Principium Unitatis*, &c. If any would know what Party Grotius was of, I desire them carefully to peruse but these places in his writings (which I have cited elsewhere) *Discus. Apolog. Rivet. p. 255, & p. 7, & vot. pro Pace, p. 1,2,3*. And of his friends in England among the Bishops in Paris and all France, in Germany and Poland. See *Discus. Apol. Rivet. p. 16*, and my Discovery of Grotius Religion.

Yea for my own part I am persuaded, that the Papists were as much afraid of King Charles and the Grotian design, as of anything that of long time hath been hatched against them. They are not all of a mind at home. The French and moderate party no doubt applauded the design, and liked such writings as S. Clara's, and would gladly have married England and France in Religion. But others (the Italian, Spanish Jesuited party) might easily foresee what danger was in brewing for them. Had France, England, Sweden, Denmark, and the German Lutherans agreed together, to bear down the Calvinists as irreconcilable on one side (as Grotius intimates it necessary) and the Italians and their adherents that set up the Pope above a

Council, on the other side, it would have made the Pope afraid, as no doubt he was. For though he was glad that we would draw nearer him, and make him the Head in any sort, yet he knew not how to stop so great an inundation as was like upon the union to over-flow him. And hence was the malice of the Jesuits against the life of the King (and withal that he was fain into such hands where he was like to do them little service.) *Secret. Windebanks Letter recited by Prin*, *ubi sup*. tells us that it was the Jesuits that were the death of Father Leander, and so were the Enemies of Francis. S. Clara and his Book, (which caused it to incur a Roman Censure) So that with one part of them that is the best way, which the other is more afraid of then of Protestants. We see it by the Jansenian contest. We see it in that Cassander, Erasmus, Vives, &c. are excellent Catholics with some of them, and Heretical and vile with the rest.

4. The persecuted Nonconformists of the Protestant party, though they were most adverse to the Papists, yet had some of the Popish brood at last crept in among them, not only to spy out their minds and ways, but to head the party, and sow among them the seeds of further discontent and error, and to make them a Nursery for various sects. For everywhere by their good wills the Jesuits will have some. If you ask me for my proof of this, I shall at this time give you but these two. 1. The fruits that sprung up from among them, and the manner of Production, (of which more anon.) 2. The words of the Jesuits Letter recited by Mr. Prin, *Introd. p. 90*. [I cannot choose but laugh to see how some of our own coat have re-encountered themselves: you would scarce know them if you saw them; and it is admirable how in speech and gesture they act the Puritans: The Cambridge Scholars to their woeful experience shall see, we can act the Puritans a little better than they have done the Jesuits: they have abused our sacred Patron St. Ignatius in

jest, but we will make them smart for it in earnest. I hope you will excuse my merry digression, for I confess to you I am at this time transported with joy, to see how happily all instruments and means, as well great as lesser co-operate to our purposes.] Yet cannot I hear of any considerable infection among this party that way before Sir Henry Vane's days.

5. How far they crept into all Societies under the name of Independents, is opened by so many already in Print, that I shall add no more of it.

6. And its a thing notorious, that they have crept in among the Anabaptists, and fomented that Sect. The story of the Scottish Missionary that pretended himself a Jew, and gave the Anabaptists the glory of his Conversion, and Rebaptizing at Hexham, and was discovered at Newcastle, is published and commonly known: (whether he be yet in Prison, or released, I know not.) And too many more have more cleanly plaid their game. And though many of the more sober Anabaptists would not be so useful to the Papists as they expected, yet multitudes of them too far answered their expectations.

If you ask now what the Papists get by all this, I answer, you see in the Instance but of this one sect, and the products of it. 1. By this means our Councils, Armies, Churches have been divided, or much broken. 2. By this trick they have engaged the minds and tongues of many (and their hands if they had power) against the Ministry, which is the enemy that standeth in their way. 3. They have thus weakened us by the loss of our former adherents. 4. They have found a Nursery or Seminary for their own Opinions, which one half of the Anabaptists too greedily receive. 5. By this they have prepared them for more and worse. 6. By this means they get an Interest in our Armies, or weakened our own. 7. By this they have got Agents ready for mischievous designs (as hath been lately too manifest.) 8.

By this they have cast a reproach upon our Profession, as if we had no unity or consistence, but were vertiginous for want of the Roman pillar to rest upon. 9. By this they have loosened and disaffected the common people, to see so many minds and ways, and hear so much contending, and have loosed them from their former steadfastness, and made them ready for a new impression. 10. Yea by this means they have the opportunity of Predicating their own pretended unity, and hereby have drawn many to their Church of late. All this have they got at this one game. What then have they got by all the rest?

I shall next tell you of some of those Heresies or parties among us, that are the Papists own Spawn or progeny; Either they laid the Egg, or hatched it, or both.

And 1. It is most certain that Libertinism or Freedom for all Religions, was spawned by the Jesuits, who hate it in Spain and Italy, but love it in England. I have met with the masked Papists myself that have been very zealous and busy to promote this Liberty of Conscience (as they deceitfully called it.) For by this means they may have Liberty for themselves, and Liberty to break us in pieces by sects, and also Liberty under the Vizor of a Sectary of any tolerated sort, to oppose the Ministry and doctrine of truth.

2. But the principal design that the Papists have upon our Religion, at this day, is managed under a sort of Jugglers, who all are confederate in the same grand principles, and are busy at the same work, and are agreed to carry it on in the dark, and with wonderful secrecy do conceal the principal part of their opinions; but yet they use not all one vizor, but take on them several shapes and names, and some of them industriously avoid all names. The principal of these Hiders are these following. 1. The Vani, whose game was first plaid openly in America in New England, where God gave in his

Testimony against them from Heaven upon their two Prophetesses, Mrs. Hutchinson, and Mrs. Dyer: The later brought forth a Monster with the parts of Bird, Beast, Fish and Man, which you may see described in Mr. Welds Narrative, with the discovery, the concomitants and Consequents. The former brought forth many (near 30.) monstrous births at once, and was after slain by the Indians. This providence should at least have awakened England to such a Godly Jealousy, as to have better tried the doctrines which God thus seemed to cast out, before they had so greedily entertained them, as in part of Lincolnshire, Cambridgeshire, and many other parts they have done. At least it should have wakened the Parliament to a wise and Godly Jealousy of the Counsels and designs of him that was in New England, the Master of the game, and to have carefully searched how much of his doctrine and design were from heaven, and how much of them he brought with him from Italy, or at least was begotten by the Progenitor of Monsters. Such extraordinary providences are not to be despised. They had a great Operation in New England among those wise and godly men that saw them, or were near them, and knew the ways of them that God thus testified against. That which healed them should have warned us. But God had a judgment for us, and therefore we were left in blindness, to overlook that Judgment that should have warned us. They are now dispersed in Court, City, and Country, and what God will suffer them, and the Papists by them further to do, time will discover.

2. The next sort of Hiders, are the Paracesians, Weigelians, and Behmenists, who go the same way in the main with the former, and are indeed the same party, but think meet to take another name, and fetch their vizor from Jacob Behmen: of their life of Community, and Chastity, and Visible converse (as they profess) with Angels, you may see somewhat in

the Narrative of Dr. Pordidge of himself, together with Mr. Fowlers of him. The most clean and moderate piece of their doctrine that hath been lately published, is Mr. Bromleyes *Way to the Sabbath of Rest*; or *Treatise of Regeneration*.

3. Another sort of the Hiders are those called Seekers, among whom I have reason to believe the Papists have not the least of their strength in England at this day. They practice the lesson that Boverius in *Apparat. ad Consultat*, taught Prince Charles long ago [*Primum est, ut quoniam vera Religio tibi inquirenda est, antequam ad eam investigandam accedas, omnem prius Religionem apud te suspectam habeas: lubeatque tamdiu à Protestantium fide ac Religion animum ac voluntatem suspendere, quamdiu in veri inquisitione versaris*—] We must suspect all Religion it seems, and be first of no Religion, if we will become Papists. A fair beginning! We must then be unchristened, and suspect Christ and Scripture, that we may be espoused to the Pope. And this is the Papists work by the Seekers, to take us off from all, or from our former Religion, and blot out all the old impressions, that we may be capable of new. And if they can accomplish this, they have us at a fair advantage. For he that is not a stark Atheist or Infidel, but believes that he hath a soul to save or lose, must needs know the Necessity of seeking his Salvation in some Religion or other: and therefore take him off from this, and you must needs bring him to some other: And he that could prevail to take him off his old Religion, is likeliest to have so much interest in him as may also prevail to bring him to another. And the Papist thinks that on the pretense of Unity, Antiquity and Universality (of which indeed they have but a delusory show) they can put as fair for him that is once indifferent as any other can.

Of these Seekers there are these Sub-divisions, or Sects. The first and most moderate do only profess themselves to be Seekers for the true Church and Ministry; holding that such a Church and Ministry there is, but they are at a loss to know which is it. A likely thing it is indeed, that men that take themselves for extraordinary wise, should think there is existent such a Church and Ministry as they predicate, and yet have no conjecture which it is. As if they should believe that there is such a creature as the Moon, but be not able to know it from the Stars.

The second sort of Seekers are to seek whether there be any Organized Political Church, or any Ministry, or any Ordinances proper to a Church at all, or not. Not denying them, but Doubting and Seeking; that so when they have found them at Rome, they may prove but Finders, and not gross changelings: And withal they yield that private men may Declare the Word, and pray together, and read the Scripture. The most rational and modest that hath wrote for this way, is the Author of [*Asober Word to a Serious People*] A likely thing indeed it is, that so rational a man should heartily believe, that Christ hath planted so excellent a Ministry, and Church, and Ordinances as himself describeth, and to those standing necessary uses which he mentioneth, even instead of Christ, to take men into the holy Covenant, and yet that all should be left but for an Age or two, and that ever since there is no such thing, or at least, no certainty of it. The Style shows us that this Author is no such dotard as to think as he speaks.

3. Another sort of Seekers are those that do not only Doubt of, but flatly deny any Ministry, and Political Churches, and Church-ordinances on Earth, as things that are lost in a Universal Apostasy.

4. Another sort of Seekers do not only doubt of, or deny these Particular Churches and Ordinances, but also they are to seek for the Universal

Church itself, and the holy Scriptures; yea many of them not only Questioning them, but flatly maintaining, that we have no certainty that the Scripture is true, or that we have the same that was written by the Apostles, or that there is such a thing as true Ministry, or State of Christianity in the World. Hence it is that some of them pour out so many reproaches against the Ministry and the Holy Scriptures, as you may find in Clem. Writer, in two ignorant Pamphlets, that have scorn in the very Titles, as well as through the bulk; one called, The *Jus Divinum* of Presbytery; and the other *Fides Divina*: In which he maintaineth the cause of the Infidels. The opinion which this sort of men openly profess, is, that no particular man is bound to believe the Gospel, but those that have themselves seen Miracles to confirm it: and therefore in the first ages when Miracles were wrought, those that saw them were bound to believe in Christ, and at the second coming of Christ, when again he shall be witnessed by Miracles, it will again become a duty to be Christians: but not to others that see no Miracles, however they may hear of them. This doctrine Clem. Writer hath professed to me with his own mouth. But I may not censure him to be so weak as to believe himself. It's possible that such a silly soul may be found, that shall think that Christ came into the world to set up Christianity as the true Religion for those only in an Age or two, or more, that saw Miracles; but it's unlikely that a man that hath any considerable use of his reason should be so silly. Who will not despise Christ that thinks he came on so low a design? Who would not be an Infidel, that thinks ten thousand Infidels are saved for one Christian? Yea who can be himself a Christian, that thinks that he is not bound to be a Christian, because he sees not Miracles? It's most evident therefore that this is but a Juggle, and that such are either Infidels or Papists. Infidelity is the thing professed, and therefore that we

take them for Infidels, they cannot blame us: But yet in Charity I hope (and not without cause) that some of this Profession are but Papists; though others I have found to be desperate Infidels.

A fifth sort called Seekers also there are, that own the Church and Ministry, and Ordinances; but yet suppose themselves above them: for they think that these are but the Administrations of Christ to men in the passage to a higher state, and that such as have received the Spirit, and have the Law once written in their hearts, are under (as they call it) the second Covenant, and so are past the lower form of Ordinances, Scripture, Ministry, and visible Churches.

And a sixth sort of Seekers there are that think the whole company of believers should now be over-grown the Scripture, Ministry and Ordinances: For they think that the Law was the Fathers Administration, and the Gospel Ministry and Sacraments are the Sons Administration, and that both these are now past, and the season of the Spirits Administration is come, which all must attend, and quit the lower forms. The David-Georgians were the chief that taught the world this lesson, their Leader taking himself to be the Holy Ghost. All these sorts of Seekers are bred or cherished by the Jesuits and Friars. And the truth is, when a man is made a Seeker, he is half made a Papist: As a Dog when he hath lost his Master will follow almost anybody that will whistle him; so when men have lost their Ministry, Church and Religion, they are easily allured to the Church of Rome: For they are a body as conspicuous to a carnal eye as any other. And who will not rather be of the Roman Church and Religion then of none?

4. Another sort of Hiders are the Quakers; an impudent Generation, and open enough in pulling down; but as secret and reserved as the rest in asserting and building up. What interests the Papists have in breeding and

feeding this Sect among us, hath been partly proved from the Oaths of Witnesses, and Confessions of Friars, and somewhat I have spoken of it in three several Papers against them. The Doctrine of this fourth sort is the same, or scarce discernible from the rest.

5. A fifth sort of Hiders, are those Enthusiasts, that shun the affected bombasted language of Behmen, and such like, but yet give us much of the body of Popery, Headed by an infallible Prophetic Spirit, instead of the Pope. Such as the Authors of the Book against the Assemblies Confession, owned by Parker, but said to be written by a London Doctor: And many such Doctors I know and hear of abroad in England. They take on them to be adversaries to the Pope; but they are friends to his Doctrines, and maintain the necessity of an infallible living Judge, and send us to Prophets for this infallible judgment. And could the Papists bring men once to this, it's an easy matter to strike off the feigned Prophetic head, by disgracing such as mere Fantasticks, and to set on the ancient Papal Head, which only will agree with the Body which they have received. So much of the Libertines and the Hiders of their Religion, (of several sorts).

3. Another sort that are spawned by the Papists, are stark Heathens, Atheists, or Infidels: These carry their judgment as to the positive part as close as any of the rest, and are grown in England to a far greater number and strength then is commonly imagined. It is not only Leviathan or his Ocean that is guilty of this Apostasy, (however they use the name of Christ) but abundance that lurk under several names. A great while I knew not what to make of this close Generation; but now I have found out that which should make a believing tender heart to bleed: even gross Infidelity, causing them secretly to scorn at Christ and the holy Scripture, and the life to come, as bitterly as ever Julian did: And this is crept so high, and spread so far,

that it is dreadful to those few that are acquainted with its progress. Some that have lately professed to turn Papists (for what ends I know not) are known to be stark Infidels: And some that have long gone for leading men with them, have satisfied us by their writings that they are Romanists of the most ancient strain; even of the Roman Religion that was ancienter then Peter and Paul. And many of the unsettled sort of Protestants, are so far forsaken of God, as to Apostatize to the same condition. Montaltus the Jansenian takes the Jesuits for false unworthy calumniators, for giving out that they have long had a design at Port-Royal to overthrow the Gospel, and set up Infidelity and mere Deism. But I am sure they deserve much harder words of us in England, between them, for doing so much to destroy the Christianity of many, in order to the setting up of Popery. I do not charge it all and only on the Papists. I know the Devil hath more sorts of Instruments then one: But that they have had a notable hand in this Apostasy, we have good reason to satisfy us. Not that they desire that men should be absolutely and finally Infidels: But 1. They would make the world believe, that all must be Infidels that will not receive the Christian Faith upon the Roman account and terms: And in order to this they industriously seek to disgrace the Scripture, and overthrow all the grounds of the Faith of such as they dispute with. And so make them Infidels in order to the proof of that their affirmation. 2. And then they think that they must take them off all Religion (as Boverius afore cited) to prepare them for the Popish Religion. 3. And the malice of some of them is such, that they had rather men were Infidels then Protestants; or at least they will venture them upon Infidelity in the way, rather than not take them off from being Protestants. And no wonder, when they allow Infidels so much more charity than Protestants, as to their salvation, as all the Authors cited by S. Clara before do signify: And when

Rome burneth Protestants, but giveth toleration for Jews. And thus by these Devilish devices, the Hiders in England that keep close their Religion, are discovered at last to be one part of them Infidels or Heathens, and another part of them Papists. And no wonder if they would lately have introduced the Jews here into England, and if they have so many other designs to promote this Apostasy.

4. Another sort that Popery hath here hatch or cherished are the Socinians; a Sect with whom both Papists and Heathens do join hands, as the Bond of their Conjunction. Yet I know that they were not bred at first by Popery: and I know that the genuine Papist that holds fast the Articles of their Faith, must needs disown the Socinian: But however it comes to pass, I am sure there are too many of late (self-conceited men, innovators in Philosophy) that have reduced their Theology to their novel Philosophy, and expounded Scripture by such conceits as suit with the Socinians.

I shall say nothing of the Millenaries, the Levelers, and many such like. But here in the close, I would desire any Papist that is conscious of the promoting of any of these fore-mentioned abominations, to tell us whether this be like to be the way of God? Or whether Peter or Paul did ever take such a course as this to plant the Gospel, or build up the Church? And whether it be like to be the Cause of God that must be maintained by such means? Is not their damnation just, that say, Let us do evil that good may come thereby? Should not the means be suited to the end? Hath the glory of God any need of a lie? This course will never ingratiate your opinions with any wise considerate men. This is but working with the Devil for God: like one that doth consult with a Witch or Conjurer, to find the goods of the Church when they are stolen. Do you think God needs the Devils help? Or is it like to be help that comes from him? But the truth is, it is your bad

Cause that requires these evils means: and it is your bad hearts that set you on work to use them: Though you think perhaps that you do God service by it, yet you know not what Spirit you are of. Christ owneth not such ways as these, and therefore his servants will not own them.

CHAP. XLVI. They Hide themselves (in their Agents and new Converts:) The means: Our danger by the Hiders.

D*etect.* 37. Another Practical fraud of the Papists is, In hiding themselves and their Religion, that they may do their work with the more advantage.

I shall tell you briefly, 1. The way by which they do this, and 2. The advantage they get by it. And 3. Help you to detect them.

1. The principal means by which they conceal themselves is, By thrusting themselves into all Sects and Parties, and putting on the vizor of any side, as their cause requireth. It's well known that formerly we had abundance of them that went under the name of Protestants, and were commonly called by the name of Church-Papists: But there is great reason to think that there are more such now. Some of them are Prelatists, and some of them call themselves Independents: some creep in among the Anabaptists; and some go under the cloak of Arminians, and some of Socinians, and some of Millenaries, and all the other Sects before mentioned. They animate the Vanists, the Behmenists, and other Enthusiasts, the Seekers, the Quakers, the Origenists, and all the Jugglers and Hiders of the times: It is they that

keep life in Libertinisms, and in Infidelity itself. Among every one of these parties you may find them, if you have the skill of unmasking them.

2. Another way of Hiding themselves is, by having a Dispensation to come to any of our Assemblies, or join in worship with any party, good or bad: Or else they will prove it lawful without a Dispensation, where the Pope interdicteth it not. And their way is this: that all the old known Papists, especially of the poorer sort, shall be still forbidden to come to our Assemblies, lest they bring the blot of levity and temporizing on their Religion and lest there should not be a visible party among them to countenance their cause. But the New proselytes, especially such as are of any power and interest in the world, and may do them more service in a masked way, and can fairly avoid the Imputation of Popery, these shall have leave to come to our Assemblies, when their cause may make advantage of it. That you may see I feign not all this of them, (besides the proof from certain experience which we daily see) let me lay before you the Decisions of one of their principal Directors, in this work of propagating their faith; and that is, Thom. à Jesu *de Convers. Gentium*. How far they are for favoring of Heathens and Infidels, and Liberty of Conscience for them (for all their cruelty to Protestants) you may see him, *lib. 5. Dub. 4, p. 207*. Where he tells you that the sentence commonly received in the Schools is, that it is not lawful for Christian Princes to use any force against Infidels, for sins against the Law of Nature itself: and citeth *Caject. Victoria, Covarruv. Greg. de valent*. And himself decides it in the middle way of Azorius, [That Pagans may not be punished for despising the honor and worship of God, though they may for not giving every man his own, and for theft, murder, false witness, and other sins that are against men's right] Compare this with Sir H. Vane's doctrine of Liberty.

And *lib. 5, part. 1. Dub. 6, p. 220*, he teacheth that [A Catholic living among Heretics may (when the scandalizing of others forbids it not) for fear of death, go to the Temples of heretics, and be among them in their meetings, and assemblies, because of itself it is a thing indifferent; For a man may for many causes go to the Temples of heretics, and be among them in their assemblies, as that he may the easilier and more effectually and commodiously confute their errors, or on other just occasions, (unless accidentally it scandalize others.) Yea as Azorius saith, he may do it to obey a Prince, though he be an heretic, when he feareth the loss of his honor, maintenance or life: For in this he only obeyeth his Prince: especially if among the faithful (that is, the Papists) he openly affirm, that he doth it only to obey his Prince, and not to profess the heretical sect: For by that open attestation he avoideth the offense and danger of Catholics, and well declineth the unjust vexation of the Prince.]

And that Papists may eat flesh on days when their Church forbids it, to hide themselves among heretics, he determineth in *Dub. 5, p. 218,219*. So that the Papists are abundantly provided for their security, against such as would discover them when it stands not with their ends to disclose themselves.

3. Another most effectual way of Hiding themselves is, by Equivocation or mental reservations, which we use to call Lying, when they are examined about their Religion, their Orders or their actions. Lying that hurteth not another, they commonly maintain to be but a venial sin, which say most of them, is properly no sin at all. And to equivocate or reserve one half of your answer to yourselves, say the Jesuits, is not Lying, nor unlawful, in case a man's interest requireth him to do it. See the words of their own Casuists cited for this by Montaltus the Jansenist. Were it a thing that needed proof, I

would give you enough of it. Thom. à Jesu the Carmelite, *ubi sup. Dub. 4, p. 218*, secureth them sufficiently: His Question is [Whether one that denieth it when he is asked of a Heretic whether he be a Priest, or a Religious man, or whether he heard Divine service, do sin against the confession of faith?] He answereth, [No: for that is no denying himself to be a Christian, or Catholic: For it is lawful to dissemble or hide the person of a Clergy man or a Religious man, without a lie in words, lest a man be betrayed and in danger of his life; and for the same cause he may lay by his Habit, omit prayers, &c. —because (N. B.) human Laws for the most part bind not the subjects conscience, when there is great hazard of life, as in this case Azorius hath well taught. *Just. Mor. Tom. 1, lib. 8, c. 27*.] So that by the consent of most, there is no danger to a Papist in any such case from his own confession.

Another way of Hiding their Religion and themselves, is by false Oaths, which we called, willful perjury, but the Jesuits take for a Lawful thing, when a mental Reservation or Equivocation supplieth the want of verbal truth, as their words cited by the forementioned Jansenian, testify. And who will ever want so easy, so obvious, so cheap a Remedy against all danger of perjury, as a mental Reservation is?

Yea that the Pope can sufficiently dispense with any of their Oaths of fidelity or Allegiance, or the like, I shall show you under the last Detection. The Parliament hath imposed on them an Oath of Abjuration, but do they not know how little the Clergy, and such as have their countenance will stick at that, such Nets are too wide to catch them in. Hear the words of one of their own Priests (*Jo. Browns Voluntary Confess. in Prynne's Introduct. p. 203.*) saith he, [Its strange to see the Stratagems which they use with their penitents concerning the Oath of Allegiance! If they be poor, they tell them

flatly, (when they are demanded to take the Oath) that it is damnable, and no ways to be allowed by the Church: If they be of the richer sort, they say they may do as their conscience will inspire them. And there be some of them that make no conscience at all, to have it taken so oft as they are demanded.] What would you have more, then such discoveries by themselves?

2. But what get they by this Hiding of themselves? *Answ.* 1. They hereby secure themselves from danger. 2. They do the more easily prevail for the multiplication of their sect: For worldly persons would not so easily flock into them without some such security from suffering. 3. They preserve those that are come over to them from revolting, by the discouragement of suffering, especially the Rich and Honorable. 4. They angle for souls with the less suspicion, when they stand behind the bush: Papists are become so distasted with the people by the Power-plot, and many other of their pranks, that they may take more with them, if they come masked under another name. 5. By this means they may openly revile and oppose the Ministry, and Ordinances, and Churches, and Protestant doctrine, without disturbance by the Magistrate. A Papist in the Coat of a Quaker, an Anabaptist, a Seeker, or the like, may rail at us and our doctrine in the open Streets, and Market place, and call us all to naught, and teach abundance of their own Opinions, without a control. And many a poor soul will take an Anabaptist Papist, or Seeker into their bosom, and familiarly hear them, and easily swallow down what they say, that would be afraid of them if he knew them to be Papists. 6. By this means they have easier access to a greater number then openly they could have. 7. And by this means they may insinuate into our Counsels, and know all our ways, and how to resist us. 8. But above all, by this means they may be capable of any office and trust among us. They may

be Ministers, or Justices of Peace: They may be Parliament men, and Leaders in our Councils, and have the conduct of our affairs: They may have a great influence on the rest that know them not; They may come to have power in our Armies. And if once the Masked Papists come to make our Laws, or guide our Councils and Affairs, and influence or command our Armies, you may soon know what would become of Protestants: Kings and Parliaments, Prelates and Presbyters shall all go one way, if they can accomplish it: Its easy therefore to discern that their principal Artifice lieth in Hiding themselves (so be it still there be a visible body of their open professors.) And for my own part, I think I have good reason to fear lest the Papists are far stronger at this day in England that are unknown, then that are known: and that wear the Vizard of Seekers, Vanists, and other Sects, then that appear bare faced: Yea I believe that our danger of the open Papists is nothing in comparison of our danger from these Jugglers. And I confess I think an ingenuous open Papist should have a great deal more gentle dealing from our Magistrates, then these Deceivers that have such stretching Consciences. For my own part I must confess I feel a great deal of charity in my heart for a conscientious plain dealing Papist; and I would never be guilty of cruelty or rigor to them. But this juggling in the matters of God and Eternal life, my very soul abhors. I have been set upon by these Jugglers myself, and by some of the most renowned of them; but as soon as I perceived any of them purposely choose the dark, and hide themselves in affected cloudy terms or methods, I was more a verse from their documents, and took them for men that were either enemies to truth, or else had not received it into honest hearts themselves. Truth is most beautiful in its nakedness; It loveth plain dealing, and abhorreth fraud. It takes that for its greatest friend, that lays it most naked to the view of all, and that for its

enemy that purposely obscureth it. We have all such a natural inclination to truth, that he scarce deserves the name of a man, much less of a Christian, that would not embrace it if he knew it. Did I think that the Papists had the truth, the Lord knows I would run after them, and follow them till I had learned it: If ever any of them would work on me, they must come bare faced: for I naturally abhor a Juggler in Religion, and a friend of darkness.

3. But how shall these Hiders be Detected? *Answ.* 1. You have cause to suspect all that use a Mask, and purposely hide their minds. To suspect them I say, to be Papists or worse: They walk not in God's way that walk in Darkness: It is the Kingdom of Satan that is the Kingdom of Darkness, and it is he that is the Prince of Darkness, and his servants that are the sons of Darkness. Me thinks a man that intendeth Deceit, whatever his end be, should not take it ill to be suspected for a deceiver, God is so good a master that nobody should be ashamed of him. Truth is so amiable, that the genuine sons of Truth are not ashamed of it. Its no true Religion that assureth not men of that which will save them harmless, and bear them out against all the malice of earth and hell, and repair all losses that they can sustain in the defending of it. *Qui non vult intelligi, debet negligi*. He that would not be fully understood, shall never be my Teacher, nor be much regarded by me. And therefore the Vain and Sterile language of Paracelsian Behmenists, and Popish Jugglers, doth serve with me for no other use but to raise me into suspicion of their Designs and Doctrines, and to signify a Vain and Sterile mind. Who will not suspect that Tradesmans wares that chooseth a dark Shop, and refuseth to open his wares in the light? I know that Scripture hath its difficulties, and strong meats. But that is from our incapacity of understanding higher points, till we are prepared by the lower: It is from the altitude of the matter, and not that God doth envy us the truth, which he

pretendeth to reveal: If a Prophesy be purposely obscured, which concerneth not the world so nearly, yet so are not the Doctrines that our life or death lieth on. But saith Clem. Writer to me, (recited in his late Book against me) [Would you not hide your mind or Religion in Spain? *Answ.* 1. No: I would not; whenever I found myself capable of serving God most by the discovery; which is the common case. 2. Till then, I would not put on the vizor of anything that I knew to be false; and make use of Positive Juggling and Dissembling to hide my Religion. 3. If Christians against Infidels, or Protestants among Papists, had thought this dissimulation lawful, there had not been so many thousands of them martyred or murdered as were. 4. What Opinion is it that brings men in England into any great danger at this day? Either your Opinion must be Atheistical, or at least Infidelity, if you suppose it will bring you now into any great suffering: or if it be some small matter that you fear, it seems you think not your Religion worthy to be openly owned in so small a danger. I will never be of a Religion that is not worthy my openest confession, even to the death, when there is so much danger.

2. The Juggling Papists may be known by this, that they are always loosening people from their Religion, and leading them into a dislike of what they have been taught; that they may be receptive of their new Impressions. And therefore of any one Sect in England, there is none to be so much suspected of a spirit of Jesuitism, as the Seekers of all sorts.

3. The Juggling Papists may be much detected by this, that they are all upon the Destructive part in their Disputes, and very little on the Assertive part. They pull down with both hands, but tell you not what they will build up, till they have prepared you for the discovery. They tell you what they are against. But what they are for, you cannot draw out of them. As if any

wise man will leave his house or grounds till he knows where to be better: or will forsake his staff that he leaneth on, or the food that he feedeth on, till he know where to have a better provision or support. Do they think wise men will be made irreligious? They deal by the poor people, as one that should say to passengers on Shipboard [What fools are you to venture your lives in such a ship that hath so much encumbrance and danger, and so many flaws, and but a few inches between you and death, and is guided by such a Pilot as may betray you, or cast away your lives for ought you know?] They know now that none but mad men will be persuaded by such words as these to leap into the Sea to scape these dangers: and therefore they do this but to make men willing to pass into their ship, and take them for our Pilots. If you are wise therefore hold them to it, and leap not over-board, but keep where you are, till they have shown you a safer Vessel and Pilot: which they can never do.

When I did but privately desire of Cl. Writer that he would acquaint me with that truth that he thought me ignorant of, and that we might privately and lovingly consider how far we were agreed, and where we differed, that we might debate the case, and try who was in the right, he resolutely denied to have any debate with me, or to open any of his judgment, but p. 46, reproacheth this very motion, as proceeding from [my aims of a monstrous shape and ugly looks] so monstrous a thing doth it appear to these deceiving Jugglers, to tell men what Religion they are of, and would have us to receive, when they will freely reproach the Religion which we profess.

4. And you may strongly conjecture at the quality of these Jugglers, by their constant opposition against the Ministry. It is Ministers that are their eye-fore; the hinderers of their Kingdom: Could they but get down these, the work were done, the day were their own: And therefore their main

business, whatever vizor they put on, is to bring the people into a dislike or contempt of the Ministry. If they seem Quakers, they will rail at them: If they seem Seekers, they will dispute against their calling: If they seem the gentlest Behmenists, they have their girds at them, to acquaint the world that they are misguided by them. But at first, they will not let you know which is the true Ministry, if ours be not; or which is the true Church, if ours be not: Here they leave you.

5. The Juggling Papist, what vizor soever he wears, is commonly putting in for his own opinions, of the Necessity of a Judge of Controversies, an Infallible Church, a state of perfection here, the magnifying of our own inherent Righteousness, without any great esteem of Justification by the forgiveness of sin: and many such like.

6. Papists have still an aching tooth at the Authority and sufficiency of Scripture; and therefore on one pretense or other, are still disgracing and impugning it, and leading men aside to some other Rule.

7. Papists have still an enmity against the Power of the Magistrate in matters of Religion: For in such matters their Vice-christ must be the only Judge. Whereas indeed, by that time the Magistrate hath judged, Who is Punishable by the Sword, and the Pastors and Particulars Churches have judged, Who is excommunicable, (which are their undoubted works) there is nothing left for a Pope to do. Suspect them that are for a Liberty for all; or at least for all that are no worse than Papists. They that set open this door intend to creep in at it themselves at last.

8. And it is a suspicious sign when you find men enemies to the Unity, Peace and Settlement of our Churches, but would still keep us in division and distraction. And yet some of these men will lament our Divisions, and cry up Unity, but they will secretly hinder it, or do nothing to attain it.

9. And it is somewhat suspicious to see men hang loose from all our Churches in their practice, and join with none, nor communicate in the Sacraments. If they know not Sacraments and Church-communion to be both our Duty, and the Means of our strength and comfort, it is doubtful whether they are Christians or Infidels. But if they know this of the Necessity and use of Sacraments, and Church-communion in general, and yet join not with any of our Churches herein, it's a shrewd suspicion that they have an eye upon some other Church. For sure a tender conscience would not be many years in resolving of so great and practical a point, no more than he would live many years without prayer, on pretense of being unsatisfied in the mode of Prayer.

10. And yet on the contrary side, there are some Juggling Papists, especially in our Councils, Civil and Ecclesiastic, that play their game by over-doing, and making everything to be Popish and Antichristian, to drive us into extremes, and into opinions in which we may easily be baffled. And it's not a little that they have won of us at this game.

CHAP. XLVII. Their exceeding industry to pervert men of Interest and power.

D*etect.* 38. Another of their Practical Frands is, In their exceeding industry for the perverting of men of Power and Interest, that are likely to do much in helping or hindering them.

Swarms of them are busy day and night, for the seducing of Princes, and Nobles, and Rulers of all sorts, and of Commanders in the Armies. Of their diligence abroad we may know somewhat by their success on diverse of the German Princes, and the late Queen of Sweden, and on many of the Nobles of France, and such others.

At home we have smarted by the fruits of their industry. What abundance of assaults were made on the late King? From his going to Spain, and the Popes Letters to him there, and to the Bishop of Conchen to take care for his seduction, and so all along to the last, I need not mention. And what Noblemen or Persons of Interest in England lay not under assaults and solicitations in those days? And are all the Jesuits and Friars dead? Or have they not still the same cause and industry as then? Is the Court, or Councils of the Land, or the Nobility, Gentry or Army now free from their fraudulent

solicitations? How far they have prevailed time will fullier reveal: but what they will endeavor we may easily judge. And certainly the number of Seekers and such other Sects among them, doth tell us that they have not lost their labor.

If these lines shall fall into the hands of any of our Rulers or Commanders, I entreat them for the sake of their souls, and the Commonwealth, to be prudent and vigilant in a matter of such consequence. I do not intend to entreat them from error unto truth without sufficient light and evidence: But that which I desire is but reasonable; 1. That you would not be too confident of your own understandings to deal with such Jugglers in your own strength, without assistance. They have made it their study all their days, and are purposely trained up to deceive: whereas you are much wanting in their way of study, and much unfurnished to resist; how highly soever you may think of yourselves.

2. That you would read a little more the learned solid writings of our Divines against the Papists, such as Dr. Fields, Crakenthorps, Ushers, Chillingworths, Jewels, Rivets, Chamiers, Ames, Reynolds, Whittakers, and such like, beginning with Sir Humfrey Linds *Via Devia, & via Tuta*, (& du Plessis *of the Church, and his Mystery of Iniquity*, and Dr. John White. &c.)

3. That you will not hearken to Papists secretly, nor masked, nor coming to you by indirect and Juggling ways: but open their persuasions, and call to some able studied Divines to deal with them in your hearing, if needs you will hear them, that so you may hear one side as well as the other.

4. That you take heed what Retainers, Servants, or Familiars are about you: For some that pretend to be acquainted with these men, are much mistaken, if they be not more frequent at your elbows, and in your Bedchambers, then many do imagine. If they cannot be of your Councils, and

your near attendants, they will rather be your Porters, or the Grooms of your Stables, then they will be kept out. We fear not anything that they can do in an open way, in comparison of their secret whispers and deceits, when there is nobody to gainsay them. Had they the Truth, we should be glad to entertain it with them. It is not therefore Truth in their mouths that we are afraid of: But seeing the Nations and our Posterity have so much dependence on your Integrity, we call for so much Justice at your hands, as that you will not cast open your ears to each deceiver, especially in secret, or on unequal terms: Let not all our peace and safety be hazarded by the self-conceitedness, or imprudence of you that are our Rulers. Seeing it is you that must give us Laws, or set the Vulgar the pattern which they are so much addicted to imitate; We adjure you in the Name of the most High God, that you be not too forward and facile in hearkening to Seducers, and corrupting those Intellects which the whole Nation hath so great an Interest in: and that you be not henceforth as children tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness whereby they lie in wait to deceive, Eph. 4:14. But we beseech you mark them which cause Divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine which you have learned, and avoid them. For they that are such, serve not the Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly, and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple, Rom. 16:17,18. Hearken not to everyone that saith, Lo here is Christ, or Lo there is Christ; here is the Catholic Church, or there is the Catholic Church: As if Christ were divided, or the Catholic Church were more then One? Or it were confined to a Sect or Party, whether Papal or any other, and did not contain all Christians through the world? All parts of this Church are not equally pure, but all are Parts: Be you of the purest part, but do not therefore take that part for the

whole: much less the polluted part. Have compassion on the diseased and tumified part: but do not therefore so far doat, as to love the tumor or disease, and say that none is the Church but this. We are willing to be as Charitable to that Proud Throne of Rome, and usurping Vice-christ, as will stand with the safety of our souls and of the Church. But God forbid that we should therefore be so blind, as to run into their Pest-house, and drink the poison by which they are thus tumified and intoxicated.

Look on their Principles, and see what an aspect they have on Christ, on the Catholic Church, and upon Princes? Look back on their Practices, and see what their Principles proved in the fruits? Yea what need we go further for a warning, then to remind you of that which one would think should be deep and fresh in your minds; even what they have brought upon Kings, Queens, Lord's, Prelates, and this whole Land? But this leads me to the next Detection.

CHAP. XLVIII. Their Treasons against the lives of Princes and the Peace of Nations, and their dissolving the bond of Oaths and Covenants, and making Perjury and Rebellion to seem Duties and Meritorius.

D*etect.* 39. The last of their Practical frauds (at home) and the most desperate is, Their Treasons against the lives of Princes, and the Peace of Nations, and their dissolving the bonds of Oaths and Covenants, and making Perjury and Rebellion to seem to be Duties and Meritorious works.

It would be a voluminous task to relate the Histories of the Papal Treasons: How the Roman Vice-christ having laid a claim to both Swords, Spiritual and Temporal, hath plaid the Traitor against the Greek Emperors, dispossessing them of the West; and against the Emperors of Germany, stirring up their own subjects, and the Christian Princes and States against them; setting his foot on the neck of one, and making another wait barefoot long at the Roman gates; and keeping many of them in wars. It was this Horrid Treason and Tyrannical usurpation over all the Christians Princes, that caused all those Treatises on that subject wrote against him, in the

Defense of Princes and their Right, which Mich. Goldastus hath preserves and conjoined in diverse Volumes. It was this that caused England, Denmark, Sweden, and so many other Princes, to be the readier to shake off his yoke. Kings are not Kings where the Pope is fully Pope; except only the House of Austria, whom he is forced to gratify, as the only prop of all his tyranny. France that hath so much stood for its Liberties, hath felt the fruits of the Roman Principles, and League; and two of their most renowned Kings successively have been basely and inhumanely butchered by them: And to this day the numerous swarm of the Popes dependent Clergy, doth not only devour, as is thought, about a third part of the Lands, but also awes and sways the Princes. Even in Ireland before our wars, a Bishop (Bedle in his *Letter to Laud in Prynne's Introduct. p. 102*.) doth open the Power of the Clergy, and their insolencies as such, that he concludes [His Majesty is now with the greatest part of this Country as to their hearts and consciences, King, but at the Popes descretion] And in another Letter to the said Archbishop (*ibid. p. 112*.) he saith [I that know that in this Kingdom of his Majesty, the Pope hath another Kingdom far greater in number, and as I have heretofore signified to the Lord's Justices, and Council (which since is justified by themselves in print) constantly guided and directed by the order of the new Congregation, de propaganda fide, lately erected at Rome—] see the rest.

Do I need to tell England of the many treacheries since the Reformation against our Princes? Or who it was that would have deposed as well as Excommunicated Queen Elizabeth, and exposed her Kingdoms to the will of others? Or who it was that wrote against King James his Title to the Crown? Or who were the Actors of the Hellish Powder-plot? Or who it is that hath been still blowing the fire, and casting all into disturbances for

their ends? Do I need to mention their approving of the Murdering of Princes, and the pretense of power to dispense with oaths of Allegiance and fidelity, and who hath actually so oft pretended to disoblige the subjects, and expose Princes and their Dominions to the first occupant? I know that many of the seculars in England disowned this doctrine: But 1. So never did the Pope, but hath owned and practiced it. 2. By disowning it, they disown Popery itself, if they know what they do: For it is an Article of their Faith, and so Essential to their Religion, as explicitly held; and is determined by a Pope and an approved General Council, even 12, the fourth at Lateran under Innocent the third, as I before recited the words at large in the third Argument against them here.

I know some of the Papists would persuade the world that it was none but Mariana the Jesuit that wrote for King killing: and that it was first condemned by themselves. But the Parliament of Paris tells another story of them, as it is recited by Thuanus (who was President and then present) *Hist. lib. 130, ad. an. 1604*. And Rivet names them Guignardus (that wrote in praise of the murder of Henry the third) and of Ode Pichenatus, Barterius suborned by Varada, &c. And Albineus the Jesuit did hear the Murderer of Henry the fourth confess before he did the fact, and put off the examiners with this answer, that God had given him that special gift to forget when once he had absolved a sinner whatsoever was confessed by him. And why was it that France did expel the Jesuits, and set up a Pillar of Remembrance of their villainies, till Henry the fourth would needs gratify the Pope by calling them in again, and told the Parliament, that the peril of it should be on him; and so it was; for it cost him his life. And why did the same Parliament of Paris, Nov. 1610, condemn Bellarmine's book against Barclay, as an engine of treason and rebellion? And the Theological faculty

of Paris, April 4th, 1626, condemned Santarellus Book as guilty of the same villainy, stirring up people to Rebellion and King-killing? And May 12th, the University confirmed it: And March 13th, the Parliament condemned the Book to be burnt.

And it's worth the reading which Rivet recites of the Answers of the Jesuits in Paris, when the Parliament asked them their judgment of that Book, viz. [Seeing their General had approved the Book, and judged the things that are there written to be certain, whether they were of the same mind?] They answered that [Living at Rome he could not but approve what was there approved of.] [But say the Parliament, What think you? Say the Jesuits, the clean contrary. Say the Examiners, But what would you do if you were at Rome? Say the Jesuits, That which they do that are at Rome. At which said some of the Parliament, What! Have they one Conscience at Rome, and another at Paris? God bless us from such confessors as these.]

But yet some of the Papists will seem so honest, as to say that private men may not kill a King till he be deposed. Very true! But withal it is their currant doctrine, that if once he be excommunicate, he is then no King, yea or if he be a Heretic; and so being no King, they may kill the man, and not kill the King. This is the juggling of these seeming Loyall subjects. You may see it in their own writings; Suarez *adverse. Sect. Anglic. lib. 6, c. 4. Sect. 14, and c. 6. Sect. 22,24*, and Azorius *Jesuita Instit. Moral. part. 1, l. 8, c. 13*. He that would see more of their mind in this, let him read the *Mysterium Patrum Jesuitarum*, and the Jansenians mystery of Jesuitism, and Bishop Rob. Abbots *Antilogia ad Apolog. Eudaemojohan*: But what need we more than the Decrees of a Pope and General Council, and the practice of the Church of Rome for so many ages?

And for the Popes power to absolve them from all oaths of Allegiance and fidelity, the foresaid Pope Innocent and his approved General Council have told the world enough of their mind to put us out of doubt of it.

But (leaving abundance of foreign instances) I shall mention but one or two at home. The Papists have lately had the confidence to affirm that the Powder-plot and the Spanish invasion in one thousand five hundred eighty-eight were not upon a quarrel of Religion, nor owned by the Pope. King James hath said already so much against them in these points, that I think it needless to say anymore (especially also after Bishop Abbots *Antilogia*) but only here to produce one Testimony of their own, concerning the Spanish Invasion.

Cardinal Ossatus in his *87th. Epist. ad D. de Ville-roy*, tells us that Pope Clement the eighth (one of the best of all the late ones) did press for the King of France to join with Spain in the Invasion of England, and the Cardinal answered that the King was tied by an Oath to the Queen of England: to which the Pope replied, that [The Oath was made to an Heretic, but he was bound in another Oath to God and the Pope] adding withal [that Kings and other Princes do permit themselves all things (or tolerate themselves in all things) which make for their commodity: and that the matter is gone so far, that it is not (or should not be) imputed to them, or taken for their fault: and he alleged the saying of Franciscus Mariae Duke of Urbine, that indeed everyone doth blame a Noble man, or Great man that is no Sovereign, if he keep not his Covenants, (or fidelity,) and they account him infamous; but supreme Princes may without any danger of their reputation, make Covenants and break them, lie, betray, and perpetrate other such like things] This was good Pope Clement the eighth. And can we look for better from the rest? You see what Oaths and Covenants are with them.

And that the design was still carried on against the Queen upon account of Religion, and the Realm to have been invaded by the Spaniard on that account, and that the principal point of the Plot was to prepare a party within the Realm that might adhere to the invaders; all this with much more Sir Francis Walsingham (that well knew) hath testified to Monsieur Critoy in his Letter, *Cabal. part. 2, p. 39*.

Thuanus a Moderate Papist (and a most knowing and impartial Historian) tells you (*lib. 89, p. 248,249, ad an. 1588*.) that, [the Spaniards pretended to undertake the expedition only for Religion sake, and therefore took with them Martin Alarco Vicar general of the Holy Inquisition, with abundance of Capuchins and Jesuits: and that they had with them the Popes Bull, which they were to publish as soon as they landed, and that Cardinal Allan was appointed as the Popes Legate to land at the same time, and with full power to see to the restoring of Religion. And that the said Bull had these expressions: that the Pope, by the Power given from God by lawful succession of the Catholic Church, for the defection of Henry the eighth who forcibly separated himself and his people from the communion of Christians, which was promoted by Edward the sixth and Elizabeth, who being pertinacious and impenitent in the same Rebellion and Usurpation—therefore (the Pope) incited by the continual persuasions of many, and by the suppliant prayers of the English men themselves, (N. B.) hath dealt with diverse Princes, and specially the most potent King of Spain —to depose that woman, and punish her pernicious adherents in that Kingdom—] Read the rest there; for though wicked, its worth the reading. The Pope there saith, that Pope Sixtus before him prescribed the Queen, and took from her all her Dignities, Titles, and Rights to the Kingdom of England and Ireland, absolving her subjects from the Oath of fidelity and obedience: He chargeth

all men on pain of the wrath of God, that they afford her no favor, help, or aid, but use all their strength to bring her to punishment; and that all the English join with the Spaniard as soon as he is landed: offering rewards and pardon of sins, to them that will lay hands on the Queen; and so showing on what Conditions he gave the Kingdom to Philip of Spain. This and more you may see in Thuanus.

And yet some of our Jugglers that say they are no Papists, persuade the world that Papists hold not the deposing of Princes, nor absolving their subjects from the Oaths of fidelity; and that the Spanish invasion was merely on Civil accounts, and that they expected not any English Papists to assist them: with other such impudent assertions.

Even Dominicus Banns (one of the best of them) in *Thom. 22, qu. 12, art. 2*, saith that [*Quando adest evidens notitia*, &c. i.e. When there is evident knowledge of the crime, subjects may lawfully exempt themselves from the Power of their Princes, before any declaratory sentence of a judge, so they have but strength to do it.] Adding to excuse the English Papists for being no worse, that [Hence it follows that the faithful (Papists) of England and Saxony are to be excused, that do not free themselves from the power of their Superiors, nor make war against them: because commonly they are not strong enough to manage these wars, and great dangers hang over them.] Princes may see now how far the Papists are to be trusted: Even as far as they are sufficiently disabled.

And their August. Triumphus saith (*de Potest. Eccles. qu. 46, art. 2*.) [*Dubium non est quin Papa possit omnes Reges, cum subest causa rationabilis deponere*] i.e. [There is no doubt but the Pope may depose all Kings, when there is reasonable cause for it] Is not this a Vice-christ, and a Vice-god with a witness?

Add but to this, that the Pope is Judge when the cause is Reasonable; (for no doubt but he must judge, if he must execute;) and then you have a Pope in his colors, even in his Universal Sovereignty Spiritual and Temporal.

And (as I said before from Suarez and others) when the Pope hath deposed a King, any man may kill him. I will not trouble you with Mariana's directions for poisoning him, or secretly dispatching him (*de Reg. instit. lib. 1, c. 7.*) Suarez his moderate conclusion is enough (*Defens. fid. Cathol. li. 6 c. 4, sect. 14.*) [*Post sententiam*, &c. After sentence past he is altogether deprived of his Kingdom, so that he cannot by just title possess it; therefore from thence forward he may be handled as a mere tyrant; and consequently any private man may kill him] O Learned Suarez! No wonder if you and your Profession be dear to Princes; and if Henry the fourth of France took down the Pillar of your infamy, and received you into his Kingdom and Heart again? No wonder if the Venetians at last have readmitted you, to procure some aid against the Turk.

I will conclude with one Testimony of a Roman Rabbi (cited by Bishop Usher, who knew his name, but would not do him the honor to name him.) It is, *B. P. ἐξ ἐαυτοῦ Epistol. J. R. impresan 1609*. Who hath excused the Powder-Plot from the Imputation of cruelty, [because both Seeds and Root of an evil herb must be destroyed] and doth add a derision of the simplicity of the King in imposing on them the oath of Allegiance, in these most memorable expressions, worthy to be engraven on a Marble Pillar [*Sed vide in tanta astutia, quanta sit simplicitas! &c*. But see what simplicity here is in so great craft! When he had placed all his security in that Oath, he thought he had framed such a manner of oath, with so many circumstances, which no man could any way dissolve with a safe conscience. But he could not see, that if the Pope dissolve the Oath, all its knots, whether of being

faithful to the King, or of admitting no Dispensation, are accordingly dissolved. Yea I will say a thing more admirable. You know I believe, that an unjust Oath, if it be evidently known to be such, or openly declared such, obligeth no man. That the Kings oath is unjust, is sufficiently declared by the Pastor of the Church himself. You see now that the Obligation of it is vanished into smoke, and that the bond which so many wise men thought was made of iron, is less then straw.]

These are the words of Papists themselves. From their published writings we tell you their Religion.

I know they will here again tell us abundance of false accusations of the Protestants, such as [the Image of both Churches] heapeth up; and they will tell us of our war, and killing the King in England. But of this I have given them their answer before. To which I add, 1. The Protestant doctrine expressed in the Confessions of all their Churches, and in the constant stream of their writers, is for obedience to the Sovereign Powers, and against resisting them, upon any pretenses of Heresy, or Excommunication, or such like.

2. The wars in England were raised between a King and Parliament, that joined together, did constitute the Highest Power; and upon the lamentable division (occasioned by the Papists,) the people were many of them uncertain which part was the Higher, and of greatest Authority: some thought the King, and others thought the Parliament, as being the Representative body of the people (in whom Politicians say is the *Majestas Realis*,) and the Highest Judicature, and having the chief part in Legislation, and Declaration what is just or unjust, what is Law and what is against Law: Had we all been resolved in England which side was by Law the Higher Power, here had been no war. So that here was no avowed resisting of the

Higher Powers. None but a Parliament could have drawn an Army of Protestants here under their banner.

3. And withal that very Parliament (consisting of Nobles, Knights, Gentlemen and Lawyers, who all declared to the people, that by Law they were bound to obey and assist them) did yet profess to take up offensive Arms only against Delinquents, or rather, even but defensive against those men that had got an Army to secure them from Justice: And they still professed and vowed fidelity to the King which, as I have shown, they manifested to the last of their power, till they were imprisoned and secluded. Read Mr. Irins *Speech for Agreement with the King*: and read the writing of the London Ministers presented to the General, and published against the Kings death: and Read the Vindication of the secluded members, and read the Passages of the war with Scotland, and of the Imprisonment of many London Ministers, and of the death of Mr. Love and others: and tell me whether you can do men greater wrong then to defame them for being causers of that which they disowned, though it cost them the loss of Liberty, Estate, or Life.

4. And really if you take either Vanists or Levelers (who were the chief agents in this) for Protestants, you may as well say that Papists are Protestants. The world knows that the Prayers, the Petitions, Protestations, and other endeavors of the Protestants, even the Presbyterians, was for the preventing the death of that King, however many of them disliked his course, and joined with the Parliament against his adherents. This is the very truth, which they that have been eye witnesses all along have good reason to know, whatever any Papist say to the contrary.

5. And what Protestants be they that give power to any man on earth to depose Princes, and give their Kingdoms to others; or to disoblige all their

subjects, and warrant them to kill them, and dispense with oaths, and turn them all into smoke and straw as yours do?

Renounce your treacherous Principles, and we will cease to charge you with them. Let a General Council and Pope but Decree the contrary to what the forecited Pope and General Council have Decreed, or else do you all declare that you think this Pope and Council erred, and then we will shake hands with you; for then you will either cease to be true Papists, or at least become tolerable members of human societies. Why doth not the Pope himself at least condemn these doctrines, if really he disown them? The case is too plain.

CHAP. XLIX. Their last course is to turn to open Hostility, and stir up Princes to war and blood.

D*etect.* 40. Their last course when all other fail, is, To turn from Fraud to Force, and open Violence, stirring up Princes to wars and bloodshed, that they may destroy the professors of the Reformed Religion, as far as they are able, and do that by flames and sword, by halters, and hatches, which they cannot do by Argument? Hence have proceeded the bloody butcheries of the poor Waldenses and Albigenses, formerly and now again of late; and the wars in Bohemia, the League and wars, and Massacres in France, the desolating wars of Germany, the plots, invasions and wars in England: Most of the flames in Christendom of late ages have been kindled for the Pope by his Agents, that he might warm him by that fire that others are consumed by. Hence his own pretenses to the Temporal Sword, and so many volumes written to justify it, and so many Tragedies acted in the execution. And yet these men cry up Antiquity and Tradition. I wonder what Bishop in all the world for above three hundred years after Christ, did ever claim or exercise the temporal sword, as much as to be a Justice of Peace? Nay it was their judgment that it did not belong to them. Neither the Pope

nor any Bishop on earth, as such, hath anything to do with the coercive power of the sword; nor may not inflict the smallest penalty on body or purse, but only guide men by the Word of God; and the utmost penalty they can inflict is, to excommunicate them. And they have nothing to do to destroy men, when they have excommunicated them, nor to cause the Magistrate to do it: but rather should still endeavor their Conversion. *Synesius Epistol. 57*, against Andronicus saith as followeth [ὸ πολιτικῶς, &c. To join together secular government with the Priesthood, is to tie together things that are incoherent (or such as cannot be tied together) The old times made the same men Priests and Judges: For the Egyptians and Hebrews did long make use of the Government of Priests. But afterward, as seems to me, when God's work began to be done in a human manner, God separated the two sorts of life, and one of them was made sacred, and the other appointed for Rule and Command. For some he turned to these Material (or common, secular) things, and some he associated with himself: The former were appointed for secular business; the later for prayer. But from both doth God require that which is honest (or Good.) Why then dost thou revoke this? Why wilt thou conjoin what God hath separated? Who wouldst not have us indeed to do the work of secular Rulers, but by doing it to deprave (or mar) it; then which what can be more unhappy? Dost thou need a Ruler? (or Patron) Go to him that manageth the Laws of the Commonwealth. Dost thou need God in anything? Go to the Bishop (or Priest) of the City: not that thou shalt be sure there to have all that thou desirest, but that I will afford thee the best assistance that I can (or will do my best in it.) So far Synesius: Which I wonder how Petavius could pass over without some distorting observation, considering how low it treads the Roman Kingdom. But Baronius had the cunning as to extract even from

hence some advantage to his cause, even to show the Power that Pastors have to excommunicate Rulers (*ad An. 411*.) as Synesius with the Council did Andronicus. But 1. He went not out of his own circuit to play the Bishop in other men's Diocese. 2. Much less did he take up the Temporal Sword against him, but disclaimeth and detesteth any such thing. Why doth not the Pope when he hath past his Excommunications, content himself that he hath done his part; but he must excite Princes, yea force them to execute his rage, and fall upon the Lives and Dominions of such Princes as he will call Heretical? He knows how small account would be made of his brutish thunderbolts, if he had not a secular Arm to follow them: Nay why is he and many of his Cardinals and Bishops, secular Princes themselves? Why joineth he those Functions of Magistracy and Priesthood which Synesius here tells us God hath separated, and made incoherent in one and the same person? Let the Pope usurp what Ecclesiastical power he please, he would not so much disturb the Church by it, if he did not second it by another power. It is violence that he trusteth too. He knows if it were not for Arms and Violence, he would soon be spewed out by the Christian world. And yet many of his followers that seem more moderate, confess he hath nothing to do as Pope with any but the Spiritual Sword (which works no further then Conscience doth consent and yield.) And yet his Kingdom standeth on those legs, which the doctrine of these more moderate men do disown.

The same doctrine also Bernard taught the Pope himself. *Ad Eugen. P. R. de Considerat. l. 2*. Saying [*Quid tibi dimisit S. Apostolus? &c*. What did the holy Apostle leave thee? Such as I have saith he, that give I to thee: And what was that? One thing I am sure of; it was not gold, nor silver, when he said himself, Silver and gold have I none. If thou canst claim this by any other title, so let it be; but not by Apostolical right: For he could not give

thee that which he had not: such as he had, he gave, a care of the Churches, but did he give thee a domination? Hear himself [Not as Lord's (or Ruling as Lord's) saith he, in the Clergy (or heritage) but as examples of the flock. And less thou think that he spoke it only in humility, and not in verity, it is the voice of the Lord himself in the Gospel: The Kings of the Gentiles rule over them, and they that have power over them, as called Benefactors, (or Bounteous) and he inferreth [But you shall not be so] It is plain, that Domination is forbidden the Apostles. Go thou therefore, and usurp if thou darest, either Apostleship whilst thou Rulest as a Lord, or a Lordly Rule (or Domination) while thou art Apostolic. Plainly thou art forbidden one of the two: If thou wilt have both alike, thou losest both.] So far Bernard. By whose verdict the Pope and his Bishops are deprived of both; by grasping at both long ago.

Nay the Pope makes himself a Temporal Prince in every Princes Dominion on earth, where he is able to do it, and takes all the Clergy out of their Government into his own. So that actually he hath dispossessed them of part of their Dominion already, by taking so considerable a part of their subjects from under their power, yea and those that have so great an influence upon all the rest: What by public Preaching, and Church-governing, and secret Confessing, and dependence on them for the Sacraments, one would think it should be no hard matter for a Romish allowed numerous Clergy, to be Masters of any Kingdom where they are. And thus Princes are more than half conquered already, without a war. If any believe not that the Pope doth not thus exempt his Clergy from the secular power, it is because he knows not their most notorious principles and practices. Nay even in England, in King Charles his Articles for the Spanish match, the Pope had the confidence to demand this Prerogative,

and therefore himself added to the sixteenth Article, which freed them from Laws about Religion, [*Ecclesiastici vero nullis legibus subjaceant, nisi suorum superiorum Ecclesiasticorum*] that is [Ecclesiastic persons shall be under no Law, but of their Superior Ecclesiastics (or Churchmen)]. Is not this plain English? See Prynne's *Introduct. p. 6*. So that no Church-man must be under any Law of the Land, or Government of Secular Princes. And when they have such a strength in our own Garrisons, a foreign Enemy is easily let in. To the exciting of whom they will never be wanting, having their Agents in one garb or other at the ears of the Princes and States in Christendom, and of most of the Great and Noble persons that are deeply interested in the Government. Yea, and with Infidel Princes sometimes, as Cyril the Patriarch of Constantinople proved, to the loss of his life, for being so much against the Papists. And the more cause have all Christian Princes and States to be vigilant against these incendiaries, 1. Because they trust to War and Violence, and build their Kingdom on it, and therefore study it day and night. 2. And because they have such a fry of politick Jesuits all abroad continually upon the design; whose contrivances and endeavors are day and night to bring Princes and Nations to their will, and to kindle divisions and wars among them to attain their Ends. They make a trade of this employment. And expert prepared men, that follow a business all their days, are like enough to make something of it at last; especially while others sleep, or silently look on, and let them alone to play their game. If the Papists can but get into the Saddle, either by deceiving the Rulers, or Commanders, or by bringing foreign force against us, they will give us leave to dispute, and write, and preach against them, and laugh at us that will stand talking only, while they are working: And when the Sword is in their hand, they will soon answer all our Arguments, with a fagot, a

hatchet, or halter; Smithfield confuted the Protestants, that both the Universities could not confute. Their Inquisition is a School where they dispute more advantageously then in Academies. Though all the Learned men in the world could not confute the poor Albigenses, Waldenses and Bohemians, yet by these Iron Arguments they had men that presently stopped the mouths of many thousands, if not hundred thousands of them: Even as the Mohammedans confute the Christians. A Strappado is a knotty Argument. In how few days did they confute thirty thousand Protestants in and about Paris, till they left them not (on earth) a word to say. In how few weeks space did the ignorant Irish thus stop the mouths of many thousand Protestants? Even in Ulster alone, as is strongly conjectured, by testimony on Oath, about a hundred and fifty thousand men were mortally silenced: Alas we now find that the poor Irish commonly know but little more of Christ, but that he is a better man of the two then Saint Patrick: And therefore how long might they have been before they could have silenced so many Protestants any other way? There's nothing like stone-dead, with a Papist. They love not to tire themselves with Disputes, when the business may be sooner and more successfully dispatched.

Well, seeing this is the way that they are resolved on, and no peaceable motions will serve for the preventing it, all men that have care of the Church and Cause of Jesus Christ, and the happiness of their posterity, have cause to stand on watch and guard: Not to be cruel to them (leave that to themselves,) but to be secured from their cruelty. I should be abundantly more earnest than I am, to press all men to such a patience and submission in Causes of Religion, as leaves all to God alone, but that we all see how the Papists are still at the door with the Swords in their hands, and watching for an opportunity to break in. And if in modesty we stand still and let them

alone, they will give us free leave when they have the day, to call them Traitors, or perfidious, or what we please. Let losers talk: Let them have the Rule, and then make the best you can of your Arguments. If they can once get England and other Protestant Countries, into the case of Spain and Italy, their Treachery shall not be cast in their teeth; for they will leave none alive and at liberty to do it. When we see in good sadness that it is Navies, and Armies, and stabbings of Kings, and Powder-plots, and Massacres that we have to dispute against, it's time to be able to Answer them in their own way, or we lose the day. It is not a good Cause, or wit, or learning, or honesty, that will then serve turn. I know God is all-sufficient for his Church, and in him must be our Trust: But he requireth us to expect his blessing in the use of lawful probable means. He can give us Corn without plowing, and sowing: but we have little reason to forbear these and expect it: He can Convert men without preaching: But yet the blessing of God doth presuppose Paul's planting, and Apollo's watering. He can Rule and Defend us without Magistrates, but it is not his appointed way. And he can save us from deceitful bloody men, without our care, and vigilancy and resistance: but it is not his ordinary appointed course in which he would have us look to him for deliverance.

And therefore in the Name of God let Princes and Parliaments be vigilant: for they watch for the outward security of the Church and Common-wealth (as Ministers do for our spiritual well-fare) as those that must give account. And let the people take heed what Parliament or Magistrates they choose: And let all that love the Gospel, and the prosperity of the Christian world, and of their posterity, have their eyes in their head, and take heed of that bloody hand, that hath in England, Scotland, Ireland, France, Savoy, Low-countries, Germany, Bohemia, &c. already spilled so many streams of

Christian blood. If the Wise, the Learned, Moderate Lord du Plessis, was so zealous for the Lawfulness of Necessary Defense, as Grotius chargeth him, as to put it into his Testament, (whom he makes also the Author of Junius Brutus, I know not on what ground) doubtless he knew with whom he had to do, and thought that every Guisian League was not a Law of God or of the King.

Some Princes think that it is their safest way to please the Pope and Jesuits, and so will be Papists, on the terms as some of the Indians worship the Devil, because he is so naught, that he may not hurt them. But these men were wiser, if they understood, that the malice of Infernal Spirits is not to be avoided by pleasing them, but by resisting them. They are too bad to be ever pleased by any means, but what will be your utter ruin: And they are not stronger than the Devil himself, who will fly if we resist him. If the best were not the most Powerful, what would become of the world? And if God be stronger than the Devil, he should rather be pleased then the Devil; for he is able to defend you from the Devils displeasure: and he is most able to hurt you if you be despisers of his power: which Justice will effect more certainly on the bad, then Satan's malice can do upon the good. Men think themselves wise, that shift for their safety by carnal and unlawful means: But they shall all find at least, that plain honesty is the best policy, and the favor of God the best security, and a life of faith the most prudent life; and that shifting for yourselves in unbelieving ways, is the greatest folly. It is the design of the Papists by the strokes of Clements, Ravilliacks, Vauxes, and such others, to terrify Princes, that they may not dare to resist them, but may see that they have no hold of their lives while they are under their displeasure. But yet such as have most displeased them have scaped best. It is recorded by one, that the great King Henry of France, being persuaded to

stand it out against the Jesuits, answered, [Give me security for my Life then] And what a security did he find in his unbelieving way?

A thousand pities it is that Protestant Princes should not be united among themselves, that they might be strengthened for their joint Defense; But that the envious man should be able so far to over-wit them, as to sow among them the seeds of war, while they sleep, or selfishly mind their own affairs and interests: And a greater pity and shame it is, that the Ministers of the Gospel of peace should be the causes of these divisions, or should not do their best to heal them: But it is the greatest shame of all to us, that so many years experience of the calamitous effects of our Divisions, and so much industry of many worthy peaceable men, should do no more to a fuller Reconciliation then yet is done. The names, and pacifying Labors of such as Duraeus, Davenant, Hall, Morton, Usher, Hayne, Dr. Morin, Amyraut, Hottonus, Conradus, Bergius, Johannes Bergius, Georgius, Calixtus, Jerem: Burroughs, and many more that have labored for peace, do live as Monuments of their honor and our dishonor, and do reflect much shame upon the faces of those Reformed Ministers and Churches that after all this are so much unreconciled: yea, that are not by the strongest motives and persuasives, so much as excited to zealous endeavors for the healing of our sad division; no nor some of them restrained from the passionate prosecution of their increase.

If yet any Papist, believing such false Histories as [the Image of both Churches] doth contain, or really finding any Protestants culpable, shall say, that we are as bad as they in wars or cruelty, and that *Illiacos intra muros peccatur, & extra*. I again reply, 1. That true History and experience tells the world, that there is no comparison between their excessive cruelties and ours. 2. Yet it is none of my desire or intent, to defend any person or people

that have been truly guilty in the least degree. 3. Our doctrine is against that which theirs doth own. 4. If either our Doctrine or practice have been amiss, we desire reproof and information, and are willing to reform them. The Word of God being our only Rule, if it appear that we have in any point misunderstood it, we desire nothing more than to be rectified, and then we shall confess our former faults before the world, and promise reformation. For our Principles fix us not in Sin or Error. But the Papists are fixed in their Errors, and think there is a necessity lieth on them never to amend. Now the Pope and a General Council hath already decreed that the Pope may depose Princes, and Absolve their subjects, and give their Lands to others; to amend this abominable error, is with them to give away all their cause, and to cease to be Papists. So that all Princes and People must necessarily despair of their amendment.

CHAP. I. Some Proposals for a (hopeless) Peace.

It is a Defensive conflict that I have been hitherto managing; This work is put upon us by our adversaries. But in the conclusion I will add a few words of that with enticeth by its amiable aspect, and which we gladly follow, without importunity or constraint. And were our Power but answerable to our Desires, we would soon put an end to these contentions of the Church, without the hurt of any of the Dissenters: Yea did there appear but any considerable Hopes of success, I should venture to be more large in Proposals to that end: But when wiser men, of greater interest can do no good, and the case appeareth as next to desperate, a few words may suffice to satisfy my own conscience, and to please my mind with the mention of a Peace, and to help some others to right Dispositions and Desires, though we have never so little expectation of success.

And in order to what follows, I must first desire every Reader rightly to understand the meaning and design of all that I have hitherto said. It is but to be a necessary help to the Discovery of the Truth, and the confutation of the contrary errors, and the just defense of the doctrine of Christ, and of his

Churches, I solemnly protest that it is none of my design or desire, 1. To make any believe that the Difference is wider between us and the Papists then indeed it is. Nay I am satisfied that in many doctrinal points it is not so great as commonly it is taken to be by many, if not most, on both sides: as in the points of certainty of Salvation, of Pardon, of Justification, of Works, of Faith; and in almost all the controversies about Predestination, Redemption, Free-will, the work of Grace, &c. The Dominicans in sense agree with the Calvinist (as they call them) and the Jesuits with the Lutherans and Arminians: and so in diverse other points. The diverse understanding of words among us, and the weakness and passions of Divines, and a base fear of the censures of a party, hath occasioned may on both sides to feign the differences to be much wider then indeed they are: so that when an Alvarez, a Banns, a Gibieuf, have spoken the same things as the Protestants do, they are presently fain to pour out abundance of unworthy slanders against the Protestants, for fear of being accounted Protestants themselves. And to show their party how much they differ from us, they must feign us to be monsters, and to hold that which commonly we abhor: And some Protestants are too blame also in some measure in this kind. This unchristian dealing will gripe the conscience, when once it is awakened. Let me be rather numbered with those that are ambitious to seem as Like to all the Churches of Christ, and as much to agree with them, as honestly and possibly I may, what party soever distaste that union and agreement. And let my soul abhor the desire of appearing more distant and disagreeing then we are, what censures so ever I may incur. Our students would not so ordinarily read Aquinas, Scotus, Ariminensts, Durand, &c. if there were not in them abundance of precious truth which they esteem. How near doth Dr. Holden come to us in the fundamental point of the Resolution

of our faith? How near come to the Scotists to us in sense, about the point of Merit? And Waldensis and others yet nearer? How near comes Contarenus to us (and many more) in the point of Justification? How near comes Cardinal Cajetan to us in the Liberty of dissenting from the Fathers in the Exposition of the Scriptures? And so doth Waldonate and many another. How near comes Cardinal Cusanus (lib. de Concord.) to us, even in the Essential point of difference, about the Original and Title that Rome hath to its supremacy? How near comes Gerson to us in the point of Venial and Mortal sin? Perhaps as near as we are to ourselves. How near come the Dominicans and Jansenians to us in the points of Predestination, Grace and Free- will? For my own part, I scarce know a Protestant that my thoughts in these do more concur with, then they do with Jansen, (that is indeed, with Augustine himself.) There are very few points of the Protestant doctrine, which I cannot produce some Papist or other to attest (and easily thus be even with Mr. Brerely, upon fairer terms then he deals with us.)

2. I do also protest that it is none of my desire or design, to create any unjust Censures of the final state of Papists in any Readers: nor to persuade men that they are all damned, or that there are no honest godly men among them. When I read such writers as Gerson, Barbanson, Ferus, and others, I am fully satisfied that there are many among them (how many God only knows) that truly fear God, and are sanctified gracious people, with whom I hope to dwell forever. And therefore I think it my Duty not only to forbear unjust Censures of them, but also to love them with that entire special Christian Love by which Christ would have us known to be his Disciples; and to persuade all others to do the like. Though still I am constrained to say, that in my small acquaintance with them, I find no comparison between

the English Papists and our Churches in point of Holiness. I would they were much better.

3. I do also protest that it is not my desire or design to make any innocent Papist to be accounted guilty of the faults of others which he disowns.

4. Nor is it any of my desire or design to provoke the Magistrate to any cruelty or injustice towards them; nor to lay any penalty on them, but what is truly of necessity for the safety of himself and the Common-wealth, and a just restraint of them from perverting others, and doing mischief to the souls of men, as I shall open more at large anon.

5. Nor is it any of my desire or design to make the generality of them unjustly more odious with Rulers or People, then the measure of their corruptions do deserve: Or to hide any of their virtues, or deprive them of any honor which is their due. This much my conscience witnesseth of my intents; though I know the partial will hardly believe it, when they feel themselves smart by that Contradiction which they have made necessary for our own defense. And this I thought necessary to premise, before I lay down the following Proposals, that prejudice and passion do not turn away men eyes, or cause them to misinterpret them. For it is prejudice, partiality, and faction, that hath hitherto frustrated all such Proposals and attempts.

CHAP. LI. Five several Degrees of Peace which lie before us to be attempted between the Roman and Reformed Churches.

There are five several Degrees of Peace which lie before us to be attempted between the Roman and Reformed Churches: We shall begin with the highest, and upon supposition of the failing of our Designs for that, come down to the next, and so to the Lowest.

1. The first Degree of Peace to be Intended and Desired is, That we may so far Agree, as that we may hold personal Communion in the same Assemblies, in the worship of God, and live under the same particular Pastors.

2. If that cannot be attained, the next Degree desirable is, That we may hold a Catholic Christian Communion in several Assemblies, under several Pastors, acknowledging each other the true Churches of Christ and joining in Synods when there is need, or at least, giving each other, as Christian Brethren, the right hand of Fellowship.

3. If that may not be attained, the next Degree desirable is, That we may take one another for Christians and Churches of Christ, though under such corruptions as we think we are bound to disown by denying the present

exercise of Communion: as we do with particular Offenders, whom we only suspend, but not condemn.

4. If this much may not be had, but we will needs excommunicate each other absolutely, the next degree of Peace desirable is, That we may at least so far regard the common truths that we are agreed upon, and the souls of the people, as to consult on certain terms on which we may most peaceably manage our differences, with the least hatred, and violence, and disturbance of the Peace of Christendom, and with the least impediment to the general success of those common truths that we are all agreed in.

5. If this may not be attained, the lowest Degree desirable is, That at least we may take each other for more tolerable adversaries then Mohammedans and Infidels are, and therefore may make a common Agreement to cease our wars and blood-shed, and turn all our Arms against the great and common enemy of the Christian name.

Were it not for the Devil, and wicked minds, all these might be attained: but if men be not themselves incarnate Devils, we may expect the last. And understand that the terms of the lowest Degrees are all implied in the Higher.

And now for the Highest and most desirable Degree of Peace, viz. That we may meet in the same Assemblies, under the same Pastors, there is so little probability that ever it should be accomplished, and withal the various apprehensions of Christians doth make it so necessary to bear with one another in this, that I shall say but little of it, as knowing that I am like to lose my labor. Only this much concerning the terms.

If you will impose no more in point of Belief, as necessary to Salvation, but what is contained in the holy Scriptures, yea and in the three Creeds, and four first General Councils; and will leave the Pastors of the particular

Churches to worship God according to the Rule of the holy Scriptures, prudentially themselves determining of mere Circumstances left to their determination; according to the general Rules, of Order, Decency and Edification, and bearing with a difference herein according to the different state of the Churches or judgment of the Pastors, this is the only probable way to bring us to this highest degree of Peace. Though according to this course, men should be left to some liberty to join with what particular Congregation they see best, and so would most commonly join with those that are nearest to their own judgment; yet the minds of most would be so mollified by mutual forbearance, and by being satisfied in the way that is thus commonly agreed on, that they would not scruple to join with one another in worship in the several Assemblies.

And here I shall further add, that if these terms cannot be yielded to, yet all that will yield to the terms of the next Degree of Peace, may be admitted into our Assemblies, though we cannot join with them in theirs. For the Papists have much more in the manner of their worship to keep us back, then we have in ours to keep them back. For their errors lie in Excess, and they suppose ours to lie but in Defect. Now Conscience may well yield to perform one part of a duty when it cannot perform the rest: But it can never yield to commit one actual sin, by doing what is forbidden by God. E. G. If the Papists think that we sinfully omit the Sacrament of extreme unction, they may nevertheless be present at the Sacrament of Baptism. If they think we preach not all the truth that we ought, they may nevertheless hear and receive that which we do preach. But in their Assemblies we must do those positive actions which our Consciences tell us are sins against God. And therefore unless they will yield (as they will not) to the above mentioned

terms, we cannot join in their Assemblies; but upon the terms in the next Chapter we can admit them into ours.

But if the Churches have not a necessary Liberty in this, they will never agree, but be still breaking into pieces, or persecuting one another, to force men to join with such Assemblies as best please them that bear the Sword. Though we readily grant that to hear and learn the principles of Religion, and submit to the state and duty of Catechumens, men may with less inconvenience be forced, and ordinarily should so be.

CHAP. LII. The second Degree of Peace desirable.

The second Degree of Peace desirable, below the former, is, That if we cannot live under the same particular Pastors, and join in the same Assemblies, yet we may hold a distant Catholic Communion in several Assemblies, without condemning or persecuting one another; and may afford the special Love of Christians to each other.

This will not be done as long as we take each other for Heretics; and therefore the causes of those censures must be removed, partly by a nearer agreement in our Principles, and partly by a greater Moderation in our Censures of one another. And this a man would think among Christians might be obtained. The terms on which it must be had are these.

Suffer us to confine ourselves in Worship and Church-government to the Word of God; and the Determination of our particular Churches or Pastors about mere Circumstantials left to their determination, and do you confine yourselves accordingly, or not extending your practice beyond the Canons of the four first General Councils, and the rest called [*Canones Ecclesiae Universalis*] (published by Justellus, Tillius, or the *Codex Dionysii Exigui*)

and for matters of Faith, we will all profess to receive the Scripture, and whatever is contained in the said Councils and the three Creeds, and to insist upon no more as necessary. And on these terms we may live in Love as Brethren.

Here note, 1. That in matter of Faith we will not be bound to take more than is in the Scripture, and yet we will take all as aforesaid that is in the Creeds, because we are persuaded that there is no more than is in the Scripture. 2. We will not tie each other to profess on what Grounds we receive the Doctrine of these Creeds and Councils. If you receive it as Tradition superadded to Scripture, and if we receive it as being the same with Scripture Doctrine, or a meet Exposition of it, we will leave each other in this without examination to their liberty, as long as it is the same things that we believe. 3. In matters of Worship and Government we may not be compelled to take in all that is in all these Councils; but only we will promise not to go beyond them, and take in anymore, and so shall you: so that if some of us confine ourselves to the Holy Scripture, and others will go further, as far as all those Canons do extend; we will yield to live as Brethren in Christian Love, and forbear the censuring of one another. And herein you may well condescend to us, when in many things you have cast off the Canons of those Councils yourselves; and abundance of them concern not our times or Countries, and so many of your own Writers confess that all things necessary to Salvation are in the Scriptures, and that Canons are mutable, and Churches may vary in these lesser things.

CHAP. LIII. Could the former terms of Peace be yielded to?

Could the former terms of Peace be yielded to, it would be happy for the Churches; and I am persuaded were it not for the Italians, the French would yield to them. And some Protestants will go further, and yield to Rome; that if Papists will confine their Faith, and Government, and Worship but to those limits as the Greeks, Armenians, Ethiopians, &c. do, they will readily hold this Catholic Communion with them. But then we must still remember, 1. That we will not be bound to approve of all that they do. 2. Nor shall they go about to force all others to rise up to their pitch; nor do as the English Bishops would have done, to silence and cast out all those Ministers that will not go beyond the Scriptures. You shall bear with all that will be Ruled by the Scripture, and we will bear with all that will not go beyond the said General Councils, or *Codex Canonum Ecclesiae universalis*: Yea, and admit such to our Society and Assemblies.

But now supposing that Rome will not yield to this (though me thinks France and other Nations may do it without them) the next Degree desirable is, that [At least we may take one another for Christians and Churches that

have such corruptions, as yet leave us good hopes of the salvation of multitudes, though we suppose salvation more rare and difficult where those corruptions are, then where they are not, and though we are forced to suspend that Communion with such which with sound members we should hold.]

And indeed the obtaining of this much Peace, requireth no more but Christian Charity conducted by a right understanding of each other. And for my part I have already this much peace with the Church of Rome, and so have many millions more of Protestants as well as I: and I think the generality of them: But Rome hath not so much Charity for us: But we shall not answer nor be condemned for other men's uncharitableness. I need not therefore propose any means for that peace which we have already attained to, or may if we will. But then let this be accompanied by the following forbearances.

CHAP. LIV. The fourth Degree of Peace desirable.

The fourth Degree of Peace desirable, whether the last mentioned be attained or not, is, [That we may so far lay by our hatred, wrath, and striving about the Controverted-points, as to consult together of the terms on which we may manage our differences with the least disturbance to the Peace of Christendom, and the least disadvantage to the Truths that we are agreed in, and to the people's souls.]

Religious Reason must needs confess the Reasonableness of this proposal in the General: But all the difficulty lieth in the particulars. If you ask me what the particular terms are on which we should agree, I answer, There are many at hand, that Reason must needs approve of; but because there is no likelihood of accepting them, I shall spare the labor of proposing them. And the rather, because we have much ado to agree on this much among ourselves, or the Papists among themselves: with what hope can we move that the Agreement should be Universal? But this much I may propose, 1. That a Consultation of the Agents of Christian Princes and Divines might do much to further such a thing. And till that can be had, some few of the

more Peaceable Princes and Divines should lead the way, and give the rest a good example. 2. And that a Universal Liberty of Conscience, with necessary restrictions, might be a probable way.

Where note, 1. That it is a Universal Liberty only that we move for, or at least on equal terms. It is not that the Papists may have Liberty in England, and we have none in Spain and other Countries. The Author of the Image of both Churches maketh a long and subtle persuasive for Liberty of Conscience: But where would he have it? Let them take this equal motion, and yield to it if they dare. Let the Protestants have liberty in Italy, Spain, Flanders, Portugal, Austria, Bavaria, &c. and we shall consent that the Papists have as much Liberty in England, Holland, Sweden, Denmark, &c. But it must in reason be on equal terms. Yet this advantage we know they have, that their Agents and Missionaries are incomparably more numerous than ours, by reason of the multitude of their Friars, Jesuits, &c. and their doctrines are more suitable to corrupted nature, and carnal interest, and the people are more engaged by worldly obligations to their ways: And yet we are so confident of the Power of Truth, that I would this Proposal were accepted. The Bible itself without any Preachers, would shrewdly shake the Kingdom of the Pope, where men have liberty to use it.

2. The limitations of this Liberty are, 1. That one party have no more of it then the other. 2. That it extend not to allow a disturbance of Ministers and Churches in God's Worship, nor any unpeaceable tumultuary proceedings. 3. That no Party be tolerated under this pretense, to teach anything against the Essentials or Necessary points that we are agreed on, nor anything that is against the peace of the Common-wealth, or lives, or dignities of the Governors thereof.

Two parties among ourselves will dislike this proposal.

1. Some will say, If Liberty be desirable, why may not we grant it in England, though Spain, Italy, &c. will not?

Answ. This Liberty is not Desirable for itself, but as a means to that end which is so Desirable. And therefore it is no further desirable then it tendeth to that end. And a partial Toleration of them, that tolerate not us, is so far from being such a means, as that it is the next way to destroy the end that we desire, it will but put our necks under their feet, and open our bosoms to their Swords, and so make our desired Peace impossible. No friend of the Gospel and Reformed Churches will prosecute that motion.

2. Others will say, It is unlawful to grant such a Liberty to Papists, because it is false doctrine which they will preach, and Idolatry which they will exercise; and we must not do evil that good may come by it.

Answ. We may do no evil, but we may omit that which at another time is a duty, in a season when it is no duty. To punish such offenders is a positive duty, which at all times is not a duty, but unseasonably performed is a sin. For a Magistrate therefore to punish such offenders, when it apparently tendeth to hinder the progress of the Gospel, and overthrow the peace and safety of the Christian State, is not a Duty, but a sin. Would any of these Objectors be against a Magistrates releasing of a Jesuit out of Prison, in exchange for a faithful Minister of the Gospel, especially of many; as prisoners are commonly exchanged in war? If not, why should they be against the releasing of such a man to higher ends, even to save men's souls? To give Liberty is but to Permit, or not to Hinder, or not to Punish: and therefore is but the not doing of a work when it is unseasonable (as Sacrifice is when God requireth Mercy.) And he that may Permit, or forbear to punish, may on a just reason promise so to do. So that this is but

forbearing the punishing of Papists, when we cannot punish them without the exceeding hurt of the Church, and wrong to many thousand souls.

But I know I speak all this in vain, for the Pope will never consent that Protestants shall sow their seed at Rome, lest it quickly unneast him. But in the meantime let the Papists here confess if they be reasonable, that we have no reason to give Liberty to them, that will give none to us, or upon unequal terms. If they claim a special Title to it, as having the juster cause, we desire no more than a fair trial of that, and let them that have the juster cause take all.

3. Another particular that should here be agreed on is this, (whether the former be consented to or not;) That on both sides where the Teachers have any Toleration or forbearance, they may be forced by the Magistrate to teach the Ignorant people that adhere to them, the great Articles of the Christian faith (both words and sense) which we are all agreed in. Which was Bishop Ushers motion to the Papist Priests in Ireland. For saith he, among the Papists the people are suffered to perish for want of knowledge; the vulgar superstitions of Popery not doing them half that hurt, that the ignorance of those common principles of faith doth, which all true Christians are bound to learn] (*Serm. at Wansted, p. 33*.)

4. Another necessary particular to be agreed on is, that we use not bitter invectives against each other, nor uncharitable contending's, especially in the ears of the ignorant people that have not yet learned the common truths which we agree in: but that our Debates be managed only in such Assemblies as are capable of them, and in a sober Christian way.

5. Another is, that such Magistrates that will not grant Toleration, may yet on both sides avoid cruelties, and inflict no more penalties for matters of mere Religious worship, then necessity shall require: and that herein they

may agree upon some equality in the several Nations. And in this let Spain, Italy, Austria, and the rest, for shame consent, to be as moderate as the Turk, and to shut up the doors of their bloody Inquisition.

6. Let us all agree to renounce all Treachery and unfaithfulness against the Sovereign Powers, and all seditious disturbances of the Peace of Common-wealth's.

7. Let those afford us the common Love of men, that think us not capable of the special Love of Christians: and so let us Love our Neighbors as ourselves, and study to do good, and not hurt to one another; and give over plotting to undermine one another, and destroy one another's civil interest, and get our Neighbors under our feet. This much well practiced, would do something to the peace of the Christian world.

CHAP. LV. The lowest Degree, that none but incarnate Devils one would think should resist.

The lowest Degree, that none but incarnate Devils one would think should resist is this; that if we will needs live as enemies, yet we may remember that we have all greater enemies; and therefore let us give over our wars, and let every Nation be quietly governed by their own Laws and Sovereigns, and let us all join together against the common enemies of Christ.

We cannot but know that much of Christ's interest lieth in our hands, and that if either party were devoured by the Turk, it would be a heavy blow to the Christian cause: If God should suffer that proud enemy to come and make a third among us, to end our quarrels, we must justify him in his judgments; and must to our perpetual shame confess that by our proud and passionate contending's, and unpeaceableness, and self-seeking, we did betray the Christian cause. O wonderful stupidity and impiety of great men, and Learned men, professing so much zeal for God, that they can no more agree, nor bear in Love and Compassion with each other, nor cease their wars, when a raging potent enemy stands over them, ready to devour them

both. Let the Venetians take the honor, and we the shame: How ever their own Interest may engage them, yet materially their wars are more honorable than ours. The Pope is eager for a General Peace among his subjects, that they may be strengthened to devour us: But it were an honester design, that would give him more comfort at last, to mediate a Peace among all Christians, that in this at least they might be one, to oppose the Turk, and rescue the Heritage of Christ which he hath oppressed.

And O what a blessed thing it were, if the Jesuits, Friars and Protestants could but agree, to join together for the conversion of the poor Indians. And either preach in the same, or several Countries, without seeking the destruction there of one another; yea and afford each other help: that the English, Hollanders, and others might send Preachers as well as Merchants into the Indies; and we might there contribute our endeavors to propagate the Gospel, though in our different ways, not envying, hating and hindering each other: but remembering we all confess one Christ, though not one Vice-christ.

Conclusion.

I Have cast out these Proposals merely to acquaint the peaceable Christian, what he should desire, that the frame of his heart may be right before God: and not with any expectation that they should be so regarded as to procure what they drive at. I am not so weak, or ignorant of the inconsiderableness of the Proposer, or of the selfishness and ungodliness of the world. But yet I may lawfully take the comfort of the most uneffectual desires and endeavors that are honest.

And for those that would have us Reconciled upon the Grotian terms, or upon the French Foundation of a General Council, and would have all forced, as our Bishops attempted to come over to their way, and deny

Liberty to the rest, that cannot thus close with them; and all that think that the Church must have some Visible Head or Sovereign to unite in, I shall show them their error in a distinct Disputation, which I am publishing next to this, as a supplement: and therein I shall give them such further Proposals for a just Reconciliation, as men that are Studious of Peace may prosecute, with hope of some success.

And because I have lately met with a Paper called [An Explanation of the Roman Catholic Belief,] &c. which pretendeth to much moderation, in diverse points; I purpose next to inquire, whether it mean as it pretends, that if it do, we may give it welcome; if not, we may Detect its Fraud: For as I should much rejoice to hear of so much amendment of the Roman Belief, which I thought had been supposed by themselves to be incorrigible; So I must confess that I am so much for plain and open dealing, that I think it my duty to help to bring their works into the Light, and try how they agree with the Truth and among themselves; that men may judge of them as they are.

FINIS.

PART II.

Monergism Books

CHAP. I. Showing the Occasion and Reasons of this Writing, especially as from the Grotians; which are Vindicated from the frivolous exceptions of Mr. Tho. Pierce.

I have already in the first Part of this Book (and formerly in another) disproved the Popes Universal Headship, and answered what Bellarmine, Boverius, and some others say for the maintaining of it: And it is a work already done so fully by Chamier, Whitaker, and many others, but most triumphantly and copiously by David Blondell in a French Treatise in *Folio de primatu in Ecclesia* against Cardinal Perron, that I need not, and therefore intend not to say much here upon that subject. But this Disputation I principally intend, 1. For the subverting of the Foundation of Popery, which is the supposition, that the Visible Catholic Church must needs be united in some Human Visible Head. 2. To confute the Opinion of the moderate sort of French Papists and Grotians, that take a General Council to be the Legislative Head, and the Judicial Head while they are in Being; and the Pope ruling by the Laws of Councils, to be the ordinary Judicial Head. 3. To deliver some persons from a dangerous Temptation, that by Grotius, or his followers here in England are drawn into a conceit that the Catholic Church is such a Body as we here deny, and think that the

unity that the Scripture so commendeth to us cannot be attained without an Universal Visible Head: which Temptation of theirs is much increased by observing the differences of Opinions in the world; which every good man doth lament, as we do all the sins and frailties that on earth accompany us in the state of imperfection. As I blame not those that desire perfect Knowledge, or Holiness; but blame them that promise it to the Church on Earth, when it is the prerogative of Heaven; and much more should blame him that would say we shall be perfectly Wise and Holy if we will but be of this Opinion, that the Church hath an Infallible Human Head; even so I blame not them that desire perfect Concord (the Consequent of perfect Knowledge and Holiness;) for this is to desire Heaven: But I blame them that promise us this Heaven on Earth; and them much more that tell us we shall have it if we will but believe that a Pope or Council is the Universal Head; and so will condemn the Church on Earth, because it hath not attained that Celestial perfection, which they have once fancied that it may and should attain.

Concerning Grotius his opinion, design and great endeavors to reduce the Churches to Popery, under the pretense of a Conciliation, I have lately by the Invitation of Mr. Thomas Pierce given in my Evidence (I think beyond all further question) out of his own writings, in his frequent and express assertions. And Rivet in his Dialysis and his *Apologet.* and other writings hath sufficiently confuted him. The mistakes of many in their judging of Grotius, are caused by their supposition, that the man was the same in his first Conciliatory enterprises, and in his last, which is not true. He oft professeth his mutations himself, and how apt he was to dislike that which he had but lately thought or said: At first he thought out of Reconciling the Protestants among themselves: But afterwards his design was to Reconcile

them with the Papists, and that by drawing them all to be Papists, that is, to unite in the Pope of Rome as the Universal Governor, ruling according to Canons and Decrees; and this he thought was the only way to the union of the Churches.

The Truth of this, and the Mischiefs of the Enterprise, must be apprehended by him that will understand my endeavors in this dispute, and escape the snare thats laid for their perversion. And for the Truth of it, I refer you to my foresaid writing of the Grotian Religion. Since which it pleased Mr. Pierce to publish a sheet containing (not anything that hath the least aptitude to persuade a rational man that Grotianism is not Popery, but) some Reasons why he doth not, at least, as yet perform the vindication, with a General profession how easily he can do it, and make me a Winding sheet, at least as suitable as that which I made for Popery (which when he hath confuted, I shall better know his mind and strength) This with two or three frivolous Exceptions, and many swelling words of Vanity, with certain Squibs and empty jeers, according to the manner of the man, is the matter of his Advertisement. Nothing could have been easier for him then to say [or almost to say, that I am very liable, in every line] and that his advantages are too many, and that I am an advocate for the crimson sins of others, and an encomiast of my own. Nothing more vain than his ostentation of the mild discharge of his Censorship, and his senseless intimation that I take the Virtues of Episcopal Divines, for glittering sins, when he never had a word from me of such a sense or tendency. (But Grotians will now be but Episcopal Divines, and their glittering sins, must be their Virtues.) Because I had acknowledged how civilly he dealt with me (no doubt on a supposition that I was nearer his conceits then those that he had so copiously reproached,) he takes it as an acknowledgement of his

moderation, as if it were the proof of a man's moderation, that he can give a civil word to any, and a while refrain abusing one, while he is abusing many. I am thankful to him that spits in most men's faces, that he speaks to, that he spitteth not in mine; when I give a civil man no such thanks. When I commend a man for not belying me, reproaching me, or otherwise abusing me, as he doth others, I should suspect he would take it for a dispraise: For I use not to thank good men for doing me no mischief. His valuing the security of his own estate above David's or Peters (that had such special Testimonies of their Holiness, and Promises from God, before theirs falls,) and his defending his Malignant sins as virtues, his venomous reproaches of Puritans and Presbyterians as Protestants frightened out of their wits, men of sedition and violence, and a bloody Generation, with abundance of the like, and then telling us that he meant no Puritans but such (as if one should say, the Arminians are a perfidious bloody Generation; and then say, Its well known that he meant no Arminians but such,) these and such like passages show the quality of the man and his Advertisement. He that durst openly and frequently charge his adversaries with slanders, and yet tell the world, that I [pretend that the difference between him and his Antagonists is merely Verbal] (because I said that Most of our contentions about those points are more about words then matter, and that such eager men as he and his Antagonist, do make themselves and others believe that we differ much more about them then we do.] Is this equipollent to [a difference merely verbal?]) this man its like dare do the same by others.

But it is the business of Grotius upon which I am to meddle with him. And first he saith [that on the same Reasons as I conclude him a Papist, I must conclude him a Protestant, unless I think as hardly of the Augustine Confession as of the Council of Trent.] *Answ.* I shall yield it, when you have

proved [that a Protestant is one that holdeth to the Council of Trent, and the New Creed by Pope Pius, made long after the Augustine Confession, and that the Common Government in which all the Catholic Church must unite, is the Universal Headship of the Pope, governing according to the Canons and Decrees, and that the Augustine Confession is so ‘to be expounded (by fair means or foul) as shall be agreeable to, or consistent with all this.] We use not to call such men as these Protestants, but Papists, but if this be your meaning when you call yourself a Protestant, you should have told us sooner, if you desire to be known.

He saith (the proof of which we wait for) that I [mistake at once the whole drift of Grotius his excellent *Discussio Apol.* and that I translate not his Latin into English, or lamely, &c.] *Answ.* 1. Nothing more easy, then to tell me I mistake! Are not his words plain enough, and frequent enough to open to us so much of his mind as I have charged him with? Let the Readers of his words recited by me, be the Judges: (For him that will believe you, either to save him the labor of reading, or against his eye sight, he is not one of them that I write for; but shall have Liberty for me to be deceived.) 2. That I translated not the words of Grotius, was purposely done, fore-deeming that such men as you would have said they were mistranslated, and that they were not his own but mine: I am sure now that I give you but his own: And if you think him wronged if the English Reader know him not, by a Translation, I pray you translate the words yourself; for I suppose you will least quarrel with your own. But to pleasure you, I will Translate (as well as I can) the passage which you choose out to defend, and a few more. *Discus. Apol. p. 255*. [Those that knew Grotius, know that he always wished for the restitution of Christians into One and the same body: But he sometime thought, even after he was known to the most Illustrious Vairius, that it

might be begun by a Conjunction of the Protestants among themselves: Afterwards he saw that this was altogether unfeasible; because, besides that the genius of almost all the Calvinists is most alien from all peace, the Protestants are not joined among themselves by any Common Government of the Church; which are the causes that the parties made cannot be gathered into one Body of Protestants; yea and that more and more parties are ready to rise out of them. Wherefore Grotius now absolutely judgeth, and many with him, that the Protestants cannot be joined among themselves, unless at once they be joined to them that cohere to the Sea of Rome: without which there can no common Government be hoped for in the Church. Therefore he wisheth that the divulsion which fell out, and the causes of that divulsion may be taken away. The Primacy of the Bishop of Rome according to the Canons is none of these, as Melanchthon confesseth.] I think this is the English of Grotius words (be it spoken with a Salvo to the preeminence of Mr. Pierces Translating faculty.) But here he hath a quarrel, and that so momentous, as to be his grand, if not only instance of my misdealing; and so he hath written enough against the Contagion of my Volume! A happy generation! That can make what they will true or false by asserting it, and can give themselves the victory at their pleasure by triumphing, and by wiping their mouths, can make themselves innocent! And by saying anything, or such a nothing as this, can prove Popery to be the Protestant Religion, and make many Worshipful Gentlemen of their mind, that were of their mind before they knew it, implicitly believing in them, and in their Church. Well: but what is my miscarriage? Why [the later part of these words, which are the chief, Mr. Baxter takes no notice of in the English account which he renders of them.] *Answ.* 1. He supposed that you and all that he wrote this for understood

Latin, though in Answer to an English Cavil, he wrote his Discourse in English. And he that Translated none of the sentence, thought it no injury, to give account in English but of part. 2. But open your eyes, and look further into his words, and see whether you wrong him not, by leaving out the rest of his account, as much as he wronged Grotius: And look into your own advertisement, and see whether you recited not Grotius his words yourself without a Translation, committing the same error which you reprehend, while you do reprehend it. But saith the Episcopal Divine, (for so he will needs be called) [He is deeply silent as to the causes of the breach which Grotius did wish might be taken away, and which he charged the Papists with.] *Answ.* 1. Was I deeply silent that Grotius would have the causes taken away? What! When I recite his very words? Or was I deeply silent of the particular causes? Do you mean Here, or Throughout? If Here, so I was deeply silent of ten thousand things more, which either it concerned me not to speak, or I had not the faculty of expressing in one sentence. If you mean Throughout, you read without your eyes, or wrote either with a defective Memory or Honesty. Read again, and you shall find that I recite the causes. 3. But did I not all that my task required, by reciting the Negation of the causes [It was not saith Grotius, the Primacy of the Bishop of Rome according to the Canons?] And I shown you partly, and the Canons show you fully, that that Primacy is the Universal Headship, which Protestants (I mean not Roman, Grotian Protestants) have ever used to call Popery. But saith Mr. P. Grotius chargeth the Papists with it.] *Answ.* 1. True! But the Protestants much more, as making many more faults by their withdrawing from Rome then they mended. 2. And he chargeth not that which we have called Popery with it, though he charge the Papists with it. That some sins of the Papists did occasion it, he confesseth, and all the Papists that ever I

spoke with of it do confess. But I am referred for these causes charged on the Papists, to *Grot. Votum p. 7,8*, and thither I will follow Mr. P. that I may know how much he chargeth on the Papists himself. And there I find that the things that Grotius found faulty in the Papists, were but these two. 1. That to the true and ancient doctrine, many quirks of the Schoolmen that were better skilled in Aristotle then the Scriptures, were introduced, out of a liberty of disputing, not out of the Authority of Universal Councils. And the Opinions stablished in the Church were less fitly explicated. 2. That Pride and Covetousness, and manners of ill example prevailed among the Prelates, &c. And really did you think that he is no Papist that is but against the Schoolmens Opinions, and the Prelates Pride, Covetousness, and Idleness? And holdeth all that they call the Decrees of General Councils? Hath not the Council at Lateran and Florence decreed that the Pope is above a General Council? And the Council at Lateran decreed that Princes are to be deposed, and their Subjects absolved from their fidelity, if they exterminate not Heretics (such as Protestants) out of their Dominions? Is he no Papist that holds all that is in the Council of Trent, if he be against some School-points not determined, and against the Prelates Pride? Well Sir, I understand you better than I did: And though you thought meet (that your words might be conform to one another, and not to truth) to say that I called you Arminian and Pelagian, I purpose (if I had done so) to call you an Arminian no more: But I beseech you cry not out of persecution till the men of your mind will give us leave to be Rectors of Churches in their Dominions, as you and others of your mind are allowed to be in these. And demand not of Mr. Hickman the bread he eats, nor the money he receives, as if it were yours, till we can have license to be maintained Rectors, or at least to escape the Strappado in your Church.

But I promised you some more of Grotius in English to stop your mouth, (or open it whether you see cause:) and you shall have it. *Discus. p. 14*. [Grotius distinguisheth between the Opinions of Schoolmen, which oblige no man (for, saith Melchior Cano, our School alloweth us great liberty) and therefore could give no just cause of departing (as the Protestants did;) and between those things that are defined by Councils, even by that of Trent: The Acts of which if any man read with a mind propense to peace, he will find that they may be explained fitly and agreeably to the places of the holy Scriptures, and of the ancient Doctors, that are put in the Margin. And if besides this, by the care of Bishops and Kings, those things be taken away which contradict that holy doctrine, and were brought in by evil manners, and not by authority of Councils, or Old Tradition, then Grotius, and many more with him, will have that with which they may be content.] This is Grotius in English. Reader, is it not plain English? Durst thou or I have been so uncharitable as to have said without his own consent, that Mr. Pierce would have defended this Religion, and that we have Rectors in England of this Religion? And that those that call themselves Episcopal Divines, and seduce unstudied partial Gentlemen, are crept into this garb, and in this do act their parts so happily? If words do signify anything, it here appears, that Grotius his Religion is that which is contained in the Council of Trent with all the rest, and the reformation which will content him is only against undetermined School-Opinions, and ill manners that Cross the doctrines of the Councils. I will do the Papists so much right as to say I never met with a man of them that would not say as much: Especially taking in all Old Tradition with all the Councils (how much together by the ears, now matters not) as Grotius doth.

Yet more, *Discus. p. 185*. He professeth that he will so interpret Scripture [God favoring him, and pious men being consulted, that he cross not the Rule delivered both by himself, and by the Council of Trent, &c.]

Pg. 239. The Augustine Confession commodiously explained, hath scarce anything which may not be reconciled with those Opinions which are received with the Catholics, by Authority of Antiquity and of Synods, as may be known out of Cassander and Hoffmeister. And there are among the Jesuits also that think not otherwise.]

Pg. 71. He tells us that the Churches that join with Rome have not only the Scriptures, but the Opinions explained in the Councils, and the Popes Decrees against Pelagius, &c. [They have also received the Egregious Constitutions of Councils and Fathers, in which there is abundantly enough for the correction of vices: but all use them not as they ought. They lie for the most part hid in Papers, as a Sword in the Scabbard. And this is it that all the lovers of piety and peace would have corrected.] And gives us Borromaeus for a president.

Pg. 48. [These are the things, which thanks be to God the Catholics do not thus believe; though many that call themselves Catholics so live as if they did believe them: but Protestants (so live) by force of their Opinions, and Catholics by the decay of Discipline.]

Pg. 95. What was long ago the judgment of the Church of Rome, the Mistress of others, we may best know by the Epistles of the Roman Bishops to the Africans and French, to which Grotius will subscribe with a most willing mind] Rome you see is the Mistress of other Churches.

Pg 7. [They accuse the Bull of Pius Quintus, that it hath Articles besides those of the Creed. But the Synod of Dort hath more.—But those in the Bull are new, as Dr. Rivet will have it. But very many learned men think

otherwise, that they are not new, if they be rightly understood: and that this appeareth by the places both of holy Scripture, and of such as have ever been of great authority in the Church, which are cited in the Margin of the Canons of Trent.

Pg. 35. [And this is it which the Synod of Trent saith, that in that Sacrament Jesus Christ, true God, and truly man is really and substantially contained under the form of those sensible things, yet not according to the natural manner of existing, but Sacramentally, and by that way of existing, which though we cannot express in words, yet may we by cogitation illustrated by faith be certain that to God it is possible] And the Council hath found words to express it [that there is made a change of the whole substance of the bread into the Body, and the whole substance of Wine into the Blood, which conversion the Catholic Church calleth Transubstantiation.

Pg. 79. [When the Synod of Trent saith, that the Sacrament is to be adored with Divine worship, it intends no more but that the Son of God himself is to be adored]

I will add no more but that which tells you who is a Papist with the Grotians, and who is none. p. 15. [In that Epistle Grotius by Papists meant those that without any difference do approve of all the sayings and doings of Popes, for honor or lucre sake, as is usual]

Ibid. He tells us that by Papists, he meaneth not them [That, saving the right of Kings and Bishops, do give to the Pope or Bishop of Rome, that Primacy which ancient custom and Canons, and the Edicts of ancient Emperors and Kings assign them. Which Primacy is not so much the Bishops, as the very Roman Churches, preferred before all other by common consent (It's well it hath so mutable a foundation)—so Liberius

the Bishop being so lapsed that he was dead to the Church, the Church of Rome retained its right, and defended the cause of the Universal Church.]

This and much more I had given the Reader before in Latin, but because Mr. Pierce thinks, that I wrong Grotius if you have it not in English, I have born so much respect to his words, and to the Reader, as to remove the wrong, and thus far to satisfy his desire.

Having told you some of the Occasion of this writing, I shall add somewhat of the Reasons of it; but the less, because I have given you so much of them already in my foresaid Discovery of the Grotian Religion.

1. My principal Reason is that before expressed, that Popery may be pulled up by the very roots: For Italians, French, and all build on this, that the Church must have one visible Head.

2. That I might take in those parties of the Papists, that I have passed by or said less to in the former Part of the Book.

3. Because I see what Influence the conceit that I dispute against hath on the minds of many well-meaning less judicious people.

4. Because I perceive in part what influence the design of Grotius had upon England, in the changes that were the occasion of our late wars; He saith himself *Discuss. p. 16.* [That the labors of Grotius for the Peace of the Church were not displeasing to many equal men, many know at Paris, and many in all France, many in Poland and Germany, and not a few in England, that are placid and lovers of peace: For as for the now-raging Brownists, and others like them: with whom Dr. Rivet better agreeth then with the Bishops of England, who can desire to please them, that is not touched with their venom?] So that he had Episcopal Factors here in England. And whereas some tell me, that Grotius was no Papist, because he professed his high esteem of the Church of England, and say they, had

Church-preferment here offered him, and thought to have accepted it. I answer 1. Either it was Grotius in the first Edition, or the Church of England in the second Edition then in the Press, that this must be spoken of, if true. 2. Was not Franciscus a Sancta Clara, (still the Queens ghostly Father) a Papist, for all he reconciled the Doctrine of the Church of England to that of Rome? Grotius and he did plainly manage the same design. 3. Mr. Pierce assures you by his Defense, that Grotius hath still his followers in England of the party that he called the Church of England: And is it any more proof that Grotius was a Protestant for joining with them, then that they are Papists that join with him? Is not his Doctrine here given you in his Englished words? Do you doubt whether the Council of Trent were Papists? This makes me remember the words of the late King to the Marquess of Worcester: when the Marbuess came into the room to an appointed conference about religion with him, and leaned on D. Bayly ‘s arm, he told the King that he came leaning on a Doctor of his own Church: and the King replied, My Lord, I know not whether I should think the better of you for the Doctors sake, or the worse of the Doctor for your sake] (or to this purpose) And indeed the Doctor quickly showed, by professing himself a Papist, what an Episcopal Divine he was: And I think we have as fair advantage to resolve us, whether to think the better of Grotius for the Church of England’s sake, or the worse of those that he called the Church of England, and that were of his mind, for Grotius sake.

In a late Treatise *De Antiqua Ecclesiae Brittanicae libertate Diatribe*, written by I. B. a Divine of the Church of England, and printed at *Bruges, 1656 p. 34,35. Thes. 4*, it is averred [That since the ancient liberty of the British Church was by the consent of the whole Kingdom resumed, remaining Catholic in all other things, it may retain that Liberty without

losing its Catholicism, and without any note of Schism or Heresy] This Liberty then was the Reformation. And this he saith was maintained by Barns, a Papist and Benedictine Monk and Priest in a M. S. entitled *Catholico-Romanus Pacificus, c. 3*, and that for this sober work of his the Peaceable Monk, though of unblamed life, and unspotted fame, was snatch out of the midst of Paris, and stripped of his habit, and bound on a Horse-back like a Calf, and violently carried into Flanders, and so to Rome, and so to the Inquisition, and then put among the Bedlams, where he died; and not contented with his death, they defamed him to have died mad] Though Rome give Peace no better entertainment, the Learned Author thinks that France will; and therefore adds concerning the French Church, [*Quâcum <H&G> optanda foret etiamnum veteris redintegratio concordiae, quam constat plus mille ab hinc annis amicissime intercessisse inter Ecclesiam utramque Gallicanam & Brittanicam, etiam tum cum Ecclesia Brittanica non communicabat cum Romanâ, & certe si utraque pars absque prejudicio, sese mutuo intelligeret, & pars extrema de rigor suo vellet remittere, ea Brittanicae Ecclesiae cum Gallicana concensio non foret adeo improbabilis, atque prima front videtur Ecclesiam utramque vel alterutram ignorantibus*.] I add this but to show the Judgment of those on whom the judgment of Grotius had any influence, for a Communion with the French, as if we little differed from them. Still professing that I would run with the forwardest to meet them upon tolerable terms: And that the remembrance of the moderation, wisdom, charity of the Cassandrian party in France (that resisted the violence of the rest long in vain, and lamented the massacres, and were oppressed by them) is very grateful to my thoughts, and the names of many of them very honorable in my esteem. And it grieves me that Grotius called by Mr. Pierce a Protestant, should so far out-go them in

Popery, whom the same man confesseth to have been Papists. He goes much further then Cassander: Much further then Thuanus, that so plainly and truly openeth abundance of the Popish evils that Grotius patronizeth; and so long and successfully did his part to keep out of France the Authority of the Council of Trent, which was part of Grotius his Religion. And how far he went beyond that excellent man Michael Hospitalius, the Head of that party (so much commended by Beza as well as by Thuanus) and Foxius, and others, is easy to manifest.

5. And I am the more provoked also to perform this task, because I see by many more as well as Mr. P. that the design is still on foot: and that the Papists that are got so strong in England, under the mask of the Vani, the Seekers, the Infidels, the Quakers, the Behmenists, and many other Sects, have so much addition to their strength by Grotians that go under the mask of [Episcopal Divines.] Which yet I should the less be troubled at, if France, Savoy, England, Holland, Poland, Bohemia, and all parts where they prevail, did not acquaint us by bloody, tormenting, thundering, flaming evidence, how they use their power where they dare.

6. And it moveth me much also to consider the consequence of the point in hand. It is not a mere speculation, but a point so practical, that the right decision and understanding of it, is as much as the Peace of millions of souls, yea of all the Churches and Common-wealths in Christendom is worth. All that have anything of the love of God alive within them, are somewhat sensible of the sinfulness and misery contained in the divisions and discord of Believers; and therefore they must needs be solicitous for the Cure, and lay out themselves and all they have or can do to accomplish it, if they knew the way. And the more zealous any man is for Peace, the more resolutely will he carry on his work, and bear down all opposition that

would hinder him in that which he thinks the way of Peace. And when persons thus disposed by humanity and grace, shall be quite mistaken in the very thing they seek, even in the Nature of the Churches unity and peace, they will think themselves bound with all their zeal and diligence, to endeavor the doing of an evil work, and to accomplish a work neither possible nor desirable. And it is not hard for a man of an indifferent wit to fore-see what uncharitableness, discomposure of minds, of Churches and Common-wealths, and abusing and endangering of souls, is like to be the fruit of such mistakes about the Churches Unity and Peace. And as the School useth to say (from Boetius and Anselm) *Malum non est nisi à bono & propter bonum*, so it will be like by experience to be made a proverb, that *Bellum & discordia non sunt nisi à pacificis & propter pacem*: The greatest discords and wars will be from the Love and Endeavor of Unity and Concord, and for the obtaining of them by impossible means. These following evils may easily be foreseen.

1. If men mistake about the Nature of the visible form of the Catholic Church, and its unity, it is like to pervert their judgments in many other weighty points of Religion. For when they have received this Error as a Truth, then they will be exceedingly inclined to bend the rest of their opinions to it, and contrive them into a Consistent Form. For Truth would to Truth, as Fire would to Fire, and Water to Water. Yea all that is flexible within them shall be bended to the interest of this conceit.

2. As soon as ever any man hath received this opinion of the necessity of a Universal Visible Head, or common Government of the whole Church, he is either a Papist, or of an opinion equivalent in folly, tyranny, and impiety, to Popery. For if such a Visible Head must be, there is no other that can pretend to it with Reason or Honesty anymore then the Pope: Nor is it our

quarrel against Rome, that their Bishop rather than another should be this usurping Head, but that they would have such a one at all! It is not who shall be the man, or power, but whether there shall be any such man or power that we dispute. This Error about the Necessity of a Universal Visible Head, is the very thing that turneth most to Popery, and this is the common argument that is managed by deceivers to that end, as their writings commonly declare.

3. And then when men are drawn over to be Papists for the avoiding of Schism, and the obtaining of Unity, they are unawares involved in the most desperate Schism; which I have proved that party to be guilty of: (and with it drink in the dregs of all the Roman abominations.) When men have set up a new Church-form, by setting up a new Head and Center of Unity, and then judge of all particular Churches and Members by this standard, it leadeth them unavoidably to separate from all the Churches and Christians upon earth, that conspire not, and center not with them in their new devised Head.

4. And by this means Charity is much destroyed in men's souls, (and he that hath least of Love, hath least of God) and the Preachers and Pastors turn all their studies into matter of Controversy, and their labors into wranglings, and all under pretense of Catholic Unity: And having not charity, they prove not only sounding brass, and tinkling Cymbals in their most learned labors, but too often burning brass (like Perillus Bull,) and military Trumpets, and all this under pretense of Charity, when they have destroyed it. Hence is it that uncharitable censures are so common, and the Lambs of Christ so often clothed in the skins of Wolves, by the Wolves that have by exchange put on the skin of the Lamb. Scarce a man that crosseth or displeaseth (that is, dissenteth from, or disobeyeth) the uncharitable

Clergy, but he is stigmatized for a Heretic, and charged with almost as much wickedness, as their mouths are wide enough to utter, and the ears of other men to hear. What horrid things have they spoken of the poor Waldenses and Albigenses, and Bohemians? Of Luther, Oecolampadius, Calvin, and who not? Though I have had applauding flattering Letters from some of them that tried whether I were flexible and ductile, yet I doubt not but I shall have my share myself before they have done with me: and I wonder I hear not of it before now. Hence among other reasons its like that Mr. Pierce became so destitute of Charity, as to disgorge his sold of so many bitter reproaches and calumnies against the Puritans and Presbyterians, whom if he know not, he sinneth but as Paul did, but if he know, he terrifieth us from his principles by the fruits: that which shows the want of Charity, shows the want of saving Grace: and consequently the want of right to Glory. Hence it is that the greatest Schismatics are the commonest accusers of their Brethren with schism, Pharisaically saying, I thank thee Lord that I am not as other men, nor as these Schismatics. Hence also it is that so many learned well-meaning Papists do so pervert their studies and endeavors, and abuse and lose (and worse than lose) their wits and parts to draw men to their way; compassing Sea and Land to make a Romish Proselyte, especially of a Prince, or man of power, interest, or ability to serve them. What pains take they to draw Nations to their minds, and to embroil the world in contentions and confusions to attain their ends? What horrid persecutions, Massacres, and barbarous inhumane cruelties have multitudes of men of learning and good parts and natures been engaged in, by the very Principle that I now confute, and for the promoting of their kind of Unity and Concord, in wicked and impossible ways?

7. Besides this, it takes men off from seeking the true Peace of the church, while they mistakenly pursue a false peace. The Devil, the cunning Enemy of Concord, hath not a more effectual way to take men off from the ways and means of holy Concord, then by starting them a false game, and causing them to lay out all their labor to build a Babel, when they should be building Zion. Oh what a blessed state might the Church be in if all the Jesuits, Friars, Prelates, Priests and others, had laid out that labor for a righteous possible Unity and Peace, in God's appointed way, which they have vainly and impiously laid out to unite the world in a Vice-christ or Vice-god?

Fore seeing, and at present feeling many of these calamitous consequences to the Church, I think it of exceeding moment, that men's judgments should be rectified that are misled, concerning the nature of the unity of the Church: Still professing that to me they are the dearest Christians, and nearest to my heart, that are most for Unity and Concord, so it be in Christ, and upon righteous possible conditions.

CHAP. II. The true State of the Controversy, and how much we grant.

Having given you an account of the Occasion and Motives that produced this Disputation, I shall now briefly state the Controversy between us. And because the terms are all plain, and my sense of them explained in the fore-going part, I shall think no more here necessary, then to tell you in certain Propositions, How much we Grant, and How far we are Agreed, and then to tell you what it is that we deny, and wherein we differ.

Prop. 1. We are Agreed that Christ hath a true Catholic Church on earth, and ever hath had since first he planted it, and ever will have to the end of the world, and that the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it, or hath it ever had an Intercision for a day or an hour: and that this Church is so far Infallible, as that it never was, nor ever will be ignorant of, or erroneous against any Article of faith, or part of obedience that is of absolute Necessity to salvation (otherwise by that error it should have ceased to be the Church of Christ.)

Prop. 2. We are agreed that this Catholic Church in respect of the Internal faith and charity of the Members, and their Communion with Christ by the quickening Spirit on his part, and holy sincere returns of devotion on theirs, may be called, Mystical, or Invisible. The thing is utterly undeniable, though some Papists in the perverseness of contentious Disputations seem to deny it. And doubtless when they assert that Christ hath no Invisible Church, they must mean it simply, and not *quoad haeo interiora*, or else they speak against all sense and Reason. No man is simply Invisible: but every man as to his soul is Invisible.

Prop. 3. We are Agreed that this Catholic Church in regard of the outward Profession of this Inward Faith and Holiness, and in regard of the discernible numbers of persons making this Profession, hath ever been visible, since first it began to be visible: And that the visibility hath never had any intercision. If some Protestants say otherwise, it's clear that this is all that by the common judgment of Protestants is maintained, viz. That Christians, and the Catholic Church containing the Professing Christians through the world, have ever since their first planting had a visible being; but yet 1. That the Visibility was not such but that Heretics (as the Arians did) might make a controversy of it, whether they, or the true Christians were the Church indeed, and by their greater numbers or Power might blind men, that they should not see which was the true Church. 2. And that in the Catholic Church some parts may be much more corrupt, and others much more pure; and the Purer part be so much the lesser, and oppressed and vilified by the more corrupt, that the most part should not discern their Purity, but take them (as they did the Waldenses) for Heretics. 3. And that two parts or more of this Catholic Church may so fall out among themselves, as that one of them shall deny the other to be part of the

Catholic Church, when yet they really for all that censure remain parts of it, as much as they: And hereupon may grow a contest between them, which of the two is the true Catholic Church, and one part may say, It is we and not you; and the other may say, It is we and not you: and no man shall be able to discern which of the two is the Catholic Church, because it is neither of them, but each are a part. 4. And though the Bodies of the members are visible, and their Worshipping actions Visible, and their Profession audible, yet the faith Professed is not Visible; nor the Truth of their Profession, or of their Christianity, or Church; Truth being the object of the Intellect, and not of sense. 5. And though the true members of the Church do know the true Church, and so it is apparent unto them, yet most that are not members of it, do not know it. Arians and Mohammedans know us to be men professing such and such Articles of faith: but they know not that to be the true faith, nor us to be the true Church, but judge the contrary. In this sense (contained in these Propositions) it is that Protestants deny the Church to have been always Visible, and not as the Papists commonly mistake them.

Prop. 4. We are agreed that this Catholic Church is but One: There are not two Visible, nor two Mystical Catholic Churches: Nor are the Mystical and Visible, two: Bellarmine might have spared all his labor that he hath bestowed in vain upon this point, to prove that the Visible and Invisible are not two Catholic Churches. The Protestants are further from that Opinion then the Papists: and it is more suitable to the Popish Interest and Cause to be of that Opinion, then to the Protestants. If it were not that they are past learning, by the advantage of their Infallibility, and especially of one man, and one so mean, condemned by them, and that it is unlawful to be a Teacher of Error, I could tell them of a new device by the advantage of this distinction of Catholic Churches, for the modelling their mistakes into a

more specious plausible form, then now it appeareth in to the rest of the Churches. But we are glad of their company in any Truth, and therefore will not disagree from them in that which makes against themselves.

One Objection I once heard a Learned Anabaptist cast in our way, viz. There may be a Visible Church of hypocrites: therefore the Mystical and Visible may be two. *Answ.* But the Question was of the Catholic Church, and not of a particular Church. We confess that some members of the Catholic Church are Mystical and Visible in the several respects before mentioned: and that some are Visible and not Mystical, or as Bellarmine well calls them, Dead Members, and not Living; and that the Church as Visible, is more comprehensive then the Church as Regenerate, or Invisible, and yet all but One Church, though it have more members in it in one respect then in another: And we confess that its possible for twenty or an hundred of these Dead members to constitute a particular Church by themselves (though it is not usual for Visible Churches to be without Living members:) and so there may be a particular Visible Dead Member (Analogically called a Member,) or a particular Visible Church that is thus Dead; and these be parts of the Catholic Church as Visible. But yet there is not two Catholic Churches, One Visible, and the other Invisible, one alive and the other Dead. In a Corn field there are, 1. Good Corn. 2. Stricken, blasted Corn, that hath a name and show, but in deed no Corn. 3. Tares, darnel, cockle, and such weeds. It is called, A Field as it containeth them all: It is called [a Corn field] only from the Corn. The Univocal proper parts of a Corn field, is the Corn only: The Visible and Analogical parts are also the blasted ears: The darnel and cockle are no parts, but noxious accidents. There are not two fields of Corn, one of true Corn, and the of other blasted ears: And yet the Corn field, taken largely and Analogically, hath more

parties in it then true Corn: and you may perhaps have some particular sheaves that are wholly of that which is blasted: which you will call a sheaf of Corn Analogically only: but a sheaf of weeds you will not at all call a sheaf of Corn. Even so in the Catholic Church, there are sincere Christians which are true and living members; and there are Hypocrites which are Analogically members; and there are locally mixed many that by denying essential points of the Christian faith, or by notorious Impiety, do declare themselves to be weeds, and no members of the Church at all.

Prop. 5. We are also Agreed that this One Visible Catholic Church, is One Political Holy Society, as united in Jesus Christ the Head, who teacheth and ruleth it by his Ministers and other Officers, in the several parts, according to the necessity of each. We call it One Political Society, 1. Principally because that all the Church is united in this One Sovereign, or Head, the Lord Jesus: and therefore it is called his body. 2. They have all the same holy doctrine of faith, and Law to live by, and be judged by. 3. They have all Church Officers of the same sort under Christ to teach and govern them. 4. They have all the same kind of Holy Ordinances, as Reading, Preaching, Praying, Praise, Sacraments, &c. appointed them by the Lord. 5. They are all engaged in One and the same Holy Covenant to the Lord: More might be mentioned (and shall be God willing, in a peculiar Treatise of Catholicism, or the Catholic Church) And though Christ himself be not now seen among us, yet may he truly be called a Visible Head. For 1. He sometime lived visibly on earth. 2. And is now the Visible King of all the Church, as he is in the Heavens. Though we see him not, the Celestial Inhabitants do. It is but little of the world that seeth the Pope, anymore then they see Christ: If one unseen to us may be a pretended Visible Head, the other may be truly so. So that the Body, Head, Laws, Worship, &c. being Visible, so is the Policy.

Prop. 6. We are agreed also, that all these Christians, and particular Churches, are obliged by Christ, even by the very Law of Nature, and the ends of their calling, and the General Laws of the Gospel, to live in as much Love, and Unity, and Peace as they can; and to hold as full and extensive communion as they can: that is, as far as their work requireth, and their Capacity will permit and enable them; those that are cohabitans and members of one Congregation, must hold local communion in that Congregation, unless Necessity prohibit. Those that through distance are uncapable of joining in the same Assemblies, should yet be conjoined, 1. In the same Lord, Faith, Baptism, Covenant, Profession. 2. In the same bond of Christian special Love. 3. In the use of the same sort of holy worship, as to the Substance, though they differ in circumstances, as in the Word, Prayer, Praises, Sacraments, &c. 4. And in one sort of Church Officers and Government. And as far as we have to do with each other, all this should be manifested, and we should readily own one another as Brethren and true Churches, notwithstanding lesser differences.

Prop. 7. To these ends it is meet that the Bishops or Pastors of the Churches should hold in way of Association, as frequent Assemblies as is needful, for the maintaining of mutual Love and Correspondency, and right understanding of each other, and to manifest their unity, and assist each other in the work of God, that it may be the more successfully carried on by united strength against all oppositions.

Prop. 8. These Associations should so far know the members Associated, as is necessary to the holding of a Christian Communion with them, and therefore should not admit all into their Association, but such as either produce the Evidences of sound faith and Holy life, or *literas*

communicatorias, certificates from credible members of their communion, that the persons are fit for their Communion.

Prop. 9. These Associations are principally for the Union and Communion of Churches, and therefore must apply themselves to the maintaining and promoting of Unity.

Prop. 10. Such Associations should therefore have their set times of frequent meeting in Synods, for Ordinary help of one another, besides extraordinary meetings on extraordinary occasions, which none should neglect.

Prop. 11. We agree that such Associated Pastors may have their Moderators either pro tempore, or stated at the cause requireth. And that it is no great matter whether he be called a President, Bishop, Moderator, &c. in which all should have liberty, so far as that the peace of the Church be not cast away for such names.

Prop. 12. We are also agreed that whatsoever shall be concluded in order to the Union and Communion of Churches, in any of these Synods, the particular Associated Members must observe, they being thereto obliged, by Virtue of those General precepts that require us to do all in Unity and Concord, and with one mind and mouth to glorify God, and to avoid divisions, &c. Except they be such things as cannot be obeyed, unless we violate the Law of God. Thus far the Canons, that is, Agreements of lesser Synods or greater are obligatory.

Prop. 13. We are also Agreed, that whenever the good of the Church requireth it, there may be Greater Assemblies also held, consisting of many of these conjunct, or special members delegate by the rest: And that this course should extend as far as our capacity will allow in needful cases.

Prop. 14. Lastly we shall grant, that where Pastors cannot through distance or other Impediments, hold Synods, or any particular Churches cannot send any competent members to such Synods, yet may they, when its needful, by messengers certify each other of their faith, professions, practices, and particular doubts and cases, and so hold communion, in some degree; owning each other as Brethren in one Lord, and by such intercourse of Messengers and Letters as we are capable of, assisting, and seeking assistance from each other: As Basil and the rest of the Eastern Bishops did to the Western in their distress while they had hope. And the faith of all the Churches that are near enough for any external communion, being thus known, their *Literae Communicatoriae* may be valid and satisfactory, when any member passeth into other parts.

Thus far I hope we are Agreed: This much I am sure we hold ourselves: But now the difference followeth.

We hold that this Universal Church (which is one in Christ their Head, as the world is one Kingdom in God the absolute Sovereign King) is by Christ distributed into many Congregations, dispersed over the face of the Earth, and that these as several Corporations in one Kingdom, have all their particular Governors and Order. All forcible Government we ascribe to the Magistrate, and deny it to the Pastors of the Church. And that teaching and Guidance which is called Ecclesiastic Government, we suppose is the work of every Pastor in his flock, and the Ordering of the communion of Churches, by Canons, Agreements (and their execution in part) is the work of Synods. And as in this Kingdom, all the Free-schools are governed by the Schoolmasters, who are all under the Prince and Laws, without any General Schoolmasters to Teach, or Oversee, and Rule the rest, (and without Synods too, though they may meet when their mutual Edification requires it,) and

yet all the Schools in England are in Peace, because no Arch-schoolmasters presume to rob the Magistrate of his power: Even so we judge, that if Pastors do but Teach and Guide their several flocks, and the Magistrate keep and use his power of forcible Government, that is, in seeing that they do their Offices faithfully, and no Arch-pastors presume to take the power of the Magistrates out of their hands, the Churches may have quietness and peace: (still allowing a greater Necessity of Communion, and so of Synods, among Churches then among Schools, and reserving the rod to the secular power.) And we conceive, that most of the stir that Popes and Popish Prelates have made about Church Government, hath been but to rob the Magistrate of his due, and to become themselves the Church-Magistrates through the world.

But that the Church hath any Political Universal Head but Christ alone, either a Vice god, or Vice-Christ, either Pope or Council; that any one is as Pope Julius saith of himself, [in the place of God, the maker of all things and Laws,] this we deny; That the whole Church on Earth, is so one Political Society, as to be under any one terrestrial numerical Head, whether personal or collective, Pope, Council, or Patriarchs, having power of Legislation, or judgment over the whole, and by whom each member is to be Governed, this we deny: and think it as absurd (and much more sinful) as to affirm that all the world must needs have one Visible Monarch under God to represent him; and that he is no subject to the God of Heaven, that acknowledgeth not this Visible Universal Monarch. We deny that the Church is such a Society: We deny that it hath such a Head: We deny that it hath any such universal Human Laws: We deny that the parts of it are to be conjoined by the subordinate Officers (Cardinals, Patriarchs, Archbishops, or whatever) of such a usurping Sovereign. We affirm that no Christian

should fancy or assert that any such Head and Order for unity is appointed by Christ; or that it is Desirable, or Rome to be the better liked of because it pleadeth for such an Order, or vainly boasteth of such of a unity; or that any should dare to contrive the promoting of it. Yea we maintain that such fancies and contrivances are the most notable means of the division, or desolation of the Churches; And that it is the notable hindrance of the unity of all the Christian Churches, that such a false Head and Center of unity is set up, and an Impossible Impious unity pleaded for, and furiously sought by fire and sword, instead of the true desirable unity: And that the Churches will never have true unity and peace if these principles of theirs be not disgraced and disowned, and the true principles better understood.

I shall now give you some Arguments for our Assertion, and then in the End shall give you the true Grounds and Means of unity.

CHAP. III. Our Arguments for the Negative.

In the management of the Arguments for the Negative, I shall principally deal with them that would Head the Church with a Council, that is, would make the Church to be autonomical, and be the Sovereign, or chief Governor of itself, or the Church Representative of the Church real (as they use to call them.) As to them that Head it with the Pope, I have said enough already, and others much more, especially Blondell unanswerably. Yet I shall partly take them also in my way, though I deal principally with the other.

And these brief Arguments may serve to confute the Vice-christship or Sovereignty of the Pope.

1. There is no such Head Instituted by Christ. The Scripture pretenses for it I have before confuted, and they are so poor, that they vanish of themselves.

2. The Popes Sovereignty is against the Judgment of the Ancient Fathers, and practice of the Primitive Church, as I have proved in this and a former Book.

3. It is against Tradition, as brought down to us by the greatest part of the Church on earth by far, as is before proved.

4. It is against the Judgment of the far greatest part of the present Catholic Church, as is proved.

5. It is the mere effect of pride and tyranny: a plain design to set up one man over all the world for his greatness, and their hurt.

6. The pretense of this Sovereignty is the consequent only of Rome's greatness, and the will of Emperors, that to conform the Ecclesiastical state to the civil, did give a Primacy to the Bishop of Rome within the Empire.

7. It is a mere impossibility for one man to be the Sovereign of all the Churches in the world, and do the work of a Sovereign for them. He had need of many millions and millions of Treasure to defray the charge (which Peter had not.) While he pretends to govern all the world, he doth but leave them ungoverned, or not by him. How can he govern all those Churches in the Dominions of Infidels, that will not endure his Government? There are more then all the Papists in the world now from under his Government voluntarily, that could not be governed by him if they would.

8. There are yet visible many great Churches that were planted by the Apostles, or in their days, and never were under Rome's Sovereignty to this day, as the Aetheopians, Persians, Indians, and most that were without the verge of the Roman Empire.

9. There is no use for such a Head, as I shall show anon, of Councils.

10. There is not so much Reason for it, or possibility of it, as that One man must be King or Monarch of all the world. Considering that spiritual Government requireth residency, and can less be done by Deputies then temporal: And that Princes are truly Church-Governors also in their kind and way.

11. It is an intolerable usurpation of the Power of all Christian Princes and Pastors, who conjunctly in their several ways are entrusted by God with the Government of the Churches under them.

12. To make such a Sovereign, is to make a new Catholic Church, that Christ never made.

13. And its the most notorious schism, dividing themselves from all the Catholic Church, that are not their subjects.

14. And inhumane cruelty to damn all (as much as Heathens at least) that believe not in the Pope, be they never so holy.

15. To set up a Vice-god (as Pope Julius paraphrastically called himself) and a Vice-christ on earth over all the Church (as the Papist commonly do, maintaining that the Pope is the Vicar of Christ) is to set up an Idol, and a name of Blasphemy, against Jesus Christ, whose prerogative it is to be the sole Universal Head; And therefore he must needs be an Antichrist, whether he be The Antichrist or not. This much to the Pope.

Thes. The Catholic Church of Christ is not one Visible Political body, as joined to one Universal Visible Head or Sovereign, (save only Christ:) And consequently it is not the way to heal the Churches divisions, to draw all into such a body, or endeavor such a Union.

This I make good by these following Arguments, which reach both the Italian Papists, that would have the Pope to be the Head or Sovereign; and the French and Cassandrian, who would have a General Council to be the Head, and the Pope only to be the chief Patriarch, and the *Principium Unitatis*: For if I prove that the Body is not one, as Headed by any except Christ, I shall say enough against both these opinions: But yet as is said, it is principally against the later (who are for the Headship of a Council) that I

shall direct my Arguments; because they are the busy Reconcilers, and because the rest are so largely confuted already on both sides.

Argum. 1. That which is the true form of the Catholic Church of Christ, it retaineth *de facto* at this day: But it retaineth not a Political Union under a Visible Terrestrial Universal Head: therefore this is not the true form of the Catholic Church.

Or, what the Catholic Church is *quoad essentiam*, that it is also *quoad existentiam*: But it is not such a Body *quoad existentiam*; therefore not *quoad essentiam*.

If any will grant the conclusion, *quoad essentiam vel formam*, and say that this Policy, Head and Union are not essential to the Church, but separable accidents tending only *ad melius esse*, he will give away his cause: For the *Pars Imperans* and *pars subdita* are the two essential parts of a body Politick, or Republic, whether Civil or Ecclesiastical, as a soul and body are the parts of man: and if it want either part, the essence is destroyed; It hath lost its Political form. But I need not stand on this, because the case is past controversy, and I know not of any that make the objection, or will go on such terms: I am sure those do not that I have now to deal with. Another thing there may be that is called a Church, without this Form or Head, but not this same thing or body that now we speak of.

The Major proposition I prove thus: The Church of Christ is a true Church at this day, or retaineth its essential parts: therefore it retaineth its form. If its essentials were not in existence, the Church were extinct, or did not exist: But that the Church is not extinct or nulled, the opponents will easily grant, and the promise of Christ will easily prove; The gates of Hell shall not prevail against it.

The Minor I prove thus; If the Catholic Church be now Headed with one Visible Head (beside Christ,) then it is either the Pope or a General Council. But it is neither of these. That it is not the Pope, the French will grant. And 1. Its proved at large by many a volume of Protestant writers; and 2. By the present visible state of the Church; The greatest part of the Church on Earth (and all those in Heaven) disown the Universal Sovereignty or Headship of the Pope; The Greeks, Abyssinians, Armenians, Protestants, &c.

That it is not a General Council appeareth, in that there is no such thing in Natural or Moral Existence. Not in Natural existence; For where is it? When called? How long have they sat? But this none will affirm.

Not in Moral existence; For there is no such thing pretended, nor possible. I confess the Common wealth is not dissolved at the death of the Prince; because a Successor being determined of by Law (as in hereditary Government,) there is one hath presently right to the place, though he want solemn admittance; or if elective, yet *Rex non moritur*, both because the successor hath an Intentional Moral being in the Fundamental Law, and the Intention of the Electors conjunctly, and they presently make an actual choice, or else the power so far as is necessary for execution, falls in the meantime into the hands of some Trustees of the Republic, while they are electing, and the sovereign is in fieri: Or if it be in some dissolvable body, whose actual Session is intermitted, yet they are still in Moral being, and ready to assemble, and the Sovereignty for so much as is of ordinary exercise, even over the Universal body, is in the mean time in the hands of some other Assembly, who therefore may be said to partake of the Sovereignty.

But none of this is so in the present case. Here is no General Council ordinarily in natural being; and therefore in the vacancy not in Moral being:

There is none that pretendeth to be in Moral being: For the Council of Trent, which was the last pretended General Council, is dissolved; and the Pope would not take it well if any shall call another without him: and no time is appointed for it: The Decennial Council determined of at Constance, is an empty name: and that Decree did but serve to prove, that really General Councils are not the Supreme Governors of the Church: For no one obeyeth them in that. And whether ever the Pope, or any one else will call a General Council again, we cannot tell. So that now there is none; nor we know not whether there ever will be. But further.

Argum. 2. That which is the Head, or form of the Catholic Church (or any way Necessary to its Being or Unity) hath ever been found in it, or at least within this thousand years, or at least in the primitive purer ages, or sometime at least: But a true General Council is not always in being, nor ever was within this thousand years, no nor in the purer ages, nor ever at all: therefore it is no Head of the Church, nor necessary to its unity.

The Major will not be denied. The proof of any branch of the Minor may serve turn: much more of all. 1. That a General Council hath not been this forty years in being, all men will confess. If the Church have been Headless forty years, or wanted anything Necessary to its Being or Unity, then was it so long no Church, or many Catholic Churches, which are known untruths.

2. If the Church have had any General Council within this thousand years, it was either that of Trent, that of Canstance, Basil, Florence, the Lateran, &c. But none of these were such. For 1. There were no Bishops from the most of the Christian world. I have told you before how few at Trent did the most egregious parts of their work (few more then forty:) The Churches of Syria, Armenia, Ethiopia, and the most of the Christian world, were never so much as fairly invited to be there. If at Florence the Patriarch of

Constantinople, and two or three Greeks more were present, what's that to all the Churches of the Greek Profession through the world? Besides all others. The ancient Councils called General, contained All the Bishops that could and would come. For all were to be there, and not one Bishop chosen by two hundred, or by a Prince, instead of two hundred. But at these later Councils were neither all, nor so much as any Delegates (though but chosen by hundreds to represent them) from most of the Churches of the world. Besides the packing and fore-resolutions of the Popes, that ruled all, and many other Arguments that nullify these pretended General Councils. I say not that all of them were useless; but none of them were anymore like to Oecumenical or Universal, then Italy and its few servants are like to all the Christian world.

And that the Ancient Councils were not General, I mean, the four first, or any like them, I easily prove. 1. From the Original of them, and the Mandates, and the Presidents, and Ratifications, and Executions. It was the Roman Emperors that called them, and that sent their Mandates to the Lieutenants and other secular Officers to see to the execution, and to the Bishops to be there: It was the Roman Emperors that by themselves or their Lieutenants, were present to Rule them all according to the proportion of secular interest. It was the same Powers that Ratified them, and what they ratified went for currant, and their Ratification was sought by the Bishops to that end. It was the same Power that banished them that obeyed not, and compelled men to submit to them. Now let any man of Reason tell me, what Power Constantine, Theodosius, Martian, or any Roman Emperor had to summon the Bishops that were subjects in the Dominions of all other Princes through the world? What Authority had they out of their own Dominion?

2. Yea de facto, the case is known, 1. That they did not summon the Bishops of other Princes Dominions. 2. That those Bishops (at least no considerable number were there.) What Mandates or Invitations were sent to all the Churches of India, Ethiopia, Persia, or the parts of Parthia, Armenia, Ireland, Scotland, &c. that were out of the Roman Power? Whoever those one or two were that Eusebius calls Bishops of Persis, Parthia, Armenia, it's a plain case, that there were no due Representatives of all or any of these Churches there, that were without the verge of the Empire. No British, Irish, (that is, then Scottish) Bishops were there, nor any from abundance other Churches. And the other Councils after that at Nice, make less pretense to such a thing. So that it is most evident that General Councils then were but of the Bishops of the Empire, or the Roman world, unless a Bishop or two sometime might drop in that lived next them. And was the Church no wider than the Empire? Let Baronius himself be judge, that tells you of the Churches planted by the primitive Preachers, in India, Persia, and many other parts of the world. Let Godignus be judge, that confesseth the Ethiopians had the Gospel since the Apostles days (and I pray in what age were they Papists?) Let Raynerius be judge, that saith the Churches of Armenia and others planted by the Apostles were not subject to the Church of Rome? Let the Antiquities of Britain and Ireland be evidence. But the case is undeniable. All this noise then of General Councils comes but from a supposition that the Roman world was the whole Christian world. A small mistake! We home-bred Rustics may shortly be as well able to prove that a London Convocation was a General Council! Pighius pleading for the Pope, saith plainly, that General Councils were the devise of Constantine. And the Popes themselves do fetch the most specious Evidences for their primacy from the Decrees or Edicts of Emperors,

Valentinian, Gratian and others. And what power had those Emperors at the other side of the world?

3. And then before the Nicene Council, what General Councils were there since the Apostle days? None doubtless that the world now knows of. It's senseless enough to think that 350 Roman Bishops at the second Council of Nice, or the 150 Bishops in the third Council at Constantinople, or the 165 Bishops at the second Council at Constantinople, or the 150 Bishops at the first there, were the Universal Church of Christ? But it will be more ridiculous to say, that the new-found *Concilium Sinuessanum*, imagined without proof to meet in a certain Cave, for the deposition of an Idolatrous Pope, were a General Council. Where then was the Head, the unity, the form of the Church for 300 years? Was it governed all that time, think you, by a General Council? Yea or ever one day since the Apostles?

Well, but was there ever such a thing at all? Indeed men have a fairer pretense when the Church was contained in a family, or a City, or a narrow space, to call the meetings of the Apostles or other Christians then, by the name of a General Council, but they are hard put to it, if this be all. The great Instance insisted on is the Council, Act. 15. But were the Bishops of all the Churches there? Or summoned to appear? Act. 14:23, they had ordained them Elders in every Church; but few of them were there, Timothy, Titus, abundance were absent. It's plain, that it was to the Apostles and Church at Jerusalem as the Fountain, and best informers that they sent. Not because these were the Universal Church, but because they were of greatest knowledge and authority. If it could be proved that all the Apostles were there, it would no more prove them a General Council, then that the Deacons of one Church were ordained by a General Council, Act. 6. And Matthias and Justus put to the Lot by a General Council, Act. 1, and that

Christ appeared to a General Council after his Resurrection, and gave the Sacrament of his Supper to a General Council before his death. So that it is most evident from the event, that Christ never made a General Council the Head or Governor of his Church; and that there never was such a thing the world, much less continually.

Argum. 3. The form or unity (no nor the well-being) of the Catholic Church, dependeth not on that which is either unnecessary, unjust, or naturally or morally impossible: But a true General Council is none such: It cannot be: or if it were it would be unnecessary and unjust. Therefore it is not the Head or Sovereign Governor of the Church, on which its being, unity, (or well-being) doth depend.

I have nothing here to prove but the Minor. And 1. I shall prove the Impossibility. 2. The non-necessity. 3. The unjustice of a General Council: and so that no such thing is to be expected.

A true General Council consisteth of all the Pastors or Bishops of the whole world; or so many as Morally may be called All. A General Council of Delegates from all the Churches, must consist of so many proportionably chosen, as may signify the sense and consent of all, or else it is a mere name and shadow. Both these are Morally, if not Naturally Impossible: as I prove.

1. From the distance of their habitations, some dwell in Mesopotamia, some in Armenia, some in Ethiopia, some in Mexico, the Philippines, or other parts of the East and West-Indies: some at St. Thome's, some dispersed through most of the Turks Dominions. Now how long must it be, before all these have tidings of a Council, and summons to appear, or send their Delegates? Who will be at the cost of sending messengers to all these? Will the Pope? Not if he be no richer than Peter was. How many hundred

thousand pound will it cost before that all can have a lawful summons? And when that is done, it will be long before they can all in their several Nations meet, and agree upon their Delegates, and their instructions. And when that is done, who shall bear their charges in the journey? Alas, the best of the Churches Pastors have had so little gold and silver, that they are unable themselves to defray it. A few Bishops out of each of these distant Countries, will consume in their journey a great deal of money and provision. To provide them shipping by Sea, and Horses, and all other necessaries by land, for so many thousand miles, will require no small allowance.

And then consider, that it must be voluntary contribution that must maintain them. And most love their money so well, and know so little of the need of such journeys and Councils, that doubtless they will not be very forward to so great a contribution.

And it is not to be expected that Infidel Princes will give way to the transporting of so much money from their countries on the Churches occasions, which they hate.

But suppose them furnished with all necessaries, and setting forward; How long will they be in their journey? Shipping cannot always be had: Many of them must go by land: It cannot be expected that some of them should come in less than three, or four, if not seven years time to the Council. And will ever a General Council be held upon these terms?

2. Moreover the persons for the most part are not able to perform such journeys. Bishops are Elders: Most of them are aged persons. The wisest are they that are fit to be trusted in so great a business by all the rest: And few attain that maturity but the aged: Especially in the most of the Eastern and Southern Churches that want the helps of Learning which we have. And

will the Churches be so barbarous as to turn out their aged faithful Pastors upon the jaws of death? Some of them are not like to live out so long time as the journey, if they were at home. They must pass through raging and tempestuous Seas, through Deserts and enemies, and many thousand miles where they must daily conflict with distress. It were a fond conceit, to think that (without unusual providences) ten Bishops of a thousand should come alive to the Council, through all these labors and difficulties.

And moreover, it's known how few bodies will bear the Seas, and so great change of air: How many of our Soldiers in the Indies are dead, for one that doth survive? And can ancient Bishops, spent with studies and labors, endure all this? Most studious painful Preachers here with us are very sickly, and scarce able to endure the small incommodities of their habitations: And could they endure this?

3. Moreover abundance of the Pastors of the Churches live under Mohammedans and other Infidels, that will not give them leave to travail so far into the Countries of Christian Princes on such occasions. They hate us and our Religion. They are oft at war with us, and then would hang those Bishops as Intelligencers that should offer to come among us.

4. And they must many of them pass through the Countries of other Princes, that are Infidels, and oft in war with the parts which they come from or go to. And it cannot be expected that in such cases they should allow them passage through their Countries. If one do, all will not: When poor Lithgow had travailed nineteen years, he was tortured, strappado'd and disjointed, and made a cripple at Malaga in the Spanish Inquisition. And thanked God and the English Ambassador that he sped so well.

5. Even at home in Europe, the Princes are so commonly in Wars (as are France, Spain, Venice, Sweden, Denmark, Poland, the Emperor,

Brandenburgh, Holland, Portugal, England, Transylvania, &c. at this very day) that there is not the least probability that they should all or half consent to have so many of their subjects pass into their enemies Countries to reside so long. Jealousies raised by particular Interests would make it Treason.

6. Moreover many Princes understand that the Pope hath no power to call such Councils, nor any man else: and they know the design of the Pope to subject the world to himself. And therefore they will abhor that their subjects should travail so far at his call, that hath such designs, (or at another man's that hath no authority to call them.) This hath made the Emperor of Habassia so resolutely resist the Popes pretensions (as Godignus, Maffaeus, and others do declare) Few Princes will endure to have their subjects brought under a foreign Power.

7. And if you suppose all the Bishops come to the Council, the very number out of all the Christian world, (to make anything like a General Council) would be so great, as would be unfit for one, or two, or ten, or twenty Council houses or Assemblies.

8. And they would be uncapable of conferring, through diversity of languages. Few of the Abyssinians, Egyptians, Syrians, Armenians, or of most of the world, understand and speak any language that would commonly be understood and used in a Council. Nor is it possible to do it by Interpreters. For so many Interpreters cannot be used to tell all that understand not, what every man saith, and to expound their minds to others. This would waste an age in a Council; so that such a Council would be a very Babel.

9. And Councils use to be so long, that it cannot be expected that after so many years journey, old men should live to see the issue, or do any great matters there. Eighteen years at Trent would consume a great many of the

Bishops: How many even of the Popes own Legates died before that Council could be finished?

10. And if they should live to see the end, can you dream that they should live to perform the like tedious dangerous journeys and voyages to bring back the Decrees of the Council to their Churches? Judge now whether such Councils are not Naturally Impossible.

I will add but this. No men can be compelled. And to make all the world at once agree to so difficult a task, and agree upon the time and place, must be a Miracle. One will be for it, and another against it. One for one time and place, and another for another, through most of the world. We see how hardly any two Princes can agree upon times, places, and all circumstances in their Treaties.

2. Let us next inquire, of what Necessity such a Council is. If it be Necessary for Church government, it is either to make Laws, or to execute them. But for neither of these: therefore they are not Necessary.

1. Christ hath made us Laws already sufficient for salvation. And I hope he hath not constituted so loose a Society, and left his Body to such mutations, as that they must so frequently have new Laws. And if it must, sure it must be from their Sovereign, who hath reserved the Legislative Power to himself as his Prerogative. Legislation is the highest act of Supremacy, and chief flower in the Crown of Sovereignty. The Church is Christ's subjects, and shall subjects make their own Laws? Scripture is sufficient. If this be all that we need General Councils for, to make Universal Laws to the Church, we can spare them as well as Traitors in a Common-wealth.

And for Execution of Laws, it is either Magisterial, by force of the Sword; and this they have nothing to do with, it being the Princes right. Or it is for

the Excommunicating Church offenders: And to cast them out of particular Churches is the work of the Pastors of those Churches. Others cannot know the persons, and hear the cause. If all Church causes should come to a General Council, Millions of men must be attending them at once.

And if it be to judge who shall be cast out of the Communion of the Churches, and what Churches themselves are to be excommunicated, the Synods of neighbor Pastors are to do as much of that as is to be done. Where then is the Necessity of such Councils at such rates? Augustine said that drunkenness in his time was grown so strong, that there must be a Council to suppress it. Could they do such feats as to cure Drunkenness, Whoredom, Covetousness, Pride, I would be for them.

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

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

the world. And Councils are most useful if ever, when necessities are greatest.

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

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

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

6. Those that think it the Popes prerogative to call a Council, do also affirm (as I before shown in the express words of Binius and others) that a Council hath no more power than the Pope will give them, and that when they are convened by him, and have done their work, it is all of no Validity, if he allow it not: If he approve one half, that half is valid, and his approbation will make their Decrees the Articles of our faith; when as the other half which he disapproveth shall not be worth a straw. And is it not a

most foolish thing for all the world to put themselves to so much charge to defray the expenses of their Bishops, and hazard their lives, and lose their labors at home for so many years, and hazard the Churches by their absence, when for ought they know the Bishops of the whole Christian world do but lose all their labor, and nothing shall be valid if they please not the Pope of Rome? And is it not most abominable justice in him thus to put all the world to trouble, and cost, and hazard the Churches and the Pastors lives, for nothing, when if the infallible spirit be only in himself, he might have done the work himself, and saved all this cost and labor.

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

8. By what Justice shall any people be required to send Delegates, on such terms as these to Councils, or to stand to their definitions when they have done? When our faith and souls are preciouser things then so boldly to cast upon the trust of a few Delegates so to be chosen and employed? What Bishops other Countries will choose, we know not. And for our own, 1. In almost all Countries it is the Princes that choose, or none must be chosen but who they will, which is all one. 2. If the Bishops choose, its those that

are highest with the secular power that will have the choice, who perhaps may choose such as are contrary to the judgment of most of that Church that is thought to choose them. Most Nations have a Clergy much at difference. The Remonstrants and Contramonstrants in Holland would not have chosen like members for the Synod. In the Bishops days men of one mind were chosen here in England to Convocations: The next year we had a Learned Assembly that put down the Prelacy, for which a Convocation had formed an Oath to be imposed on all Ministers but a little before. And why should the judgment of the Prelates be taken for the judgment of the Church of England, any more than the other, when for number, learning and piety (to say the least) they had no advantage (laying aside ignorant, ungodly men, in point of number.) Till the Spanish match began to be treated on, the Bishops of England were ten, if not twenty to one Augustinians, Calvinists, or Antiarminians: Now the Arminians would be thought the Church of England, and their doctrine, agreeable to the doctrine of that Church. Would they not accordingly have differed, if they had been sent to a General Council? How bitterly are the Articles of the Church of Ireland decried by the Arminian Bishops since sprung up both in Ireland and England? So that if Delegates be sent to any Council, they may speak the minds of those that sent them, (which perhaps is the King, or a small prevailing party,) but not of the rest: (which perhaps may the best and most.) If Jeremiah of Constantinople be of a Council, he will go one way. If Cyril be of a Council, he will go another way: And his counterfeit Successor undo what he did.

9. No Church that sendeth three or four Bishops to represent a thousand or two thousand Pastors, can be sure how those Bishops will carry it when they come thither. For ought we know they may betray our cause, and cross

their instructions: They may be perverted by the reasonings of erroneous men, or bribed by the powerful: And to cast our faith on so slender an assurance, is little wisdom.

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

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

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

12. Moreover such Councils are unjust, because of the multitude of Bishops that must there meet and cannot be heard speak. As the case standeth already, there are many more Bishops in the world then can meet, and speak, and hear in one, or two, or three Assemblies: And many thousand more may be made. If I should say that all the Rectors of particular Churches, whom they call Parish Presbyters, are Bishops, and have votes in Councils, they would easilier deny it then disprove it, or invalidate the proofs already brought: But (to proceed on their own grounds) me thinks they that make him a Bishop who hath Presbyters and Deacons under him, should admit all those Pastors of particular Churches that have Presbyters under them, as their Curates, which are many. Or if they say that only Cities must have Bishops, yet must they on their own

grounds admit a Bishop for each City: And if every City in a few Kingdoms in Europe had a Bishop in the Council, there would be no room for all the rest of the world. But how prove they that Country Parishes may not have Bishops? Why may not (on their own grounds) every four or six parishes have one? Hath God forbid it? Where? And when? Sure they will not say it is of Divine institution that a Bishop have just so many Parishes and Presbyters under him, and neither more nor less. The number is confessed to be left undetermined. And what if Christian Princes, Bishops and people agree to settle Bishops in every such small number of Parishes, by what Law can they exclude them from a General Council? If they say, by the Canons of former Councils; I answer 1. Those Canons are contrary to Scripture. 2. They contradict one another. 3. They themselves do not obey the Canons of many such Councils. 4. Those Councils have no power to make Laws; much less Laws that shall reach to this time and place. But they will say Paul's command to Tit. 1:3,5, and the example Acts 14:23, is only of ordained Elders or Bishops in every City: therefore they may not ordain them anywhere but in Cities. But I deny the consequence. Most ancient interpreters by Elders, Acts 14:23. Understand mere Presbyters: And then it would as much follow that Presbyters must be ordained nowhere but in Cities: What if I can prove that the Apostles never gathered a solemn Assembly of Christians for Divine Worship anywhere but in Cities; or that they never administered the Lord's Supper anywhere but in Cities? Will it follow that therefore we ought not to Assemble or administer the Sacrament anywhere but in Cities? But what if this were granted? They cannot deny but every corporation, such as most of our Burroughs and Market Towns in England are, may truly be called Cities in that Scripture sense. And if every such City had a Bishop, Even England, France, Germany, and Italy, a little

spot of the world, would make Bishops enough for two or three Councils; and more then could Assemble and do the work.

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

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

And for the other way, 1. A Representative General Council is another thing, quite different from a Real. 2. What word of God have they to prove such a Representative Council? Doubtless none: And will they give us a Church form, and center of Unity, merely of their own brains, upon supposition that it is prudential? 3. Men are of exceeding different degrees of understanding, and of different judgments actually: so that if e. g. England should send one, or two, or ten men to represent the rest to a General Council, its more than possible that they may give their judgments in many points so far contrary to the minds of those that sent them, that twenty or a hundred to one at home may be against them. For we cannot send our understandings and all our reasons with them to the Council when we send them. And so no man can say that any such Council doth express the mind of the greater part of the Church. 4. By this rule you may reduce a General Council to a dozen men, or to the four or five Patriarchs: For all the

rest may choose them as their representatives. 5. But its not to be expected that all the Churches should be satisfied of the lawfulness or fitness of such substitutions and representations: And therefore they will not consent or elect men for such a power and work: And who may justly force them?

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

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

The Antecedent is partly manifest by what is said from their different languages and other considerations. Moreover 1. The persons that will have

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

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

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

to one that the treaty will be in vain, and its next to an impossibility that all should consent. Besides; no man can show a Commission from God to enable them, and only them to such a work.

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

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

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

The Minor is proved, 1. Ad hominem by the confession of the chief Opponents, Grotius *de Imperio summar. potest*. doth purposely maintain it: and so do others: (See of this Lud. Molinaeus new Book supposed against the Presbyterians: his *Paraenesis*.) 2. It is the high Prerogative of Christ the true King and Sovereign of the Church, which none must arrogate. He was faithful in all his house as was Moses. His Law is perfect: It is sufficient to make the man of God perfect: even a sufficient rule of faith and life: No man must add thereto, nor take ought therefrom, but do whatsoever he hath

commanded, Deut. 12:32. To the Law and to the Testimony: if they speak not according to these, it is because there is no light in them, Isa. 8:20.

*Obj. But m*en may make By-laws under Christ and his Laws. *Answ.* True: but as those are in this case no proper Laws, so no man or men may make them for the Unversal Church. For the business of those Laws is only to determine of circumstances which God hath made necessary *in genere*, and left to the determination of men *in specie*: And we may well know that there was some special reason why Christ did not determine of these himself. And the reason is plain; even because that they depend so much on the several states, capacities, customs, &c. of men, that they are to be varied accordingly in several times and places. If one standing Law would have fitted all the world, or all ages in these matters, Christ would have made it himself. For if you say he makes some Laws, and neglect others that are of the like kind, and might as well have been done by himself, you make him imperfect and insufficient to his work. And if it be not fit that one Universal Law be made for the world, then a Council must not make it.

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

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

The plain truth is, Christ hath left them none of that work to do which belongeth to a Head or Sovereign, but they make work for themselves, that there may seem to be a Necessity of a power to do it. The Church needeth none of their Laws. Let us have but the Holy Scriptures, and the Law of Nature, and the civil Laws of men, and the guidance of particular Pastors pro tempore, and the fraternal Consultations and Agreements of Councils, not to make any more work, but to do this foresaid work unanimously, and the Church can bear no more; there is nothing left for Legislators Ecclesiastical to do. We can spare their Laws, and therefore their power and work. Their business is but to make snares and burdens for us; and therefore we can live without them, and cannot believe that the felicity, or unity, or essence of the Church consisteth in them.

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

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

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

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

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

Argum. 8. The Head or Sovereign Power hath the finally decisive Judgment, and in great causes all must, or may appeal to them. A General Council hath not the finally decisive judgment, nor may all men in great causes appeal to them. Therefore a General Council is not the Head or Sovereign power.

The Major is undeniable. The Minor is proved, 1. In that it is not known, nor hath the world any rule or way to know in what cases we must appeal to

a General Council, and what not; and what is their proper work. 2. In that an appeal to them is an absolute evasion of the guilty, and in vain to the innocent, because of the rarity of such Councils, or rather the nullity. 3. Because the prosecuting of such an Appeal is impossible to most of the world (as is before shown) and were it possible, it would be so tedious and laborious a course, that its ridiculous in most to mention such Appeals.

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

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

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

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

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

That is, the greatest part by far of the Christians in the world; And 2. By the ensuing argument: And the necessity of the consequence is evident of itself.

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

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

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

Governments, are only said to be set in the Church, as eyes and hands in the body; but not over the Church as the Head or Sovereign Power: ver. 17,18,19,28,29, so that though he that is baptized into the Church, is baptized into an Organical body, and related to the Pastors, as to hands and eyes, yet not as to a head, nor as to a representative body neither. And me thinks neither Pope nor Council should pretend to be more then Apostles, Prophets, and Teachers, and Governments. If the form of baptism had but delivered down the authority of the Pope or a Council, as it did the authority and name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, Tradition would have been a tolerable Argument for them, though Scripture had been silent. But when the Baptismal Tradition itself is silent, and it is a doctrine so monstrously strange to the Primitive Church, that all the baptized are baptized to the Pope or a General Council, I know no remedy but they must both put up their pretenses.

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

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

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

Argum. 13. As it is high Treason in a Republic to deny the Sovereign, and to be cut off from him, is to be cut off from the Common-wealth; so it would be a damning unchristening sin to deny the Headship of the Pope or General Council, if they were indeed the Head of the Church. But it is no such damning unchristening sin: Therefore they are not the Head of the Church.

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

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

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

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

Argum. 15. The Sovereign Head of the visible Church and Center of our unity, must be evident, that all the Christian world may know it: The Pope and General Council are not such. Therefore neither of them are the Head of the Visible Church.

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

The Minor is known by common experience. For many a year together (by Bellarmine's confession) learned and wise men could not tell which was the true Pope; yea their Councils could not tell. Most of the Christian world

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

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

The Minor is proved by experience. The Popes Decretals are many unknown, and many proved forgeries (by Blondell ubi sup. and many others) beyond all question: and none of them proved Laws to the Church. The Canons of the first Council of Nice are not agreed on among the Papists. Many others are proved forged: Many are flatly contrary to each other (as I have shown ubi sup.) and how then shall Christians know what to obey? The ancient Canons condemned the gesture of kneeling on the Lord's Day (and consequently then at the Lord's Supper) the reading of the Heathens Books, and many such things which are now taken for lawful: The later Councils that contradict the former, do seem to most of more questionable authority then they. And what Councils are to be received and what rejected, they are not agreed among themselves, nor have any certain

Rule to know by on which they are agreed: Nor will their Popes or Councils yet resolve them this great question. So that Christians are at a loss concerning these Laws, and know not which of them they are obliged by, and which not.

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

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

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

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

What good will it do to say we must center somewhere, and know not where, and obey somebody, and know not who? The Italians and Spanish make the Pope the Infallible Head, and say a General Council without him may err, and is but the body. The French make the Council the Head, and

say the Pope may err; and that the infallibility (such as they plead for) is in the Council. It is not a Head, but this Head in specie, that is, the form of the Church, if any such be: And therefore they must needs (according to their own principles) be of diverse Churches, while they place the Sovereignty in several sorts and persons. Till they better agree among themselves in their Fundamentals and Essentials of the Church, we have small encouragement to think of uniting on any of their grounds.

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

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

None seems more to favor their conceit then Eph. 4:15,16, which Grotius fastens on: But even that is against them, and not for them. For 1. It is Christ and only Christ that is here said to be the head, and all other parts contradistinguished, and excluded from Headship, and the Body is not said

to be united in them. 2. And it is by association, and mutual communication of their several gifts, that the parts are compacted together, and edify the whole; and not by meeting in any one, and deriving from it.

*Obj. But w*ere not the Apostles General Officers, and so the Church united in General officers? *Answ.* This is little to the Question. For 1. The Apostles had one among them to be the Sovereign or Head of the rest, but were of equal power. 2. Nor did a major part of their whole number make such a Head for the Church to unite in, nor do we read that ever a Major vote carried it among them against a Minor; for they were all guided by the Spirit. Yet its true that they met ofter together then a General Council can. 2. The Apostles as extraordinarily qualified, and as the Secretaries of the Spirit, have no successors: But the Apostles as ambulatory unfixed Ministers, had even then many companions: For Barnabas, Luke, Apollo, and abundance more, did then go up and down preaching, as well as the Apostles; yet had not any one of them a special charge of Governing all the Churches: nor yet all of them united in a body: For the Apostles called not the Evangelists and other fellow workers to consult in Councils about the Government of the whole; But both they and their helpers, did severally what they could to teach and settle the Churches. 3. Who be they now that are the Apostles successors? If all the Bishops in the world, the case is as we left it. If any small number of Primates or Patriarchs, how shall we know which and how many? If they be not twelve, why should one Apostle have a successor, and not others? But there are no twelve only that lay claim to the succession. And if you go further, who can limit, and say who, and how many they be, and how far the number may be increased or decreased, and by whom? In Cyprians days he and his fellows in the Council at Carthage declare that all Bishops were equal, and none had power over

other. And so thought others in those times. Nor was there than any number of Bishops that claimed to be the sole successors of the Apostles, to rule all the rest. And if they had, when the Church increaseth, the Rulers must increase. But this is not to the main point.

Argum. 20. The Scripture doth appropriate the Universal Headship to Christ only, and deny it to all others: therefore neither Pope nor Council are the Universal Head.

Eph. 5:23. It is the peculiar Title of Christ to be Head of the Church, to whom it must be subject, 1 Cor. 11:3. The Apostle would have us know that the Head of every man is Christ, and the head of the woman is the man, and the Head of Christ is God. So that there is a particular Head over some parcel of the body below Christ: but to be the Universal Head of every man, is the proper Title of Christ. In 1 Cor. 12, the unity of the body and diversity of the members is more largely expressed than anywhere else in Scripture; and there when the said unity of the body had been so fully mentioned, the Apostle comes to name the Head of that Unity, ver. 27, which is only Christ. [Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular] The Church is never called the body of the Pope, or of a Council, but the body of Christ: yea (as was even now said) in the next words the Apostles, Prophets, and Teachers are enumerated to the particular members, contradistinct from the Head, so far are all, or any one of them from being the head themselves. And in Col. 2:10,17,19, it is Christ only that is called the Head, and the body is said to be of Christ, and he only is mentioned as the Center of its Unity [And not holding the Head, from which all the body by joints, and bands having nourishment ministered and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God.] And Col. 1:18. And he is the Head of the body, the Church.] If any say that you cannot hence argue Negatively

that therefore no one else is the Head, I answer, They may as well say, when it is affirmed that [the Lord he is God] you cannot thence conclude that Baal is not God. The Apostle plainly speaks this of Christ as his peculiar honor: And he spoke to men that knew well enough that natural bodies have but one Head, unless they be Monsters: And he would not so oft insist on this Metaphor, intending so great a disparity in the similitude, and never discover any such intention; So in Eph. 1:22. He gave him to be Head over all things to the Church, which is his Body, the fullness of him that filleth all in all.]

And in Eph. 4, the Apostle purposely exhorteth us to the observation of this unity; and purposely telleth us by a large enumeration wherein it doth consist: but in all he never mentioneth the Pope or a Council: yea he plainly excludeth them, ver. 3,4. &c. [Endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace: There is one body, and one spirit, even as you are called in one hope of your calling, One Lord, One Faith, One Baptism, One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all: But unto every one of us is given Grace, according to the measure of the gift of Christ—He gave some Apostles, and some Prophets, and some Evangelists, and some Pastors and Teachers, for the perfecting of the Saints, for the work of the Ministry, for the Edifying of the body of Christ, till we all come in the unity of the Faith, &c.—] so then you see there is but one Lord of the Church; therefore the Pope or Council is not Lord (in name or deed.) And Apostles, Prophets, Pastors, and Doctors, are the member contra-distinguished from this One Lord, and whose diversity is purposely mentioned, they being the matter or parcels that must have their unity in some other, but not the Church to be united in them. Here is then no mention among all these [Ones] of one earthly Head, whether Pope or

Council, not of One Apostle that was the Head of the rest. If such a thing had ever come into the Apostles mind, he would sure have mentioned it on such occasions as these, and not have quite forgotten it; yea and contradict it so evidently.

1 Cor. 6:15,17. Our bodies are the members of Christ, (not of the Pope) and he that is joined to the Lord is one spirit (not he that is joined to the Pope.)

Gal. 3:28. We are all one in Christ Jesus (not in an earthly Head) Many and many times doth the Apostle exhort them to be of one mind, and accord, and take heed of schism, and maintain peace, and he reproveth their divisions at large: yet doth he never mention such a sin as dividing from an earthly Head, nor ever once direct them to a Pope or General Council as the Center of their unity, or the necessary means of curing divisions. Peter himself exhorteth them to be all of one mind, 1 Pet. 3:8, but never to be all united in him as their head. The Apostle Paul is punctual in describing the Officers of the Church, and the people's duty to them: But he never describeth a Pope, or any earthly Head of that Church: nor ever telleth the people of their duty to such: And if such a supposed fundamental should be quite forgotten by men that believed it, and taught others that which was necessary to be believed, it were incredibly strange. That Paul writing to the Romans should never mind them of the honor of their Sea, or their duty to their supereminent Prelate, was his forgetfulness or unbelief. And surely he would never have so sharply reproved them of Corinth for contentions, in saying I am of Paul, and I of Apollo, and I of Cephas, and I of Christ, if he had thought they must have been united in Cephas; without once telling them of such a means of union and reconciliation. He saith [Is Christ divided?] as much as to say, you must be all united in him: but he saith not

[Is Cephas divided?] but plainly makes the exalters of Cephas a party that was guilty of division, and Chap. 3:3,4,5, tells them plainly that this shown that they were carnal. And speaking of all others in his own person and Apollos, saith [Who then is Paul, or who is Apollo, but Ministers by whom ye believed?] They had not then learned to answer [Why Cephas is the Head of the Church.] And 1 Cor. 46. He speaks as if it were purposely to a Papist [All these things, brethren, I have in a figure transferred to myself and to Apollo for your sakes: that ye might learn in us not to think (of men) above that which is written: that no one of you be puffed up for one against another] What not for Peter? No not for Peter himself. And doubtless Paul did not believe his supremacy, when he so presumed to reprove him to his face, Gal. 2. So 1 Cor. 10:16,17, there is mention of our being all one bread, and one body: but thats because we are all partakers of that one body of Christ, and not because we are united in the Pope or any other.

Moreover when the Disciples strove who should be greatest, Christ expressly rebuketh such thoughts, and instead of granting any of them that desire, he denieth it to them all, Matth. 22:25,26; Luk. 22:26. The Kings of the Gentiles rule over them, and are called gracious Lord's, but with you it shall not be so.] Bellarmine indeed can merrily hence gather that there must be one appointed to be the greatest, because Christ saith, He that will be Greatest, let him be the servant of all.] This is to make good their charge against the Scripture, that it is a nose of Wax by their presumptuous abuse of it; as some men would prove the Apostasy of the Saints, by their own Apostatizing, when yet they prove it not, though they ruin themselves. Did not Christ by these words reprehend their seeking of a Supremacy? And yet doth he grant it?

Oh but it is only Tyranny that Christ forbiddeth them. *Answ.* That which Christ acknowledgeth in the Kings of the Nations, without reprehension, that is it which he denieth to his Disciples. But it is not Tyranny but Dominion which Christ thus acknowledgeth in, and alloweth to the Kings of the Nations: therefore it is not Tyranny but Dominion which he forbiddeth to his Disciples; That which Christ here speaketh of the Kings of the Nations, is somewhat common to all Kings, and so as Kings. But Tyranny was not common to all Kings, nor to them as Kings: therefore it is not Tyranny that he speaks of. Moreover its plain that it is a Greatness in Desire and Affectation that is the subject of Christ's speech, and not an allowed supremacy, and that he forbids this Supremacy in the following words, [Let him be the servant of all] q.d. [I allow in my Kingdom to the Preachers of the Gospel no other Greatness or superiority above others, but what consisteth in holiness, and humility, and doing good, and so in disclaiming of Ruling Greatness.] In Luk. 9, there's mention of [him that was least, &c.] It follows not thence that one was appointed to be the lowest. And if the will of Christ were known to them that one should be the Supreme, and this was Peter, what need they strive any further about it; or why doth he not rebuke them for resisting their Supreme?

Again I say, that I cannot see how it can stand with the wisdom or goodness of Christ the Law-giver of his Church, or the perfection of his Laws, or how it can be any way probable, that he should be wholly silent of so great a point as the Headship and Center of the Churches Unity; never giving us either the Name or Titles of such a Head, nor the seat of his Empire, nor appointing him his work, nor directing him how to do it when he hath the greatest work in the world to do (as these men suppose) and such as surpasseth the strength of man, yea of a thousand men; never giving

him any advice and direction for the determining of his very many occurrent difficulties; nor once giving us any of his power, nor telling us of his prerogative, nor telling us what officers he shall appoint under him, and how; nor once telling any man of his duty to obey him; never telling us anything of the succession of this Sovereign in whom it shall reside; nor once telling us historically of the exercise of any of his power: I say that not a word of this should be mentioned by Christ or his Apostles, even when there was so great occasion, when Peter was among them, when there was striving for supremacy, when the Churches were lamentably contending about the preeminence of their teachers, and some were for one, and some for another, and some for Cephas himself; and when so many heresies arose, and hazarded the Churches, as among the Corinthians, Galatians, and others there did; This is a thing so hard to be believed by one that believeth the wisdom and love of Christ, that I must say for my part, it surpasseth my belief. Especially (as is said) when also so much is said against the Supremacy contended for. All this I speak of any earthly Head, whether Pope or Council.

*Obj. But (*say the Papists) you can allow Princes to be the Heads of the Church: why then not a Pope? *Answ.* We acknowledge Princes and Pastors over parts of the Church, but not over the Church Universal. Every Corporation may call the Major or Bailiff a subordinate Head of that Corporation, but not of the Kingdom.

Obj. There may be a Prorex, a Vice-king: and why not then a Vicarious Head of the Catholic Church? *Answ.* 1. Because a Kingdom is not so big as all the world, or all that is and may be Christian. 2. Because a King having Dominion, hath power of doing all that by others that he cannot do himself: But a Pastor being a Minister, hath no such power given him, but must do

his work himself. 3. Because the work of the Ministry requires far more labor and attendance. So that it is an utter Impossibility that any man should be able to do the work of a supreme Ruler of all the Christian world, yea or the hundredth part of it, as it must be done. 4. And lastly, because Christ hath made no such Prorex, or Vice-head: and none can have it without his commission.

*Obj. But t*he Civil power hath been exercised by an Emperor over more than all the Christian world: And why then may not the Ecclesiastical? *Answ.* 1. Its notoriously false that ever Emperor had so extensive a Dominion. 2. The Gospel must be preached over all the world; and therefore we must consider the possible future extent of the Church, and not only the present existent state. 3. There are many millions of Christians mixed in the Dominions of Infidel Princes among other Religions, which makes the Government of them the more difficult. 4. I shown before from the nature of the work many other difficulties, which make a difference.

*Obj. Monar*chy is the best Government; therefore the Church must have it. *Answ.* The Monarchy of God is best: but among men it is according to the state of the Rulers and subject. One way is better in some cases, and another in others. 2. For one man to be Monarch of all the Christian world, is not best, when by taking a thousand times more upon him then he can do, he will ruin instead of ruling well. 3. You may as well say, A Universal Civil Monarch over all the world is best; therefore so it must be: but when will you prove that? But if I mistake not in my conjecture, it is the thing that the Jesuits have lately got into their heads, that the Pope must have the Universal Sovereignty Ecclesiastical and Civil; that so a Universal peace may be in the world.

Obj. There was but One High Priest before Christ. *Answ.* 1. No more there was but one Temple; Will you therefore have no more? Nor but one civil Monarch in that Church: Would you have no more? I partly believe it. 2. It was easy for one to Rule so small a Nation as Judea in comparison of all the world. 3. Prove you the Institution of your Supremacy, as we can prove the Institution of Aaron's Priesthood, and the taking of it down again, and we will yield all. 4. That Priesthood was a Type of Christ the Eternal Priest, and is ended in him, as the Epistle to the Hebrews shows at large.

Obj. There is a Monarchy among Angels and Devils. *Answ.* 1. Its a hard shift when you must go to another world for your pattern: But for your Argument fetched from Hell, I will leave it with you: but for that from Heaven, I say, there's no proof of it. And if there were, till you can prove that our work and fitness for it is the same as Angels, and that the Lord hath appointed the same form here, you have said nothing.

But because this Question is largely handled by abundance of our Learned Writers, I shall say no more to it here, but conclude, that by this which is already said in brief, it is manifest, that The Catholic Church of Christ is not one Visible Political Body, as joined to any One Universal Visible Head or Sovereign, besides Christ.

If any being driven from this hold, shall say, that yet there are several Patriarchs that Govern the several Provinces of the Christian world, though there be no head but Christ. I answer. 1. If there be no earthly Head and Center of unity, then I have the main cause. These Patriarchs may and do at this day, unreconcilably disagree among themselves. This therefore will not serve for a unity. 2. When (as is aforesaid) you have well proved the Institution of these Patriarchs, and how many they be, and who, and the power of Princes to make new ones, (and not to forbear it, and to pull down

the old ones:) and when you have answered the foregoing Arguments, as many of them as extend to Patriarchal power also, as well as Universal Headship, then we shall take this further into consideration. In the meantime, I supersede, as having done that which I think necessary to take off men, from inclining to Rome, and reproaching of Churches, upon the erroneous Conceit of the Nature and unity of the Catholic Church; as if it were One, as under One Earthly Visible Head.

CHAP. IV. Opening the true Grounds on which the Churches Unity and Peace must be sought, and the means that must be used to attain so much as is here to be expected.

Quest. But if this be not the way of the Churches Unity, which is? And what should we desire and endeavor for the attaining it? For the distractions of the Church are so great through our divisions, that it makes us still apt to suspect that we are out of the way.

Though it be a great work to answer this question rightly, and a hundred, a thousand times greater to answer it satisfactorily (that is, to satisfy prejudiced incapable men with a right answer,) yet I shall attempt it by casting in my thoughts; or to speak more confidently, by declaring so much as I am certain is the will of God concerning this weighty thing.

And here I shall first lay down those grounds upon which we must proceed, if we will do our duty for the union of the Church. 2. I shall tell you what must be done to reduce them into Practice.

1. The first General Ground is this [Peace and Holiness must be carried on together: Yea Peace must be sought as a Means to Holiness: and therefore Holiness which is the End, must be preferred.] The wisdom that is from above, is first Pure, then Peaceable, Gentle, easy to be entreated, &c. Jam.

3. A man may be saved that cannot attain Peace with men: and therefore we are commanded to seek it as an uncertain good, Rom. 12:18. If it be possible, as much as in you lieth, live peaceably with all men: But no man can be saved without Holiness, Heb. 12:14. Follow Peace with all men, and Holiness, without which no man shall see God. There is a kind of Unity among Devils. For if Satan were divided against Satan, how could his Kingdom stand? Matth. 12. There is a Peace in a state of misery and sin, which hindereth men's recovery. For when the strong man armed keeps his house, the things that he possesseth are in Peace. It is a state of greatest danger on earth to be United in evil, and to have Peace in a way of sin. And therefore it is no wonder if there be more lovers of Peace then of Holiness, and more that will cry out of our Divisions then of our ungodliness, and more that cry out of so many Religions, then of irreligiousness and ungodliness. For nature may make a man in love with Unity and Peace, but not with Holiness; for with that it is at Enmity. Hence it is that we hear so many Worldlings, Swearers, Drunkards, Whoremongers cry up unity, and cry down so many minds and ways: And hence it is that so many, such wicked livers do turn Papists on supposition that there is more unity with them. And so the Popish party among us are the sink into which the filth and excrements of our Churches are emptied.

2. The second General Ground. From hence it followeth that the first closure of the members of the Church must be upon principles of Faith and Holiness: and therefore only between the Professors of Faith and Holiness. And therefore we ought not to be solicitous of obtaining a Unity with open ungodly men; For what Communion hath light with darkness? Or what concord hath Christ with Belial? If men will not agree with us in the great Principles of Godliness, nor join with us in avoiding crying sins, and living

a Holy life; it is they that are the Separatists, and withdraw from our communion. If they will not come to us in Piety, we must not come to them in Impiety. And to attempt a union with them in Government and Ceremonies, when we cannot bring them to a Union with us in seeming Godliness, is as vain as to attempt to an Association with the dead, and to make a marriage with a stinking Corpse. It is therefore but a carnal stir that Papists, and some Reconcilers make to have a Union so General, as shall take in the most impious rabble that ought to be excommunicated, and should conjoin the living and the dead. And therefore in some cases we are all called to separate, by him that calleth us in other cases to unity: And he tells us that he came not to send peace, (with such) but division.

3. The third General Ground. Unity and Peace are such excellent things, and so much depend upon Love and Holiness, and suppose also so much Illumination, that the perfection of them is reserved for Heaven: and as it is but a small measure of Illumination, and Love and Holiness that is here attainable, in comparison of that which we shall have in heaven; so it is but a small measure of Peace and Concord: And therefore though our desires and endeavors should go as high as we can, yet our expectations on earth must not fly too high. This hath been my own error. I have not sufficiently considered, that perfect Peace, as well as perfect Holiness is the prerogative of Heaven, and that true Peace will be imperfect while the Light and Virtue which is supposed to it is imperfect. And it is a blind absurd conceit of them that wonder we have not perfect Unity, when yet they murmur at Piety, and think a little may serve the turn, and any sin is tolerable thats directly against God, but not disunion.

So much for the General Grounds: The Particular Grounds are these following.

1. Ground it is the Prerogative of the Lord Jesus to be the only Head and Sovereign of the Church. And his will revealed is our Law, and in him only must we center: and not in any Vicarious Universal Head: And from him must all receive their power: and all must worship God according to his praescript. Eph. 4:3,4,5, and 1:21,22; Matth. 28:18,19; Col. 1:18; Acts 4:12, and 3:22, and 7:37; Matth. 3:17; 1 Cor. 3:5,22; 1 Cor. 1:12; Gal. 2:9,10.

2. Gr. The Holy Scriptures with the Law of Nature, are the only Laws of Christ: unless as he may possibly by extraordinary Revelation, oblige some person to a particular duty, not contrary to that word, but left undetermined: which yet is so rare a thing that men must not rashly presume of such a matter, 1 Tim. 1:3; Gal. 1:7,8,9; Isa. 8:20; 1 Cor. 4:6; 2 Tim. 3:17; Deut. 12:32; Matth. 15:9,11.

3. It is the prerogative of Christ himself to be the supreme, absolute and final Judge of the sense of his own Laws, and of the causes that are to be tried thereby.

And therefore it is treasonable folly to attribute any of this to man: and to cry out for an Absolute Judge of Controversies here on earth: when one saith, This is the sense of Scripture, and another saith that is the sense: saith the Papist, [But who shall be Judge?] To which I answer, How far man is Judge, I shall tell you in the next: but the Absolute Judge, and the final Judge is only Christ. He that made the Law is the proper Judge of the sense of his own Laws: Do you not know that Christ will come to judgment, and that all secrets must then be opened by him, and he must decide what man cannot? Man is to Judge but in tantum; ad hoc; secundum quid; limitedly; so far as he must execute; but Christ only Judgeth entirely, finally and absolutely, 2 Cor. 4:3,4,5; 1 Tim. 5:24; Jam. 4:11,12; 1 Pet. 1:17, and 2:23; 1 Cor. 2:15; Act. 23:3; 1 Cor. 13:9-12; Mar. 7:9,13.

4. All Councils whether General, or Provincial, or Classical, which consist of the Bishops or Pastors of several Churches met together, are appointed and to be used directly, but *gratiâ Unitatis, & Communionis Christianae*, and not directly *gratia regiminis* for the Governing of Pastors, in order to Unity and Communion, and not as a Regimental, as to the Pastors. This Proposition which is of exceeding consequence, was voluntarily asserted to me, without my own asking his opinion, by that Learned, Judicious man Arch-Bishop Usher; a man well known to be acquainted with the Judgment and practice of the Ancients, if any other whoever. His words were these. [Councils are not for Government, but for Unity; not as being in order of Government over the several Bishops; but that by consultation they may know their duty more clearly, and by agreement maintain Unity; and to this end they were anciently celebrated] Himself a Primate, recommended to others these moderate Principles. And this middle way of Reverend Usher is the true healing Mean, between them that would have properly Governing Councils, and them that would have none, or think them needless, or but indifferent things.

But yet (as is before mentioned in the tenth Proposition) consequentially we are obliged to perform the Agreements of these Councils, if they be agreeable to the General Rules of the Scriptures, or if our performance be not forbidden by the Word of God; Because we are under the General obligation to do all things in as much unity, concord and peace as we can, Gal. 2, *per totum*. 1 Cor. 3:5,22; 2 Cor. 13:11, and 1 Cor. 1:10, and 4:6; Matth. 20:25; Phil. 3:16, and 4:2; Matth. 23:8,9,10; 1 Pet. 5:3.

And I grant that Pastors are related to the Universal Church, as well as to a particular, and are to have a common care of the whole, though they have a special charge only of their particular flocks. Therefore many Pastors in a

Synod are Pastors as well as disjunct, and therefore their acts are authoritative Governing Acts as to the flock. But 1. To the Pastors themselves, they are not properly Governors, no more in Synods then out. 2. And as to the flocks, they are not in a direct superior order above their particular Pastors; but only from their concord are accidentally more to be regarded and obeyed then a single Pastor, as a College of Physicians is more to be regarded then a single Physician, not as being of higher authority, but of greater credit, in cases where men must be trusted.

5. A Council consisting of Bishops or Pastors that by distance are not uncapable of ordinary local Communion, whether it be a General Council (as they are commonly called, which are not such properly) or National, or Provincial. 1. As they are Christians singly, have a Judgment of Discerning, what is sound Doctrine, and whom to judge Catholics and fit for their Communion: And 2. As they are single Pastors, they have the Judgment of Direction, what Doctrine to recommend as found to their people (limited to the Superior Direction of God by his Word,) and whom they must hold or not hold Communion with: And this is an Authoritative Direction, which may be accompanied with a Commanding, as a Herald or Pursuivant may command in the Princes name. 3. And as they are many Pastors in Council assembled, they have a Judgment of Concord, or Power to enter solemnly into Consultations for mutual information, and then into Agreements, for the right performance of their duty, in recommending that which is sound Doctrine to their people, and receiving the true members of the Catholic Church, and rejecting such as are to be rejected.

So that the most General Councils of true Pastors caeteris paribus, are to be most reverenced by the Princes and people, and in cases where they are sure it is lawful to follow their Agreements, though they be not satisfied of

the necessity of it à natura rei, they ought to follow them on the account of unity; and also in cases merely doubtful to them in point of Doctrine, to be balanced by their judgments rather than by the Judgment of single Pastors, and more then by any other human judgment caeteris paribus: which exception I add, because a smaller Assembly, yea a single Pastor or private man, speaking according to the Word of God, is to be believed and regarded more than the greatest Assembly contradicting the Word: yet we are not easily to think, without evident proof, that one man should be rather in the right then so many; seeing it is easier for one to err then so many, and the promises are more to the public, then any single persons, so far as they can be known to others: And yet an Assembly of an hundred, or twenty, or ten apparent humble, holy, Judicious men, is likelier to be in the right, and more to be regarded, then an Assembly of a thousand ignorant unlearned wicked Bishops. One clear eye may see further than ten thousand purblind ones, Act. 6:5; Act. 5:34; 1 Thes. 2:14; 1 Cor. 11:16, and 14:33, and 10:32.

6. As the properest matter for such General Assemblies to Consult and Agree upon, is General things; as, What Doctrine is sound, and what unsound in General; what persons in General fit for the Churches Communion, and what unfit, &c. so smaller Assemblies that are capable of ordinary personal Communion, and know the persons and circumstances of the cases, are fittest to consult and agree whether such or such particular persons are fit for their own Communion; yea and for their Churches Communion in difficult cases: And also may consult and agree what Doctrines and practices to recommend to their own people, as most agreeable to the Word of God: And thus far these two sorts of Synods may be said to have a power of Judging; viz. ad hoc, in order to such agreements and practice, Act. 6:5,6; Rom. 15:26,27; 2 Cor. 8:19.

7. The Pastors of particular Worshipping Churches, are the Authorized Guides, Rulers or Teachers of those Churches, and each Member thereof: and must first discern in their own minds, and next (if they be many over a Church) Agree among themselves, and then teach the people, what is to be believed and practiced, and with whom in General, and in Particular to hold Communion, and whom to avoid, and may charge the people in Christ's name to obey their just directions; and when they have done, must themselves execute their own part herein (as by avoiding the Rejected, and not delivering them the Symbols or Sacrament of Communion, &c.) And though they must consult with neighbor Churches for carrying on the work of God in unity, and to the best advantage of the Common cause, yet are they not under the proper Government of them, or any Assemblies (Ecclesiastical,) though obliged in all just things to Agree with them. So that Canons as Canons, I mean the Conclusions of such Assemblies, are but properly Agreements, and not Laws, though by consequence they may be said to oblige, or rather we by another Law obliged to accord and practice them, Heb. 13:17; 1 Thess. 5:12,13; 1 Cor. 4:1,2; Act. 20:28.

8. The work of Councils how large so ever, is not to make new Scriptures to be the Rule of our Faith and Life, nor to make new Articles or Doctrines of Faith, nor to frame God a new Worship in whole or in part; But by Consultations and Agreements to strengthen each other, and Direct the people in the faith of Christ, and the maintaining and propagating the Doctrine of the Holy Scriptures, and doing those duties in the Worship of God, and in Righteousness and Mercy to men, which the Scriptures do impose, and in agreeing upon those Modes and Circumstances of Worship which God hath made necessary *in genere*, and left to occasional human determination *in specie*: Nor may they under this pretense, either contradict

the just determination of the Magistrate concerning such Circumstances, or impose any ensnaring, needless Ceremonies upon the Church; but only order the service of God according to the General Directions of the Scripture, and the Light of Nature, which by the consideration of the case may help to discern the fittest order. It is therefore a strange assertion of some, that Governors have nothing to do if they may not appoint new Ordinances or Symbolical Ceremonies on the Church, and make new Laws, seeing God hath done the rest already. As if it were nothing to see to the execution of God's Laws? Or as if this were not the fittest work for such kind of Rulers, whose Rule is only by Ministerial Guidance? Or as if the determination of Necessary Circumstances requisite ex natura rei, were not enough for them to do, beside what is written? There being no more necessary to the reducing of the Laws of God into practice: Me thinks mere servants and Ambassadors should not be very forward in making Laws, if they understand their office, Jam. 4:12; Heb. 8:10,16; Gal. 3:15; Deut. 12:32; Ezek. 2:7, and 3:10,11; 1 Cor. 3:5, and 4:1,2; 2 Cor. 1:24; 1 Cor. 6:12.

9. Those necessary Circumstances in Religious Worship which are of human determination, and left undetermined by God, are unfit matter for General Councils or remote Assemblies to make standing General Laws of: For 1. The Nature of the things are such as are mutable, and unfit to be fixed, but must be frequently varied as occasions require. 2. The occurring circumstances will be the fittest guide to determine them. 3. They may be meet in one Country, or Church, which are unmeet in another. 4. Upon such reasons God himself hath left them undetermined: Therefore he left them not to any fixed General determination. 5. The Pastors that are in the place are the fittest Judges of those occasions that must determine them. 6. And it

is the office, and in the Commission of those Pastors to be the Guides of their own actions and Congregations. 7. And Councils are not their Lord's. So that all this laid together, may tell us that it is rather the work of particular Pastors or Bishops, and of nearest Associations in those cases where Concord is requisite, then of Provincial, or National, or General Councils to determine of such Circumstances. For example: The command of preaching, reading, administering the Sacraments, singing Psalms, &c. do imply that I must have some time and place to do them in: I must use some gesture, vesture, necessary utensils, but it tells not what in particular: I must read some particular Chapter, Psalm, &c. or so much of it: Now common prudence will tell me what to do in these cases myself, or else I am not fit to be a Pastor, or entrusted with so great a work as God's public Worship, or the care of souls. Shall a Council now make Laws that all the Ministers in the World, or in this Nation, shall preach only on such a day, and only at such an hour, and in this or that part of the Church, and only on such Texts such days, appointing them a Text for every day; or that they shall use only such words in praying and preaching as is written for them; or shall pray or preach just so long; or shall sing only such a Psalm, in such a tune, using only such clothes, and such gestures, with an hundred the like? This is to make themselves Masters of the Church, and use their power to the destruction of Ministry, Worship and Church, and not to the Edification of it. The present state of the flock, by sin; or affliction, or the like, may make such a Text fittest for me to preach on, and such a Chapter to be read, or such a Psalm to be sung, when by the Impositions of proud usurpers I am commanded to use the contrary, viz. Subjects of Joy, in a time of Humiliation, or of Humiliation in the time of Joy, &c. Many the like inconveniencies might easily be manifest. These unnecessary Impositions

are the Engines of Division, Act. 15:28; Rom. 14, throughout. Rom. 15:1,7; Phil. 3:15,16; Matth. 23:4, and 11:28; 1 Cor. 6:12; 2 Cor. 1:24.

10. Where some Impositions by Magistrates or Agreements by Ministers in such Circumstances are thought lawful or fit, yet must not the Churches Unity or Peace be laid upon them: So that if through the weakness of Christians they could not perceive the lawfulness of them, but did think they should sin against God if they used them, it is a cruel dividing course for Magistrates here by sore penalties, or Pastors Excommunications to seek to drive them upon that which they think is the way to hell, or the wrath of God, when in the Judgment of the Imposer it is a thing indifferent: The peace of the Church and of Conscience is more worth then a Ceremony, and better kept by gentle recommending such things (if fit,) and a tender rebuke or check to the weak, then by forcing all to that which they neither can nor need to use. But some say, if all may use what way they will, what order shall we have? I answer; therefore make no unnecessary Laws: cast not a foot-ball of contention before them: These presumptuous Impositions are the fire brands of the Church. For example: we had here a Law that Ministers should read only such a piece of a Chapter called an Epistle and Gospel such a day (which yet I would not disobey:) here now arose contention about it: The same Ministers were left at liberty what Text to preach on: and this liberty made no breach in the Church. Ministers were commanded to wear a Surplice, and this raised contention: But what kind of hat, or cap, or shoes, or hose to wear, they were left at liberty, and this made no contention, nor occasioned any undecency. The Lord's Supper was to be taken only kneeling: and this raised contention: But they were left at liberty whether to kneel, or stand, or sit at Sermon, or reading, or singing Psalms, and this bred no undecency nor division. They were enjoined to bow at the

name of Jesus in the reading of the Gospel only: And this raised division. But they were left at liberty to bow or not to the Name of God; Christ, Lord, &c. and to the Name Jesus in Sermon, or the Epistle, or the same Gospel read in the whole Chapter: and this bred no division, nor discontent: Lay the Churches peace upon no new human Impositions, if you would have it hold. Peruse Rom. 14, and the other Text last cited, 1 Cor. 6:12.

11. The Churches Peace or Unity must not be laid on any bare words of man's devising. It's not a work for Councils or Prelates to form the Christian doctrine in new methods and terms, and then to force others to subscribe or use those very terms: If the same men that refuse this, be willing to subscribe to the whole Scripture, or to a Confession in Scripture terms, you may force him to no more.

*Obj. But H*eretics will subscribe to Scripture. *Answ.* 1. They must wrest it then, or wrest their Consciences: And by either or both these shifts, they may also subscribe to any of your Confessions. 2. If his Heresy be latent in his mind, you know it not, nor can call him a Heretic, nor doth it hurt the Church: If it he published or preached to others, let civil Governors question him for corporal punishment, and let the Associate Pastors question him to his Reformation or Rejection. You will have a better ground to reject him for delivering falsehood in his own words, then for not subscribing to Truth in your words, when he subscribed the same Truth in God's Words.

There is no Unity to be expected, if you will so far depart from the Scripture sufficiency, as to make any more for sense or phrase, of absolute necessity to our peace. By phrase or terms, I mean either the same numerically (as in the Original) or equipollent (as in translations.) And I say not that it's necessary to the unity of the Church, that every word in

Scripture (Original or Translations) be subscribed to; (for some may doubt of the corruption of a word or Book) But that no more is necessary. If all Scripture be not of that degree of Necessity, much less human additions, Isa 8:20; 1 Tim. 3:17; 2 Tim. 1:13; 1 Cor. 9:5; 1 Tim. 6:20; Act. 20:32.

12. The Churches Unity and Peace must not be laid upon all Divine Truths: as not on lesser darker points, which neither the being nor well-being of Christianity is concerned in so much as to rest upon them, Phil. 3:15,16; Rom. 14:15,17,20; Heb. 5:11-14; 1 Cor. 7:19; Gal. 5:6, and 6:15; Col. 3:11.

13. We ought to love and esteem as Christians and members of the Catholic Church all those that profess to believe the Essentials of Christianity, and to be sanctified by the Spirit of God, and lead a holy upright life; so they make a credible profession, not evidently contradicted by words or deeds: though these persons may differ from us in many lower points of Doctrine, Worship or Government, 1 Cor. 1:2; Eph. 6:24; Gal. 6:15,16; Phil. 3:16; Rom. 15:1,2, and 14:1,2; 1 Cor. 8:9.

14. We ought so to manage the Worship of God in our particular solemn Assemblies, that no sober peaceable Christian may be repulsed or forced from our local Communion, through differences in things of indifferent nature, Heb. 8:5; Matth. 15:9; Rom. 14:13, and 14:1; 2 Cor. 11:3; Joh. 4:23,24.

15. If any Churches differ from us in Ceremonies or smaller things, or if any particular Christians differ, so that they cannot in conscience hold local Communion with us in the same Assemblies for Worship (E. G. if we sit at the Lord's Supper, and they dare not take it without kneeling: if we sing a version of the Psalms which they scruple to join in; If we permit none to join that will not conform in disputable things) in such cases, though it be

first our duty to do our best to remove all offenses, yet if that cannot be done, we may and ought in several Assemblies to take each other for Brethren, and of the same Catholic Church, so be it we all hold the same essentials of Faith and Godliness, and walk accordingly, and especially if we also hold those weighty superstructures, that the welfare of the Church is most concerned in.

Though here were few or no instances of this case in the days of the Apostles, when divisions were not so great as now, yet the general rules in the fore-cited Texts do prove it.

16. Ecclesiastical Ministerial Government (by whomsoever exercised) must not degenerate into a secular coercive Government; nor may we use carnal weapons, nor meddle by force with men's bodies or estates; nor yet can we oblige the Magistrate to do it, merely to execute our censures, or without sufficient Evidence to prove it his duty; nor can we oblige the people against the Word of God, *clave errante*: so that neither Bishop, nor Council hath any such power as is properly decisively Judicial obliging to execution, be the sentence right or wrong: But our people must know that though we be their Guides or Rulers, yet are we but Ministers, and that they have a higher power to regard, and must not obey us against the Lord, but in and for him. The Power of Pastors therefore is not like Magistrates, or absolute Judges (as is said before, but like a Physician in his Hospital, or in an infected City among his Patients, and like a Reader of any Science to voluntary Scholars, in his School: and as an Ambassador to them to whom he is sent. So that our Governing being but by the Word, and on the Conscience, is of the same nature with our Directing. 1 Pet. 5:3; Luk. 22:25,26; 3 Joh. 9:10; 1 Cor. 4:1,2.

17. Magistrates are Governors of the Church even as a Church, and of Christians as Christians, though not Absolutely, nor in the same respects, by the same means, and to the same nearest Ends, as Pastors. Magistrates must force us to our duty, and punish us if we be wicked or negligent, even as Pastors, and cast us out of our Benefices, and deny us encouragements, if we be insufficient: so that *ad hoc* the Magistrate is the only Judge what is sound doctrine, and what heresy, what Ministers are sufficient or insufficient, culpable or not; I say, ad hoc, so far as to Judge who shall have public Liberty and Countenance, and who shall be punished, restrained and discountenanced: Thus far the Magistrate is Judge in Religion; (besides that Judgment of Choice which every private man hath) And therefore the Princes of the Christian world should hold some correspondencies like General Councils, among themselves by their agents for carrying on the work of Christ, and much of the unity and prosperity of Christians lieth on their hands, Isa. 49:23; Psal. 2:12; Rom. 13:1-4; 1 King. 2:27,35, and 2 King. 18:4, and 2 King. 23:8,20; 2 Chron. 14:3,5; Josh. 1:8; 1 Tim. 2:2.

18. Yet are the Pastors of the Church in their places Rulers or Guides of Princes and Magistrates: that is, we Guide them by Doctrine and Church discipline, as they Rule us by force. The Pastors are the Judges of Heresy and Vice, ad hoc thus far, so as to judge who shall be Denounced by themselves unmeet for the Churches Communion; and Judges of sound Doctrine so far as to resolve what is by themselves to be taught to the people: and Judges of that Magistrate so far, as to determine whether he be a fit subject for their Administrations and Communion. For every man is to judge when he is to act and execute (in these cases;) and therefore when the Question is, Who is to be tolerated or forcibly restrained, the Magistrate is the only Judge, and the Minister but a teacher: But the Question is, whom

should I admit or not admit to my Communion, and whom should I persuade and require the Church to avoid or to receive? Here the Pastors are the Judges: And when the Question is, Whether the Pastor go according to God's Word or not, here the people have *Judicium Discretionis*, and cannot be forced; though they ought to obey where they see not sufficient reason to the contrary, Matth. 28:18,19; Heb. 13:17; 1 Thess. 5:12; 1 Cor. 4:1; Luk. 12:42,44; 1 Sam. 28:18; Dan. 9:8,10; Joh. 20:23; 2 Chron. 36:14,15,16.

19. The honor and power of the Pastors is for their work: And so great is that work, that as to fleshly accommodations, it layeth us under abundance more trouble, then the power and honor affordeth us relief from. All true Pastors therefore should be so far from striving for Power, and Greatness, and Rule, and extent of their Diocese as matters of advantage, that they should still look on their Power but as Power to thresh, or plough, or sow, or reap; a Power to give alms to all the poor in the Town, to visit all the sick, to cure mad men that will abuse me, &c. such a Power to labor and suffer in doing good. And thus he that will be the Greatest, but think of no other kind of greatness, but a power to become the servant of all: If men had these true apprehensions of the Episcopal office, they would be no more forward in contending for power and large Dioceses, then now they are in contending who shall Instruct most of the ignorant, or go to the poor ungodly families to further their reformation; or entreat, beseech, exhort most of the obstinate from man to man; or who should relieve the most of the poor of all the Country about. And if this be it they contend for, they may Rule without a Commission from the Prince: Who will hinder them, that hath any fear of God? 1 Cor. 4:9-13,16; Act. 20:18, to the end. 2 Cor. 1:24; Mar. 10:44; 1 Thess. 2:9; Luk. 10:2.

20. No man is called by God to more work than he can possibly do, nor should desire and undertake more. And therefore if Prelates, and Councils, and Popes would but conscionably bethink them of the work, what it is, and how to be done, and of what weight, and how strict will be the account, and then consider how they can do it, our differences would quickly be at end: For though godly men would put off no service they can do, yet when they looked on the undertaking of these Impossibles, they would tremble to think on it. All conscionable men are sensible of their weakness, and the weight of the work, and say who is sufficient for these things; And I dare say the strongest of them all would feel the weight of the burden of one Parish, and be readier to beg and seek about for help, then to contend for a larger Diocese, unless as the mere necessity of the Church for want of laborers might call them to labor in other parts. Duty supposeth Authority, and Authority supposeth ability and opportunity; even natural ability and mental qualifications, Psal. 131:1,2; 2 Cor. 2:16.

BY this much you may see what Unity may be expected in the Church on earth. 1. A unity of internal Faith and Love, and Spirit among all real Christians. 2. A Unity of Profession, all professing the same Belief, that is of the word of God in General; and of the Creed and Essentials of Religion in particular; and as many more of the particular truths as they can reach.

3. A Unity of Professors in local communion in the same Assemblies in God's public Worship, in the Word, Prayer, Praises, Sacraments, &c. Where they cohabite, or have opportunity for such communion.

4. Among those that are out of our reach, or being near us, yet differing in some smaller things, where a difference is tolerable, we may yet in word, writing and deed own each other as Brethren, and combine for the promoting of the common good, and the commonly received truths and

duties. So that we have in these four, the unity of the spirit in the bond of Peace: One Body: (the Catholic Church comprehending all properly called Christians) One Spirit (The sanctifying Spirit of Christ:) One Hope of our calling (One Promise or Gospel, and One Heaven and End:) One Lord (even Christ the only Head of the Church) One Faith (Both objective, in Scripture, and the Creed: and subjective, specifical, which is our Reception of Scripture doctrine, and of Christ with his benefits:) One Baptism (entering all one and the same Covenant with Christ, to be his, and take him for our Lord and Savior, renouncing the world, the flesh and devil, and signifying this by external washing in the name of that Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.) One God and Father (Our Creator, Preserver, our End and Happiness) Eph. 4:3,4,5.

And is all this Nothing to you that seemed so much to Paul? That unless you have also an Earthly, Universal Head, and a Unity in Ceremonies (wherein all must be of your mind, and conform to you as if you were God's) you will revile at our divisions, and run to Rome for further Unity.

Having laid down those Grounds or Principles on which the Unity and Peace of the Church must be built, there appears not any great need of adding anymore for the reducing these to practice; if these were but received, the way of practice would be obvious. But briefly I shall lay down these few Propositions, implied in those expressed before.

1. Let every man profess his belief of the Holy Scriptures in General; and in particular of all that Scripture hath expressed to be of Necessity to Salvation: by denouncing death to them that have it not; And let them also Profess to consent that God be their God, and Christ their Savior, and the Holy Ghost their Sanctifier, and that they renounce the flesh, the world and Devil, resolving to live a holy life. And let this be by a credible way of

Professing. And all that do thus, let us esteem, love, and use them as Christians, till they some way plainly disown this Profession.

2. Let every such Baptized Professor, owning also the Ministry, Church and Worship Ordinances, plainly required in Scripture, be a member of some particular Church, where he may worship God in the Communion of Saints.

3. Let those that make not the foresaid Christian Profession, be excluded the number of Christians, and those that own not the Fundamentals of communion, (the Church, Ministry, Word, Prayer, Praise, Sacrament of Communion) be taken as unmeet for actual communion with us, though yet we censure them not to be no Christians.

4. Let those that are obstinate and impenitent in any Errors, contrary to the said Profession and Ordinances, or in actual gross sin, or discovering an ungodly heart, be rejected by the Church, after due admonition and patience.

5. Let all the Pastors Associate, and hold constant correspondency according to their nearness and opportunity, for helping and strengthening each other, and unanimous carrying on the work of Christ.

6. Let these Associations have standing Presidents, where the peace of the Church requireth it.

7. Let no particular Pastors set up anything in God's public Worship which is not Necessary, and may tend to make divisions by driving tender Consciences from his communion.

8. Let Associations forbear making Laws to others, and imposing as Governors, and let them make Agreements for certain Duty, and not Laws that pretend to make new duties; and let them Agree on nothing unnecessary.

9. Let them study Holiness as much as Peace, and keep clean themselves and their societies as far as they can, and look at labor and suffering, and not at any other honor and power, but what is for duty; and let them look abroad and help the dark parts within their reach, and lay out themselves freely and industriously for God, and have the chief regard to the most public good.

10. Let him that is justly cast out of one Church, be received by none into communion till he be reconciled; and if they suspect that he is unjustly cast out, let him not be received till the Church that cast him out be heard, and the injury or his Repentance manifest.

11. Let those that cannot hold local communion, because of some smaller practical difference (as gestures, words, &c.) and yet agree in the foresaid Profession, and Fundamentals of Communion: yet own each other professedly as Brethren, and maintain Love and communion in other respects.

12. Let all differing Christians consult and agree how to hold their differences, so as may least prejudice the common truths which all receive, and as may least hinder the salvation of the ungodly, or offend the weak.

13. Let none judge or defame each other till they are heard, and see they have sufficient cause by certain proof: And then admonish them, and bring the cause to the Association, before they proceed further.

14. Let the correspondency of Pastors extend as far as there is Capacity, Opportunity, and need. We cannot correspond with the Antipodes, nor much with the Ethiopians, nor such remote parts: there is seldom opportunity, and seldom necessity of actual correspondence with foreign Nations: But yet when public occasions require it, (the publicest cases being the weightiest)

we should by Delegates or Messengers from several Associations, perform our duties in all such correspondencies, whether in Councils or otherwise.

15. If any members of our Churches travail into other parts, they should take Certificates or Communicatory Letters, that they may be admitted to the communion of the Churches where they travail or abide.

16. The chief consultations for General Peace and effectual promoting the healing of the Churches, and the propagation of the Gospel into the unbelieving parts of the world, should be done by Christian Princes by their Agents: and though Ministers are fit to be (partly) their Agents in such consultations, yet not merely as Pastors, but as fit men employed by their Princes. He that lives to see but this much reduced to practice, will see a better unity and peace in the Church, then ever was or will be attained by an earthly Head and Judge of the Universal Church, whether Pope or Council, or then the Agreement of the five Patriarchs, and the later Primates and Metropolitans will procure. Let us be content with one Head, and one Heart; and center there: but though the fingers and toes be more, we can well bear it. Take up with the Holy Scriptures as the sufficient Rule: Let the Profession of that be the mark of a believer: and all such believers be taken to be, as they are, the Catholic Church; and no faction Schismatically and presumptuously confine it to themselves; Let this Intellectual Unity of faith, be seconded with a cordial Unity of Holy Love, to Christ and his Members: (that so our Unity may begin at the Head and Heart, and not perversely at the fingers and toes of smaller matters, or at the hair and nails of Ceremonies and indifferent Modes;) Let this be manifested in Professions of Love, and public ownings of the Catholic Brotherhood, and of Christians as Christians; and by public disclaiming all selfishness, and partiality, and private Interests, and all reproachful words and writings, and by actual

communion as far as we can. Let the Worship of God be performed in such holy simplicity that none may be driven from the sacred Assemblies; and let the people be suffered to go the same way to heaven as Peter and Paul did go themselves, and lead their hearers in; Let us not be ambitious of Church Union or Communion with those that ought to be cast out of the Church, and whom we are in Scripture commanded to avoid; but let the three attributes of [Holy Catholic, and Apostolical] be still affixed to the Church; and be practically considered; and those considerations issued in [The Communion of Saints] And then we shall have so much Unity and Peace, as may honor the Christian Religion, and strengthen us in the way to our Perfect Peace, which is not to be expected in this dark, diseased, imperfect world. This is the way, and none but this.

But is there any hope that while men are as they are, such healing Truths should be received and obeyed? Yes: by here and there a man; who shall have the Peace of their peaceable Affections and Endeavors; but not by the most either of the people or the Pastors; let the evidence of the truth be never so clear. Who can expect any great success of such Proposals, that knows the world? (till the time come when Light shall go forth with an absolute resolution to prevail.) God is one; and all that Deny themselves and center in him, must needs be One: But self is as various and numerous as Persons are. And this self is the Heart of the Natural man, and the Center of all the unsanctified. And every self is a grain of Sand, thats hardly made coherent with another. The Darkest mind, is self-conceited: and the poorest child or beggar is self-affected; and high and low, Princes and people have self-interests, which draw them several waves. And in the sanctified this self is mortified but in part, and is the first living, and strongest, and last dying sin, in all; and giveth strength to all the rest. What hope then of Unity,

while every man hath a numerically different Center, Principle, and End, and so few forsake it, and devote themselves to God the common Center, and End of the Saints? And those few so Imperfectly; permitting self to live and do so much within them. And though the Papists have devised a way to make this sand into a rope; or cement innumerable selves together, by finding out such a Carnal Head and Center where every man may find his own Carnal Interest involved in the Interest of that Head and his body; and so may have a carnal unity of a multitude of carnal ones to glory in; Yet Christ is another kind of Head and Center, condemning and destroying carnal self, and commanding all his followers upon pain of damnation to deny it, though to nature it be the dearest thing in the world. No wonder therefore if the number of his Adherents be few, and the unity of those that center in him, be less conspicuous and glorious in the world. With strong Desires therefore, but Low Expectations I propound these terms of Unity to the Church; as knowing how many thousand of the Dark and selfish will not only neglect them and reject them, but rise up against them (if they come into their hands) with no small self-conceited confidence and scorn.

But the Church is the Lord's, who hath purchased it by his blood; his Interest in it is more than mine; and it is infinitely dearer to him then to me; and his wisdom is fittest to dispose of the success of our endeavors, and to determine of the season and measures of its cure: He is the Physician, and hath undertaken the work, and in the fittest way and time will perfect it, and be the finisher as well as the Author of our faith. The eye of the chief Shepherd is even now upon all his scattered flock, and of those that are given him to be saved, he will lose none; he is neither insufficient for them, nor careless of them; but will gather into one the Elect that are dispersed; and present them all pure, unblameable, and spotless to his Father at the

last; and as much as they seem now to us, to be uncurably divided, we shall then see them perfectly healed and united, and made up One Glorified Body of our Head. For that blessed Marriage Day of the Lamb, and the Glory of the New Jerusalem, we therefore Pray, and Hope, and Wait, in our passage through this sinful and distracted world.

There are three common sayings in which I am much delighted that conduce to the Illustration of what I have said.

1. *Servanda in Necessariis Unitas; In non-necessariis libertas: in utrisque charitas*. Vulg.

2. *Contra Rationem nemo sobrius; Contra Scripturam nemo Christianus; Contra Ecclesiam nemo pacificus*. August.

Scripture is the test of Christianity, and must show us sound in the faith; though the Church may show us Peaceable.

3. *Unitatem, Vetitatem, Felicitatem,*

<Querit.>

Homo Socialis, Philosophia, Natura,

<Invenit.>

Catholicus Speculativus, Theologia, Fides Historica,

<Possidet.>

Sanctus Charitativus, Religio, Charitas.

Therefore to seek for Unity, Verity or Felicity, by the loss or destruction of Sanctity, Religion, Charity; is really to renounce, oppose and lose them.

Satisfaction to certain Calumniators.

I am informed from London, and several parts of the Land, that some of my Books having lately been sold at excessive rates by the Booksellers, it is somewhat commonly reported that it is caused by my excessive gain, which say they, is at least three or four hundred pounds a year. I thank the Lord

that doth not only employ me in his service, but also vouchsafe me the honor and benefit of being evil-spoken of for doing him the best service that I can, Matth. 5:11,12; 1 Pet. 4:13-16. Blessed Augustine was put to vindicate himself by an oath, from the infamy of a covetous design, which was raised by one godly woman, upon a disorderly action of other men, and to that end he wrote his 225th Epistle. I find no call to use his oath; but yet I judge it my duty to imitate him in patience, and in rescuing the slanderers from their sin, that they abuse not their souls by uncharitable surmises, nor their tongues by false reports. To which end I give them this true information: The two first Books I printed, I left to the Booksellers Will; for all the rest, I agreed with them for the fifteenth Book, to give to some few of my friends, hearing that some others agreed for the tenth. Sometime my fifteenth Book coming not to a hundred, and sometime but to few more, when of Practical Books I needed sometime 800 to give away. Because I was scarce rich enough to buy so many, I agreed with the Bookseller, (my Neighbor,) to allow 18. d. a Ream (which is not a penny a quire,) out of his own gain towards the buying of Bibles, and some of the practical Books which he printed, for the poor: Covenanting with him, that he should sell my Controversial Writings as cheap, and my Practical Writings somewhat cheaper than books are ordinarily sold. To this hour I never received for myself one penny of money from them for any of my Writings, to the best of my remembrance: but if it fell out that my part came to more than I gave my friends, I exchanged them for other Books: My accounts and memory tell me not of 5.li that ever was returned for me on these accounts, which was on literary occasions: so that my many hundreds a year is come to never a penny in all, but as abovesaid, in some exchange of Books. And the price I set on my Books which I exchanged for theirs at the dearest rates, is

as followeth, [*Treat. of Conversion, 2. s. Treat. of Crucifying the World, 2. s. Dispute. of Justificat. 2. s. 4, d. The Call to the Unconverted, 8. d. Dispute. of saving Faith, 5. d. Of the Grotian Religion, 6. d. Directions for sound Conversion, 1. s. 8. d. Dispute of Right to Sacraments, Edit. secund. 2. s. 4. d*.] These are all my bargains and my gains. And I chose the honestest Booksellers that I could meet with, according to my small measure of wit and acquaintance; who told me, they still made good their Promises. And now censorious Slanderer, tell me, what thou wouldst have had me to have done more? If I had got Food and Rayment out of my own hard labors, had it been unlawful or dishonorable, when Booksellers get so many hundred pounds by one Book, that never studied nor spent their time and cost for it, as I have done? And yet dost thou reproach me that receive not a groat? But because I will not oblige myself to the same course for the future, and that thou mayst know at what rates I serve thee, let me tell thee, that in these labors early and late my body is wasted, my precious time laid out, and somewhat of my Estate, and somewhat of the labor of my friends. I cannot have twenty quire of my writing well transcribed, under fifty pounds. And who shall pay for this, or maintain me in thy service? I have troubled a Neighbor-Minister in the tedious work of transcribing my Characters (for some books,) for which, neither he nor I had ever one penny. These personal matters are unsavory to me, and I take it for a great injury that thou puttest upon me a necessity of mentioning them. But I have yielded this once to thy unrighteous importunity, that thou mayest hereafter learn what to believe and utter, and make more conscience of thy censures and reports. And that thou mayst have the utmost relief that I can procure thee for the time to come, I shall agree with my Booksellers, to sell all that I publish at

three farthings a sheet, and to print the price of every book at the bottom of the Title page.

October 11, 1658.

Farewell. Richard Baxter.

Errata.

Much of the Errata is not descriptive enough for me to pinpoint exactly what needs to be corrected. It has been included here for others who may may find use for it.

p. 24, l. 9, r. Platina. p. 30, l. 9, r. Formosus. p. 31, l. 19, r. Cardinals. p. 58, l. 13, r. mean time. p. 59, l. 5, and 16, r. Filiutius. and l. 9, and 25, r. Bauny. and l. 13, r. a man may do. p. 61, l. 7, r. Baldellus. l. 23, r. Escobar. p. 126, l. penult. for of r. take. p. 131, l. penult. r. Vignerius. p. 145, l. 9, r. to receive so many. and l. 19, r. when he hath. p. 195, l. 35, for this, r. his. p. 196, l. 36, r. Baldwin. p. 206, l. 27, for of, r. or. and l. 28, for Dr. r. D. p. 213, l. 7, r. when we do. p. 220, l. 36, r. Dan tes. p. 224, l. 2, and 3,4, r. the names in the Accus. case. p. 225, l. 8, r. yourself. p. 259, l. 31, r. Anathema's. p. 261, l. 35, r. not, for nor. p. 266, l. 17, r. that it is. l. 28, r. Cano. p. 267, l. 10, r. to end the. p. 288, l. 24, for left, r. lest. p. 297, l. 17, for them, r. the. p. 314, r. Paulus 5, p. 356, l. 31, r. hatchets. p. 362, l. 28, r. at last. p. 365, l. 8, for may, r. many. and l. 33, r. Maldonado. p. 397, l. 30, r. the other of. l. 32, for parties, r. straw. p. 409, l. 32, r. in the. l. 36, blot out

none. p. 422, l. 13, r. presided. p. 426, l. 17, blot out of. p. 432, l. 33, for had, r. had not. p. 434, l. 4, for to, r. as, p. 435, l. 1, r. members. p. 433, l. 29, blot out a. p. 452, l. 20, r. But when the.